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Abstract

This creative practice research explores the concept of an identifiable screenwriter’s voice from the perspective of screenwriting as craft, proposing that voice can be understood and described based on its particular characteristics. Voice is understood to be the authorial presence of the screenwriter, whose mind shapes every aspect of the text. This presence is inscribed in the text through the many choices the screenwriter makes. More than this, the research argues that the choices made inflect the text with a cultural-national worldview. This occurs because of the close association between voice and personal (including cultural/national) identity, and because of the power of textual elements to signify broader concepts, ideas and phenomena belonging to the actual world.

The thesis includes an original feature film screenplay evidencing a particular Australian voice, and an exegesis which describes voice and national inflection more fully. The practice research began with the interrogation of voice in a previously-existing screenplay which, though an original work written by an Australian screenwriter – myself – was described as having an American voice. Voice and its mechanisms were then further investigated through the practice of writing the original screenplay, Calico Dreams. Theories of voice from within literary theory, and the concept of mind-reading, from cognitive literary theory, acted as departure points in understanding voice in screenwriting. Through such understanding a conceptual framework which can assist practitioners and others to locate aspects of voice within a screenplay, was designed. This framework is a major research outcome and its use is illustrated through the description of voice in the screenplay, Calico Dreams.

The research found that screenwriter’s voice serves to unify and cohere the screenplay text as an aesthetic whole through its stylistic continuities and particularities. Through the voice, the screenwriter also defines many of the attributes and characteristics of the film-to-be. A theory of screenwriter’s voice significantly shifts the theoretical landscape for screenwriting at a time when an emerging discourse of screenwriting is developing which can enrich understandings of the relationship between the screenplay and its film.
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Part I - Origins of the Research

Introduction

This thesis proposes that the concept of an identifiable writer’s voice can be applied to screenwriting, and it offers ways to understand, describe and locate voice in a screenplay. It also illuminates the processes by which a screenwriter inscribes voice in the screenplay text. The question which drives the research is: “What is screenwriter’s voice, and how might an individual screenwriter’s voice be described?” A complementary aspect of the research is the observation that some aspects of voice can be related to the writer’s worldview as it has been shaped by her life context. This leaves opportunity for voice to be culturally and/or nationally inflected. This argument is intertwined with the argument for personal voice, since the identity of the screenwriter which informs voice can include aspects of her cultural-historical-political identity (Edensor, 2002, p. 161; Higson, 2006; Hobsbawm, 1996). This document comprises the research exegesis and the screenplay, which is the embodiment of the voice under discussion and which was written as part of the creative practice research. The voice found within that text, and the characteristics argued to be inscribed there, complete the argument that voice is present in the work, Calico Dreams, as it is in all screenwriting, and that this voice is influenced by the writer’s female and Australian identity. Significantly, a second research outcome is the conceptual framework for screenwriter’s voice which is presented, explained and applied in the thesis.

In this Part, ‘Origins of the Research’, I offer an overview of the project and a brief discussion of the American voice in the pre-existing screenplay, Cashflow (Ferrell, 1996). The first stage of the research was to interrogate its voice within, asking what it is in the language and ideas which led it to be identified by an Australian reader as American. This introduces the question of voice, and substantiates the way that creative practice was integral to the research. This section is followed by a description of the methodology as practice research. The practice in this case has encompassed screenplay analysis, invention and further script development each of which require different approaches to a text, and all of which are part of screenwriting practice at different times.
The second Part, ‘An Introduction to the Field,’ describes the efforts made to confirm the relevance of the topic voice to working screenwriters in Australia and elsewhere. It then provides a brief introduction to the field of film studies and its specific stance towards the screenplay as an object. It is due to the uneasy relationship between a film and its screenplay—both texts which describe/illustrate the same story and yet one of which tends to be privileged over the other—that this thesis argues strongly for a discourse of screenwriting in which the screenplay is placed centrally as the entry point for inquiries into screenwriting. The Part serves to illuminate the rationale behind the research. It closes on a description of the significance of the research for practitioners and for academia, and suggests its potential impact in other areas.

The third Part, ‘Voice in the Context of Screenwriting,’ defines and describes voice in the broader context of scholarship and industry, and raises some of the issues within the field which impact a theory of voice. Part IV, ‘Discovering/ Uncovering Voice in Craft,’ explains some of the ways that the creative practice drove the research, and through practice, a deeper understanding of voice was gained. This understanding placed writing craft as central to the inscription of voice in any screenplay. The Part also describes the framework for screenwriter’s voice which was developed during the course of this creative practice research. The framework describes the craft areas in terms of the types of choices which the screenwriter makes which create the voice. The framework itself is the tool which, it is proposed, can aid readers to uncover voice in instances of screenwriting. The description of the framework craft areas in some cases suggests the ways in which a national-cultural context can be reflected in the text and observed in the choices made.

In Part V, ‘Screenwriter’s Voice in Calico Dreams,’ the synopsis and screenplay are presented. The screenplay is followed by a case study in which the voice in *Calico Dreams* is analysed using the framework. This demonstrates the framework’s use as a tool to locate the voice of this writer. The screenplay’s voice is described as being inflected with a female and an Australian worldview. In the final Part, VI ‘Conclusions,’ the arguments for voice are summarised to describe how and why
voice is present in screenwriting, how it can be discerned, and which aspects of voice in *Calico Dreams* more specifically speak to the writer’s own identity as an Australian woman.

The lack of a coherent theory of screenwriter’s voice is the major prompting behind this research project. The concepts of dramatic and narrative voice in filmmaking have been raised by Ken Dancyger (1995; 2002; 2007; 2013), Jeff Rush (1995; 1997; 2002; 2007; 2013) and Cynthia Baughman (1997). However, I argue that Dancyger, Rush and Baughman’s scholarship places the “filmmaker” (2007, pp. 312, 314) at the centre of authorship of a film in a way which marginalises, obscures or negates the screenplay and the writer’s role and contribution (Baker, 2013; Maras, 2009; Price, 2010). Because of this, the authors’ interrogations of the screenplay are superficial, and the investigation of the screenwriter’s voice lacks substance and depth of analysis. This research problematizes Dancyger, Rush and Baughman’s concepts of dramatic and narrative voice as they pertain to screenwriting particularly and, I claim, represents new knowledge in the understanding of voice in screenwriting; knowledge which properly belongs to a discourse of screenwriting.

The emerging discourse of screenwriting (Maras, 2009, p. 12), to which this thesis belongs, understands screenwriting “on its own terms” (Maras, 2011, p. 277) rather than from within the discourses of filmmaking, film studies and film criticism. This thesis therefore positions the screenplay as central, addressing voice from the perspective of screenwriting craft and its written text. Moreover, this research is undertaken through practice, as is described more fully in the methodology section. Here, the screenplay is seen as a coherent, stand-alone artwork (Horne, 1992, p. 53) whose author is the screenwriter. While it is understood that screenwriting is often undertaken by co-writers; that a screenplay may have different writers across its lifecycle; and that producers, script editors and other technical personnel may add input, the screenwriter as author is represented in the singular in most cases within this exegesis. This is reflective of Australian screen industry practices, in which the screenwriter is accorded moral rights in her works (Apolonio, 2017) in line with a European conception of the *droits d’auteur* (Fischer, 2013, p. 11). The consequence of this in Australian practice is that the originating writer will generally continue to work on her own script (with input from others) throughout all development stages.
At the same time as referring to the screenwriter in the singular, I also refer to her using the female pronoun, ‘she’. The reader is spoken of using the male pronoun, ‘he’. This avoids the contradiction inherent for me in speaking of a screenwriter as masculine. This is also convenient for differentiation between the reader and writer since I speak of both. This decision is not unprecedented in screenwriting research, and I follow the lead of screenwriter-researcher and academic Stayci Taylor (2016, p. 9).

While film theory has tended to understate the centrality of the screenplay to its finished film, literature has generally eschewed screenwriting as a literary practice, based on screenwriting’s commercial and industrial contexts (Baker, 2013; Cheu, 2007; Maras, 2009; Price, 2010). Nevertheless I have drawn on concepts from literary theory, and have adopted a definition of voice from that discipline. Voice here is understood as the “pervasive authorial presence” of the writer, which operates as a “controlling force” within the text (Abrams & Harpham, 2015, p. 288). I also draw on Theory of Mind as applied within cognitive literary theory (Rabinowitz, 2010; Zunshine, 2002; 2003; 2006), arguing that this field offers valuable insight into the way that readers ‘read’ voice in a screenplay.

In defining voice as an authorial presence this research argues that voice can be understood to be native to all writing. This argument is grounded in the term ‘presence,’ which need not be associated with quality or mastery. In the case of dramatic writing, the writing itself is evidence of a human consciousness which is responsible for the text. Arguing this makes it possible to bypass value judgements regarding what is or is not voice, and focus on the characteristics of any writing as voice. The research argues that perceiving voice is always consequential upon a reader’s responses to the text, and that reading voice remains a process of indexing tendencies. All observations of voice are personal and valid, though not universal.

Voice is everything within a text, and it is a complex in much the same way that a molecule is a complex of atoms which are bonded in certain ways. The bonds which form a molecular structure are intrinsic to its behaviour and properties. Voice is embodied through written words on a page, and yet it is the specific combination of
those words which define the properties of the text. For a reader it is easy to be
overwhelmed by the sheer number of word combinations which make up voice,
many of which are pedestrian and everyday. It becomes necessary to draw back to
look at the whole or larger parts to see the shades of meaning and design in the
work. In all cases, it is the ideas behind the words which add moments of the
‘marvellous and unique’—moments which are only present because of the balance
between placement and structure of quite ordinary words—to in/form the whole,
create design, and ultimately, convey meaning. Such is the complexity of voice.

While a screenplay text is claimed as evidence of the voice through which it is
expressed, this thesis also proposes that voice can be understood as originating
in the writer’s mind particularly because of the mind’s role in identity-formation
(Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule, 1986; Jung, 1973; Klimstra, Hale III,
Raaijmakers, Branje, & Meeus, 2010; Levine & Cote, 2002; Mairs, 1994).
Furthermore, Tim Edensor (2002) states that the nation is the “pre-eminent entity
around which identity is formed” (p. vi). Therefore voice is also argued to incorporate
a national accent or inflection which reflects the ethnic, cultural and national
contexts which have influenced the writer during her life. Throughout this exegesis
the term ‘national’ stands in for all identity markers of familial, social, political,
cultural, national and regional belonging.

The argument for voice is constructed around the idea that screenwriters make
innumerable choices while writing (Bordwell, 1997; Catmull, 2008; Novrup Redvall,
2013), through which choices voice is inscribed in the text. As Bordwell (1997) and
Novrup Redvall (2013) both note, not all of these choices are consciously made or
understood, and yet all form the voice. By recognising each element of the
screenplay text as a choice made by the writer, a reader can weigh these choices in
light of other possible choices, and come to understand the way that the voice
coheres a work, and is an expression of a particular writer’s knowledge, experience
and skills. The framework for screenwriter’s voice presented here locates voice in a
screenplay by focusing readers’ (and writers’) observations in areas where these
choices are made. It can be used to uncover personal voice and traces of a national
inflection which inheres in the voice.
In keeping with screenwriting as a craft, the research methodology adopted has been creative practice research. This is understood in the creative arts as research for, into and through practice (Downton, 2009; Frayling, 1993; Gray, 1996). The central conceit of the project had been to rewrite the pre-existing screenplay Cashflow, whose voice was identified as American, with an Australian voice. However, the practice research caused me to alter this intention when analysis and critical reflection showed that the American voice in Cashflow was so deeply embedded that it was not possible to simply transpose the language and story into Australian idiom and locations to persuade audiences that the voice was now Australian. Instead it became necessary to write a new screenplay to achieve an Australian inflection. Calico Dreams is the resulting screenplay.

The two major outcomes of the practice research include the feature film screenplay, and the framework for screenwriter’s voice. A questionnaire on screenwriter’s voice, which was undertaken to confirm the applicability of the research to practising screenwriters, was completed with the cooperation of professional writers guilds and the Screenwriting Research Network web forum, and its report represents a further outcome (See Appendices E & F).

The practice described here relates to writing an original dramatic screenplay in master scene format. Several conditions pertain to the screenplays considered here. The first is that both screenplays (Cashflow (Ferrell, 1996) and Calico Dreams) are the work of a single author and are written without the constraints and challenges of funding partners or co-writers. Thus the voice of the screenplay can be directly connected with the range of this screenwriter’s voice. Throughout it is noted that when the screenplay comes about through collaborative or sequential co-writing, the voice must be termed the ‘voice of the screenplay,’ to accurately reflect this. Similarly, the voice in a production of the screenplay is best termed the ‘voice of the film.’

A further issue pertains to the veracity of the statements made here concerning voice and its mechanisms. While it is proposed that voice is not limited to drama nor to any particular written or audiovisual format, some statements made here regarding voice
may not hold true for other genres of writing, where voice may function in specific and different ways. Voice ties a work to the intelligence, moral and aesthetic sensibilities (Abrams, 1993, p. 156) of its writer, and speaks to the complexity of human identity which is foundational to voice (Abrams, 1993; Abrams & Harpham, 2015; Cavarero, 2003; Elbow, 2007; Gilbert, 1994). Related to this is the idea that individual screenwriters approach their practice in characteristic ways, and that voice generally can be evidenced by the stylistic continuities which a reader discovers in a work. While a personal style and philosophy which underpins the text may go unnoticed in a single work or when a reader is unfamiliar with the writer, the sense of a distinct writer’s voice can be enhanced as readers become familiar with several works by the same writer. In responses received to the Screenwriter’s Questionnaire (see Appendix F) it was clear that many screenwriters have a strong sense of their own voice, recognise and are able to articulate this.

As the starting point of this research, discovering the American voice in *Cashflow* through analysis and reflection highlighted the possibility of conveying cultural and ideological identity through screen stories. This prompted me to investigate not only national inflection as a part of personal voice but also as part of a theory of voice in screenwriting. There is a body of literature which acknowledges the dominance of 8 major American studios in worldwide film distribution and exhibition (Crane, 2014; Davis, 2006; Elizabeth Ezra & Terry Rowden, 2006; Lee, 2008). Diana Crane (2014) states that “film policy contributes to the success of national film industries but does not enable [those industries] to challenge US dominance” (p. 365) within their own borders. Through developing an awareness of personal voice and national inflection in screenwriting, this thesis seeks in part, to champion a diversity of voices and stories on global screens. The power of audiovisual media to promote greater understanding and respect between peoples through screen culture is immense, and yet in many cases, this remains a hope for the future rather than a reality. A more developed awareness of voice may encourage emerging and current screenwriters and filmmakers to move beyond emulation of Hollywood storytelling norms, to create a greater variety of thoughtful and compelling screen stories.

Overall, the thesis aims to build a greater understanding of the labour which screenwriting entails, and the extent to which the screenwriter writes their particular
worldview into the text through their unique screenwriter’s voice. It also seeks to build awareness amongst screenwriters, filmmakers, scholars and consumers of films, of the power of screenwriter’s voice which coheres the text as an artistic and aesthetic whole which is the consequence of a personal consciousness and identity.

**Background**

The central research question was raised nearly two decades ago when the voice of my screenplay *Cashflow* (see Appendix B) was first identified as American by an Australian reader. *Cashflow* was the first feature screenplay I had written. It is a fantastical work set in a mythical frontier. It has a clear structure and storyline, and strong stylistic elements: melodramatic and comic in places, with naïve, exaggerated characters. It is the story of a young woman who, as a maid in a brothel, is increasingly under pressure from the madam to prostitute herself, and how she escapes this fate.

Neither genre nor voice were considered when writing, yet these arose as issues when readers came back with a curious (yet logical) question: “Why is it American? Why does it have to be set in America?” Why indeed, when all the major elements were Western Australian, including writer-director, actors, and a possible location for filming (a local pioneer theme park) in Perth, Western Australia.

The answer was complicated. At the time of writing I thought of the production as Australian, with international elements. The mix of nationalities amongst the characters and the strong Australian presence through creative personnel and location led me to the presumption that the film would be ‘Australian-international,’ which Deb Verhoeven describes as

> Films and filmmakers happily embedded in both the local and global … [producing] films initiated by Australians wanting to work with large budgets, international resources, high-profile actors and local content and personnel, and shooting either in Australia or offshore. (2010, p. 141).
Though I had paused before committing to the American language, American terms and cultural tropes (‘Sheriff,’ ‘Deputy,’ ‘Southern Belle’ and others) naturally flowed from my pen and fitted the style and tone of story. I was also hopeful of attracting American interest in the production. Since it is common practice amongst co-production partners to insert their own ‘named’ actors into co-productions in which they invest, I rationalised that several issues would be negotiated at that time, and language could be one of these.

Although it was my first attempt to write a feature film, Cashflow was surprisingly easy to write. As the narrative unfolded I began to realise that it had strong similarities to F Troop (Creator: Bluel, 1965-1967), an American frontier television series which I had watched and loved as a child. At the time I was dis-inclined to question the similarities deeply because the writing came so easily. I also imagined specific elements within the screenplay and its production as Australian. Thus, it came as a shock when readers identified Cashflow as American because I, an Australian, had believed I was expressing my own writer’s voice. The rich seam of voice had been exposed, and had revealed its capacity to embrace national identity amongst its formations.

This American inflection raised contradictions which problematized voice and ultimately led to this research. Through the research I can now argue that it is both true that the voice is mine, and that it carries indices of an American national inflection. Through the research too, I have been exposed to scholarship which notes imitation as central to how children learn (Alexander, 2012). Alvarez claims it is also a way through which new writers learn writing craft (Alvarez, 2005, p. 25). I now understand my experience of writing Cashflow as one in which imitation was so wholly integrated into my own creative processes of invention that I was unaware of it. I believe that it was my early experience of F Troop (Creator: Bluel, 1965-1967) which had influenced me to produce a comic western which others identified as having an American voice.
Questions

The questions posed for me when *Cashflow* was described as American were: ‘what does voice mean in the context of screenwriting?’ ‘how do we know it exists?’ and ‘how does this relate to the concept of an Australian voice?’ These three questions were modified through the research journey, leading to the final question:

“What is screenwriter’s voice, and how might an individual screenwriter’s voice be described?”

The final question represents a more concise way of expressing the concerns which were foregrounded through the original questions. Of course, the reason that *Cashflow*’s voice was brought into question in the first place was because of the large number of signifiers in the text which suggested that the story was grounded in an American world, not least of which the American English used throughout. This was notable because the writer – myself – was Australian. *Cashflow* showed clearly that national identity could be implicated in a screenwriter’s voice even if, ironically, it was not the national identity expected. This investigation of voice, then, had to take account of the national within personal identity, which Tim Edensor (2002) contends is foundational (p. vi). For this reason, the theory presented here acknowledges national inflection as an aspect of screenwriter’s voice, and incorporates some discussion around national identity and the ways in which identity inheres in a voice and through inscription, in a text.

‘Inflection’ was deemed the more appropriate way to label aspects of voice which suggest an association with a particular ethnic-cultural-national group because it suggests an accent or trace within the voice. It is not intended to suggest that the ‘nation’ or ‘national’ are in any way fixed or complete descriptors. The terms ‘Australian’ and ‘American’ are intended to broadly identify ideas and features of language whose source can be traced to the cultural, social, political and historical circumstances within specific geo-political spaces as these have influenced the writer’s worldview (however contested the concept of nation may be in a globalised world). Use of the term ‘inflection’ is also deemed more appropriate to a methodology in which the dataset rests in only one Australian-voiced (and one American-voiced) screenplay. This thesis does not seek to argue for any fixed national voice.
The framework for screenwriter’s voice was an unexpected outcome of the screenwriting practice undertaken. As the practice research developed, voice was shown to be so complex and multi-layered, particularly when the concept of national inflection was considered, that I became interested to understand how these layers were interrelated, and how they interacted. This encouraged me to attempt to represent voice in a diagrammatic way. The framework was the result. It represents the complexity of voice, illuminates its complementary dimensions, and is a useful tool for discerning and identifying voice in screenwriting when speaking of both the particular characteristics of a voice, and/or the voice’s specific national inflection.

The first stage of the research practice involved using my skills and experience in script analysis to answer what it is within Cashflow’s text which made a reader suggest the voice was American. In undertaking this analysis, it quickly became clear that it was a combination of aspects of the text which produced the impression of an American storyworld. I discovered the intricate interrelationships between aspects of craft, and signifiers of national belonging which worked together to characterise the voice as American. It became clear how potent the nation is as a symbolic field within voice and/or fictional worlds (Edensor, 2002, p. 17). This symbolic and mythic field is particularly present in depictions of recognisable and everyday life (Aldea, 2012; Avram, 2005; Edensor, 2002; Ransom, 2014), with which film, as an audio-visual medium, abounds. Overlaid with this signification of national-cultural belonging is a range of storytelling techniques and devices which have become understood internationally through instances of filmmaking. The predominance of the United States as a producer of films (Crane, 2014, pp. 366-370), and the success of that nation in exporting their films (Carroll Harris, 2013; Crane, 2014; Davis, 2006; Elizabeth Ezra & Terry Rowden, 2006; Scott, 2002), leads to further connections between filmic techniques and devices with specific signifiers, conventions and tropes which are associated as American. Perhaps this is what Martin McLoone (2008) means when he speaks of Irish film being trapped between “its nationalist past, its European future and its American imagination” (cited in Zaluczkowska, 2009, p. 3). In the case of Cashflow however, the degree of erasure of any Australian inflection in the text was alarming, at least to myself as the Australian screenwriter who penned the text.
American voice in Cashflow

When a reader engaged with the screenplay Cashflow (Ferrell, 1996 – see Appendix B), he described what he encountered as American. This raised the question of voice because a screenplay is a verbal text; and voice—defined as the “pervasive authorial presence” of the writer (Abrams, 1993, p. 156)—is a metaphoric term which speaks to the characteristics of ideas and language which make up that text and originate with the writer. This short section presents a snapshot of Cashflow’s text to begin to explain what this American voice looked and sounded like, and what its effect was in the screenplay text. Analysing the screenplay in this way was the first creative practice task of the research.

Edensor (2002) identifies that “habits, rituals and ways of speaking” are resources which communicate a sense of national belonging (p. 20). Early on in reading Cashflow, it becomes clear that ‘America’ is signified through the language. The title sequence (shown at Figure 1 below) gives several examples of the American English which appears in the screenplay text. The American terms ‘sidewalk’ (‘footpath’ in Australia), ‘cowboy’ (‘stockman’) and ‘Deputy’ (police officer) suggest an American storyworld. The use of cultural idioms such as ‘Southern Belle’ and ‘Billy the Kid’ also reflect cultural ideas which are specific to the United States and are rooted in U.S. history and culture. Also present in the title sequence are cues to visual language (blue highlights)—filmic conventions which were learned from viewing American cartoons on Australian television during my youth.
Each of these signifiers contribute to the impression that the screenplay is set in an American storyworld, with American characters and language. In the absence of a competing national culture which is strongly identifiable, it is easy to see why this reader described the screenplay as American.

Apart from the language and cultural iconography, the United States is also represented amongst the characters. Jimmy is described with reference to several items which identify him as American through the implications of his dress (a cowboy outfit) which in turn draws on American filmic convention and tropes (Meyerhold & Hoover, 1966). Wild Bob, a secondary character, is also depicted as a cowboy/bank robber. Though not all characters are American, and several different nationalities
are present, many characters can be identified as American, and in fact, were in my own mind as I wrote.

Tim Edensor observes that the national can be signified through small everyday acts and behaviours (2002, p. 24), and Gledhill (2001) argues that national discourses are mobilised by “kinds of 'story-telling, modes of acting and theatricality’” (cited in Edensor, 2002, p. 144). This is true of certain of Cashflow’s characters, whose behaviours were stylised in line with filmmaking conventions and performance styles which I had learnt from F Troop. When bank manager, Ted Griffiths, locks his keys in the safe, or slams the door in his assistant, Derek’s face, his behaviour can be recognised as part of a comic tradition (Meyerhold & Hoover, 1966, p. 189) which I had learned as a viewer of American films and television. Ted’s behaviour as a bumbling, sycophantic and lecherous comic villain is also in keeping with the style of a Chaplin, Marx Brothers or Jerry Lewis movie. This cinematic idiom has a history, and such conventions can be thought of as traditions within physical comedy (Meyerhold & Hoover, 1966) – traditions which can be thought to belong to the nation from which those films emanated. Though these types of characters are not at all unique to American films, such characters had become familiar to me through American film and television which dominated Australian screens since the early 20th century, and continues to do so (Carroll Harris, 2013; Dermody & Jacka, 1988; Doyle, 1927; Hamilton & Mathews, 1986; Johnson, 1923; Mathews, 1984; Megaw, 1985; Moran & O’Regan, 1985; O’Regan, 1996; Pike & Cooper, 1980; The Cinema Commission of Inquiry, 1917). I can only assume that my reader associated these with the USA for the same reason. As Scott contends, the American cinematic idiom is pervasive

Figure 2. Mind map – Writer’s Impression of character nationalities in Cashflow
internationally due to American global networks for distribution and exhibition (Crane, 2014; Davis, 2006; Scott, 2002).

There is a vast amount of scholarly literature which associates specific genres with nations/cultures (Aldea, 2012; Alessandrini, 2000; Coogan, 2003; Grant, 1986; F. L. F. Lee, 2008; Limbrick, 2007; Malphurs, 2008; Pye; Ransom, 2014). Barry Keith Grant (1986) describes genre as coming about through the shorthand way that audiences described films to each other from the earliest days of film exhibition (p. xii). This nomenclature was then picked up by exhibitors and salesmen, and was later developed into a way of understanding films in scholarship (Grant, 1986, p. xii). Genre definition is an important way that many aspects of a screen story can be conveyed in one short label, and many associated ideas are encapsulated within a genre category. Kenneth Burke (1945) categorises genre typology in terms of the most recognisable characteristic of the films, using Agent (who the main character is), the Agency (how the story is told) and Setting (such as the wild west in the case of westerns) (cited in Perez, 2002, p. 190). Visually-literate viewers match agents, agency and setting in any screen story, aligning their observations with their expectations of genre. The perceived competence of the screenwriter/filmmakers is at stake if these do not align.

The impression that Cashflow was American partly developed from and was wholly supported by the genre, comic western. On its first page, Cashflow is described as being set in the ‘wild west’ town of Bristly Hills. This suggests a ‘western’ setting (and genre), the default value of which, in Australia, is the United States (Moran & Vieth 2009, p. 16). However, my reader need not rely solely on the genre or the location to identify the storyworld (and therefore, the screenplay) as American. As shown, the cues to an American story were embedded in the language, the characters, their dress, the presence of cowboys, the location and the situation, to name only a few indices. It should be noted that many of these cues, when taken alone, may not be specific to the U.S.A. However in the absence of multiple contradictory and competing signifiers, the brain - having once concluded the location of the story - understands the elements it perceives through a lens which reinforces its expectations. This has been theorised in philosophy of mind by Daniel Dennett, who names the phenomenon the ‘intentional stance’ (Dennett, 1987).
Theory of mind, from cognitive psychology, uses this concept as a major precept which underpins its assumptions, and some scholars apply this to their understanding of the value and joy readers receive from literature and film (Rabinowitz, 2010; Lisa Zunshine, 2003; Lisa Zunshine, 2006). The default value for Cashflow’s storyworld has become ‘American’ and contradictory evidence must be even stronger to overcome the impression of Americanness to simply call into question what the brain believes it ‘knows’.

Interrogating Cashflow in the ways described above helped to explain the sources of the impression of Americanness which led to the statement made by my reader. It also taught me much about voice. It became clear that while voice was conveyed through language, the ideas behind the words on the page were also fundamental to describing and characterising a voice. Not only that, these ideas encompassed craft choices including language, characters (and their representation), setting and genre. Voice was not simply formed on the page, but was informed by the prior knowledge and life experiences of its writer/s and, in turn, by its readers.

This led to the understanding that each of the elements on the screen—including signifiers of culture/nation—is conditioned by the situatedness of the particular reader/viewer within their own specific geo-cultural context. In this case, an Australian associated a comic western with the United States, while an Italian reader may have associated the genre with their favourite spaghetti western, and presumed an Italian storyworld.

This explanation of the voice of Cashflow illuminated the complexity of voice, and it also suggested that national identification could be a strong aspect within any voice, though an aspect governed by the particular lived experience of the writer-reader. Through the example of Cashflow I had shown that any writer could write with a cultural-national inflection which was not their own. But what, in writing, is Australian about any voice? Could there be such a thing? The clear task of the next stage of the research journey was to investigate the possibility of rewriting Cashflow in my own Australian voice.
Methodology

Introduction to creative practice research

Robyn Barnacle (2009) challenges the “definitive account of knowledge generation proposed by scientism or positivism” and proposes instead a “dialogue between researcher and researched, focusing on how something works and what it does” (cited in Grierson & Brearley, p. 11). In these cases, creative arts research can “transcend the dualisms of doing and thinking, mind and body and become a confluence between artist, artefact and its particular social, historical and spatial context” (Grierson & Brearley, p. 11). The result is an “understanding of research on its own terms” (Grierson & Brearley, p. 11) which gives space to argue that in creative practice research the artist-researcher herself becomes a research subject (Gray, 1996; Grierson, 2009; Sawtell, 2017). A creative practice approach also means that the texts produced can be studied as artefacts which “evidence specific creative writing practices [and] produce and disseminate new knowledge” (Baker, 2013, p. 7). The argument that the artefacts themselves embody and communicate knowledge is supported in other scholarly literature (Beattie, 2013; Downton, 2009; Grierson & Brearley, 2009) and, as Downton (2009) notes, such communication of knowledge is enhanced when the reader/audience is also a practitioner who brings “canonic knowledge” to their reading of a work (p. 124).

The more holistic understanding of creative arts research, and the knowledge created through its artefacts, is the reason behind naming the methodology applied here as ‘creative practice research’ or ‘practice research’ rather than specifying the research as ‘practice-based,’ ‘practice-led’ or ‘research-led practice.’ It has been noted that “the terms ‘practice-based’ and ‘practice-led’ are often used interchangeably” (Candy, 2011). In addition, Simon Grennan argues that “there is still no agreed pedagogic definition of practice-based research,” asserting that “there is not a dearth of definitions, but rather a wide variety, predicated upon the developing programmes of individual places of study” (Grennan, 2015). I therefore follow Stayci Taylor’s (2016) precedent in claiming that I have been “guided by practice” towards the range of “processes and theories” (Taylor, 2016, p. 15) that have informed this research, which from various perspectives does not fit easily into definitions of either ‘practice-based’ or ‘practice-led’ inquiry. I argue that the new knowledge created and
communicated through the research practice described in this exegesis, and that it represents a significant contribution to screenwriting scholarship. In the next section I describe the methods and activities which were integral to this creative practice approach to research.

Interdisciplinarity

Beattie notes that interdisciplinary research theory and methods can accompany screenwriting research (2013, p. 2). Through necessity, I have adapted theories of voice from literary theory as a starting point from which to argue for screenwriter’s voice. I have also developed themes and arguments from philosophy, film studies, transnational film theory and inter-cultural communication studies, as part of this approach. My understanding of how voice is ‘read’ has been informed by philosophy of mind and cognitive literary theory (theory of mind). Some of the practice methods used are from creative writing (Baker, 2016) while others have been described by Gray as visual, multi-medial and social science (qualitative) methods (1996, pp. 15-16). The argument for voice has also been informed by reference to studies of identity and identity formation (Jung, 1973; Klimstra, Hale III, Raaijmakers, Branje, & Meeus, 2010; Levine & Cote, 2002; Toronto, 1991), which relates to voice as a reflection of the writer’s personhood. Overall, by choosing a creative practice research methodology I have been able to maintain an openness to other disciplines which has enriched my understanding of voice.

Embodied learning and knowledge

Estelle Barrett (2007) and Gray (1996) both offer strong approaches to describing what the practitioner-researcher actually does. Barrett argues for Michel Foucault’s (1991) concept of the researcher as embodying ‘dispersed selves’ when undertaking research (cited in 2007, p. 135). This is fully supported in Grierson’s argument that the researcher becomes a “research subject” in the process of creative practice research (Grierson, 2009). Gray acknowledges that research includes the researcher as participant, and describes “‘real world research’, [where even] ‘mistakes’ are revealed and acknowledged for the sake of methodological transparency” (1996, p. 15).
The importance of recognizing the researcher’s personal involvement in creative practice research (or in fact, any research) inheres in the ways that creative practice research operates not only on the “basis of explicit and exact knowledge but also on that of tacit knowledge” (2007, p. 143). Through this it has the capacity to “bring into view, particularities of lived experience that reflect alternative realities that are either marginalised or not yet recognised in established theory and practice” (Barrett 2007, p. 143). Barbara Bolt (2004) writes that

Heidegger argues that we do not come to “know” the world theoretically through contemplative knowledge in the first instance. Rather, we come to know the world theoretically only after we have come to understand it through handling. Thus the new can be seen to emerge in the involvement with materials, methods, tools and ideas of practice. (Cited in Barrett, 2007, p. 143)

Certainly, screenwriting is one such artform, where writers (and readers after them) need to feel their way through the composition of the screenplay, relying on emotional and intuitive responses which, in my experience, often remain opaque even to the person in the flow of such practice, to be revealed later through reflection and analysis. As greater numbers of artist-researchers pursue their projects based on the “particularities of lived experience” (Barrett, 2007, p. 143) other knowledges which are currently marginalised may be revealed in this way too. This joining of action, analysis and reflection has been important throughout this research project, and underpins many of the insights which have been brought to light.

While Grierson (2009) argues for the researcher as also a subject of the research, Downton describes the experience of a “me” and a “meta-me,” who “scrutinised what the designing me was up to” (2009, p. 112). This concept engages with that of “tacit knowledge” which is gained through experiencing the material nature of creative practice. Though language is a "living, breathing artefactual poetic of the writer” (Grierson, 2009, p. 21), Grierson claims that many in the creative arts “presume that text-based work is somehow less creative that (sic) arts practice” (2009, p.21). Nevertheless she insists that
The processes of crafting language and performing text is as material as the process of crafting clay or paint or metal...; the challenges to one's language can be as potent as the challenges to one's selection of appropriate media in art, or rhythms and movements in dance or music. (Grierson, 2009, pp. 21-22)

I argue that the craft of screenwriting is as experiential as Downton's model-making, if not in an external way—reliant upon touch, smell, vision, sound—but in an internal way, reliant upon affect and emotion to produce understanding and ‘knowing’. The corollary of this argument is that “text performs one’s subjectivity as it reveals one’s political orientation” (Grierson, 2009, p. 22). Thus voice is again, shown to be connected to identity, which is a central tenet of this research.

Downton extends the understanding of the ways in which a research artefact—in his case, a designed model—embodies or performs research undertaken when he argues that different viewers/audiences can elicit knowledge from an artefact based on their own disciplinary familiarity with artefacts of similar types, that is, through drawing on “canonic knowledge” (Downton, 2009, p. 123). As he explains, “in any piece of design, there is evidence of the knowledge involved in its designing that can be understood by others and potentially learnt by them” (Downton, 2009, p. 124). On the same basis I argue that a practitioner-reader of the screenplay presented in this research may read the screenplay and at the same time experience a greater awareness of voice and its effect, which is gained through the context and the knowledge the reader brings to such reading.

This following outlines the stages of the creative practice research journey and describes the methods, activities and tasks which constitute the practice research/research practice. I argue that this thesis represents new knowledge both through the theory of screenwriter’s voice described, and the framework for screenwriter’s voice produced, and through the illumination of voice in the screenplay, Calico Dreams. Further new knowledge has been communicated through the ways that screenwriting practice is laid bare in Part IV ‘Creating Voice through Craft’. As Grierson explains, “creativity and creative research [is] a condition of knowing and being” (Grierson, 2009, p. 17). The approach taken here represents an embodied and immersed scholarship, which embraces both epistemological and
ontological knowing—knowing as knowledge, and knowing as being. This following describes this more fully by describing the methods involved in the practice research.

Introduction to the Stages of Practice

In approaching the topic of voice, an early insight gained was the scarcity of academic research into screenwriter’s voice. In fact, all research into voice in the sense implied here was scattered and difficult to find. It worried me that I should be developing a theory of voice in isolation from my colleagues and discipline. This drove me to seek evidence of the concept from other screenwriters. To this end I developed a questionnaire on screenwriter’s voice which was distributed in Australia through the Australian Writers Guild, and internationally through the Screenwriting Research Network and other writers guilds. It was pleasing to see the level of engagement with the topic from respondents, who generally shared my own sense of voice and its presence and nature in our work. The questionnaire and its results are held in the appendices (E & F).

From its inception, the research was designed to explore voice through re-writing the screenplay *Cashflow* to illustrate an Australian voice. These stages were proposed: an assessment of *Cashflow* through the Australian Writer’s Guild; analysis of the screenplay based on that assessment and on my own notes; a period of rewriting to produce a second draft of *Cashflow* with an Australian voice; and assessment and a public reading of the second draft screenplay. This was to be supported by relevant literary and film theory, particularly on Australian national cinema.

The strength of this research design was the ability to compare two drafts of the same screenplay. The project did not proceed as expected however, when it became obvious through screenwriting practice that the screenplay *Cashflow* could not easily be ‘transposed’ to Australia because the ideas, genre, structure and plot which lay behind the characters and situations in *Cashflow* were sources of the Americanness in the voice. At this point it became clear how deeply characters can embody a cultural-national context, and how such characterisation was enmeshed with genre and plot. Since the characters carried the Americanness through their assigned
nationalities, characteristics, performance and film style, genre and plot also needed to be different. This led to the decision to write an alternative screenplay using the same story premise, changing only those elements that needed to be changed to create a convincing Australian story and voice.

As I embarked on the practice it became clear that many more things needed to be changed than were at first imagined. Even while retaining the story premise (a young girl working in a brothel was being forced into prostitution), the major and minor characters, many locations, plot devices, tone and all elements of sets and dressings were altered when the genre was changed from comic western to an historical melodrama based in realism and set in Australia. The research design was modified to incorporate historical research and a field trip to support the invention of a new historically-based screenplay.

Changing the setting to one based in an authentic historical era and place in Australia was an attempt to ensure that my Australian audience did not read Australian ‘outback town’ as ‘(American) frontier’ as I felt they had with Cashflow. However, I consistently found that the first ideas and images which sprung into my mind were based on my viewing of American films and television. As Ruth Megaw (1985) has noted, plays, books, films and television are important in forming the image of a society even when their intention is not to impart such knowledge (p. 24). Indeed, it seemed that the American west was far more familiar to me that the Western Australian outback. Therefore, though the field trip was undertaken to cement a familiarity with the chosen Australian frontier in my own mind and imagination, it was not entirely successful in achieving this. This factor slowed the writing process significantly, and the difficulties of writing from my own cultural perspective shed new light on the consequences for a writer of being exposed to works from a different screen culture in inordinately large amounts. It was this experience which is reflected in the use of the word ‘recovering’ with regard to an Australian voice in the title of this thesis. This insight also suggests to me the importance of voice as a concept in an increasingly transnational/transcultural world.

Stages in the creative practice research
Table 1 (below) indicates the stages and methods of the practice methodology as these were undertaken to the stage when it became obvious that it was necessary to change the genre.

Table 1. Stages and methods of research methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of <em>Cashflow</em></td>
<td>Australian Writers Guild (AWG) (professional assessment – See Appendix C)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Analysis of *Cashflow* (identify problems in first draft and solutions) | Reflection and journaling  
Practice methods (analysis of structure, plot, characters,.. drawing on prior learning; tacit knowledge; experiential knowledge. |
| Public Script reading *Cashflow* (30th November 2011) | Discussion/feedback with peers, actors, audience  
Analysis of feedback surveys  
Journaling |
| Second draft planning (Revised ‘beat sheet’ interrupted through difficulties) | Practice methods (structural design: create beat sheet, etc.  
Journaling |
| Investigation into genre (Constraints – genre creates the ‘American’ voice through locations, characters, language and so on – leading to the decision to write a new screenplay) | Assess/journal the problem; analyse why/how  
Research into screenwriting and film especially genre  
Academic writing (resulting in conference paper) |
| Planning/Writing new screenplay *Calico Dreams* | Practice methods including 5-sentence structure; develop characters; define storyworld, etc. |
| Field Trip (Research into historical Australian ‘world’) | Historical research (through W.A. Museum and others: academic; archival; photographic; experiential/interactive.  
Embodied/situational learning (Interviews, photography, experiential immersion) |
In the above table, the stages in bold: ‘Second draft planning;’ ‘Investigation into genre;’ and ‘Planning/Writing new screenplay,’ indicate the place at which I met difficulties which caused me to alter the expected research stages. In this case, the problem of rewriting *Cashflow* led to the challenge of writing a new screenplay, the result of which is *Calico Dreams*.

Outcomes produced through the research

When creative practice research is described as research in which “questions, problems, [and] challenges are identified and formed by the needs of practice and practitioners” (Gray, 1996, p. 3), I recognise this as my own approach to the question of voice. Lisa Dethridge (2009) describes creative practice research in the field of screenwriting where the

> Researchers in screenwriting organise their work into two components: firstly there is the project document (a screenplay for feature film) representing an act of creative imagination; secondly, there is the support of an exegesis investigating a specific conceptual framework and the methodology through which the creative work is undertaken. (p. 97)

Maggi Phillips, Cheryl Stock and Kim Vincs (2009) note that creative practice research is generative in that there are often multiple multi-modal outputs which are both creative and theoretical (p. 5). Grierson (2004) contends that critical practice involves an “active engagement with risk, imagination and reflexivity as discursive processes of knowledge are identified, and knowledge is generated” (cited in Dethridge, 2009, p. 97). Dethridge argues that both rational and imaginative capacities of the researcher are activated (2009, p. 97) as, in this case, a first draft screenplay, *Calico Dreams*, and a framework for screenwriter’s voice were generated. Schön (1983) proposes that the context of reflective practice means that “story-telling is an effective genre for the translation of research back into practice” (cited in Marshall & Newton, 2000, n.p.) Though the screenplay may be more specifically identified as imaginative and the framework as rational, I argue that each text was created through processes which draw on *both* rational and imaginative capacities. The main documents generated through these stages are shown below.
Figure 3. Document Map showing the Generative Nature of the Research

Figure 3 (above) is a document map which illustrates the major documents and depicts the research design. At the same time, it evidences the research journey and something of its nature in practice. As has been mentioned, Cashflow (see Appendix B) was the starting point from which I began my investigation of screenwriter’s voice. This screenplay provides a concrete example of what I am calling ‘American’ voice. Cashflow was given a public script reading from which Feedback sheets were collected and a report written. Both that screenplay and Calico Dreams were compared using the STI-MAR system of computer analysis (Marinov & Stitts, 2013). I conducted an international survey on screenwriter’s voice, and include this with its report in the appendices (E & F).

Of the other documents pictured, it is the Journal of Creative Practice, the Journal of Reflections, and the Inventory of Creative Practice which track every stage of the practice research. The Journal of Creative Practice which tracks the ideas behind the research from its earliest explorations, including both craft exercises undertaken to clarify voice, practice notes intended to help in the analysis of Cashflow, and ideas and concepts as they arose out of general reading around the topic of voice. Part of this reading included differentiating between voice and authorship. Figure 4 (below)
illustrates my early conception of these differences, and was developed in this journal.

---

**Figure 4. Excerpt from the Journal of Creative Practice – Diagram of Voice vs Authorship**

The Journal of Reflections performed a different function in that it allowed me to play with theoretical ideas on voice in an informal space where the intention was not to produce theory, but to explore it deeply. Figure 5 (below) shows an excerpt of my thoughts regarding musicality as an aspect of voice, developed in this journaling.

---

**Alvarez, Metricality, Rhyme and Rhythm (Poetry) & Pace (screenwriting) (Elements of voice..)**

... in a screenplay you wouldn't be looking firstly at the words on the page if you were seeking rhythm. Instead you are looking at sequences of scenes, or images within scenes, or acts in relation to each other. So screenwriting involves the same concepts but at a whole other level upwards (meaning taking a broader view of the whole - on the level of scenes, beats, sequences and acts). In attempting to ‘mind-read’ screenplays, I become caught up in the drama, and often miss rhythm, although I recognise ‘pace’. that is, notice when things are happening very quickly and there is much to take in. I may or may not notice structural points or beats as they arrive and pass. We tend to speak of 'pace' in screenwriting, which becomes the cumulative effect of the rhythm of smaller chunks of action. For example, a character takes action, moves, speaks. A rhythm is associated with that character, their characteristic 'running condition'. But they are in a scene with another character, who also speaks and acts but has a different running condition. The rhythm becomes contrapuntal. There is background …

---

**Figure 5. Excerpt from Journal of Reflections – Discussion of musicality in the screenplay**
The Inventory of creative practice traced the screenwriting process, methods and trials, from my first attempts to rewrite *Cashflow* with an Australian voice, through the practice which led to completion of the first draft of *Calico Dreams*. In pursuing historical research I also collected photographs, pamphlets and newspaper clippings on the history of Kalgoorlie, and read several books on prostitution. The Inventory and associated documents journal every step of the screenwriting process, including annotations on script pages as each scene/draft progressed, to side notes of critical self-reflection about the voice; to notes about the process of finding and shaping the characters, storyworld and voice. The inventory also included notes such as conversations held between myself and my characters, or between characters, as I pursued exploratory creative writing or design practices to learn about my characters, story structure, and world. Figure 6 (below) is an excerpt of the Journal of reflections which shows the floorplan drawn in order that I could visualise the spaces and so design the movements and interactions which occurred in the brothel.

Figure 6. Excerpt from Inventory of Creative Practice – Floorplan of the brothel

One of the most time-consuming parts of my practice is trying to keep abreast of the multiple characters and scenes I create. At certain points this requires me to map the structure I have created. This is particularly complex when I write parallel narratives.
for ensemble casts, as I generally do. The Figure 7 (below) is a doodle showing two different ways in which I tested ideas on how to depict the story, to keep myself on track. While the more simple method sketched first as A, B, etc. layers clarified the story through its suggestion of ‘depths’ of interpretation (‘what’s going on;’ ‘what’s really going on;’ .’), it didn’t help me to remember specific incidents. The ‘A-;’ ‘B-;’ story columns below this was very practical. However, it requires some time to map a whole feature film through this method, in which every major structural beat is listed. This type of invention illustrates the ways that I need to create my own tools within the writing practice, in order to do it in a more stream-lined and efficient manner.

Figure 7. Excerpt from Inventory of Creative Practice - Experimenting with a new way of Mapping the Text of an early draft of *Calico Dreams*

‘Practice methods’ explained

While all that has been said here contextualizes the practice research, the diagram (Figure 8) below presents the practice as a set of tasks built around Imagining,
Gray has documented the methods by which practitioner-researchers identify researchable problems and respond through practice. The creative practice methods shown above comprise tasks of: observation; absorption (of ideas and embodied responses); collection; reflection; notation/annotation; and communication, and support Gray’s findings (1996, pp. 13-15). I extend these with imagining, visualising, role-playing, ‘playing’/ ‘exploring’ and experiencing. The ethnographic approach to screenwriting practice adopted integrated self-observation and critical self-reflection with creative practice writing techniques to produce exploratory documents through the activities illustrated above (Figure 8). In practice, Downton’s “meta-me” (2009, p. 112) was never far from the me who was screenwriting and (re)searching simultaneously, for solutions to the challenges inherent in screenwriting.

Embodiment as a means to dramatic design

In all cases, the knowledge gained through these methods was “situated,” “partial,”
“locatable” and “embodied” (Barrett, 2007; Haraway, 1988), and involved technologies which “integrate visual, tactile, kinaesthetic, experiential data into ‘rich’ information” (Gray, 1996, pp. 14-16). The situated and embodied nature of the research is described further in Part III ‘Discovering Voice in Craft.’ The activities above are related to those imaginative and critical processes which allow stories to be developed through the embodied sense of what is dramatic in screenwriting—a sense which is learned and honed through practice. This sense is central to the activity of creating the dramatic design of any screenplay, and is work which is not only essential to screenwriting, but which is foundational to the voice inscribed in the finished text.

Understanding the nature of voice and developing the framework

As previously described, the research journey began with an analysis of the voice in Cashflow, in order to locate the voice and the Americanness inscribed there. This was essentially a process of reverse-engineering screenwriting craft, where the threads which went into crafting the screenplay were unpicked to understand its individual elements. The question of Americanness was central to the analysis because Americanness was an affectation in the voice which was different to my expectations of my own voice. Americanness was recognisable to me through its ‘otherness.’ This made voice easier to locate, and from that point on, easier to interrogate. The American inflection in the screenplay Cashflow gave me a head start in identifying aspects of voice, and from here, I could begin to sort and categorise in order to understand that voice itself had many aspects, and that it was the relations between these aspects which formed the essential character of each individual voice within the balanced whole, for each different instance of voice in writing.

I added to my understanding of voice read other voices in screenplays as varied as Mo’ Better Blues (Lee & Jones, 1990), The Piano (Campion, 1993) and The Seventh Seal (Bergman, 1993). The more I read, the more subtle and complex voice became, leading me to seek to represent it in diagrammatic form to truly express the relationship between all its parts. I tried several ways of doing this, from a ‘form’; to a diagram; through several versions of the framework as presented here.
The first attempt, the form shown here, represented the integration of the many facets of voice I had observed. I devised a set of headings which were intended to allow for the full description of any personal voice. The categories I came up with were: Intentionality, Point of View, Implied Author Image, The Implied Reader (/Viewer), A Mind at Work, In the Mind’s Eye, A Musical Ear for Language, and The Structure of Music / A Dramatist’s Brush. The form used these as major headings, and indicated what sort of responses expected under each. These responses were partly in a ‘checklist’ format, and could simply be ticked, or required a short descriptive phrase in explanation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intentionality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plot complexity: who knows what and when?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point of View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who do we watch at a given time? Who we hear?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implied Author Image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who would write this? How the reader imagines the writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implied Reader (/Viewer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who would read this?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Mind at Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is the screenwriter really?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In the Mind’s Eye</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What images are triggered in the reader’s mind?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Musical Ear for Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What type of language is used/seen? Formal/informal/poetic?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm &amp; pace: relationship to images?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Structure of Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What provides the beats which drive the story? What rhythms support the structure?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of these addressed a specific orientation to the voice. For example, some interrogated the screenplay for screenwriting craft (‘In the mind’s eye’ – imagery; ‘A Musical Ear for Language’ - Sounds). Others noted the stance adopted by the writer (‘Intentionality’ – whether the writer reveals, conceals or mis-leads her readers). Others implied the ways readers may approach the text (‘Implied Author Image’ – who was the person who wrote this text?). While these headings were confusing in themselves, the burgeoning subcategories I devised were mind-boggling. This was not a user-friendly way to elicit information about the voice, and neither did it make voice more easily comprehensible.
The checklist revealed different possible perspectives and approaches to voice. This I learnt that any depiction of voice must indicate relationship of some kind. I abandoned the ‘form’ format, and attempted a pictorial diagram (shown at Figure 10).

Figure 10. Diagram of elements in Screenwriter’s voice – First attempt

The resulting diagram adequately suggested relationships amongst the elements of voice, but it failed to represent the relationship between voice and anything external to the voice. For my purposes, it didn’t illuminate voice sufficiently, and it wasn’t clear how it could be used effectively by readers.

At that time I was developing the concept of national inflection, and for this purpose I created a grid (see Figures 11 and 12 below) through which I tested elements within screenwriting (and films) which I associated with a culture other than my own. I used the film Big Hero 6 for this purpose. Big Hero 6 was perfect to interrogate in this way, since it was inspired by original Marvel comic stories which were set in Japan. The American filmmakers had spoken often in the media about the ways in which they had incorporated elements of Japanese culture into the film (Hall & Williams, 2015; Garratt, 2014b; Giardina, 2015; Konow, 2014). This grid exercise allowed me to confidently identify national-cultural signification through many Japanese and American influences depicted in the story. That these were areas in which culture or nation could be signified was largely supported in my reading on national identity and transnational cinema ((Aldea, 2012; Alessandrini, 2000; Allerdig, 2009;
Anderson, 2007; Avram, 2005; Bhabha, 2006; Buchanan, 2007; Burgelman & Meza; Burges, 2003; Carroll Harris, 2013; Cattrysse, 2015, 2017; Chambliss, 2012; D. Collins, 1987; F. Collins & Davis, 2004; Coogan, 2003; Cook, 2010; Crane, 2014; Davis, 2006; DePaoli, 2012; Desai, 2006; Desser, 2006; Edensor, 2002; Elsaesser, 2006; Ezra & Rowden, 2006a, 2006b, 2006c; Fiske, Hodge, & Turner, 1987; Frater, 2015a, 2015b; Frayling, 1998; Geraghty, 2006; Gilbert, 1994; Goldsmith, 2010; Hall, 1993; Hambly, 2016; Hamilton & Mathews, 1986; Hess, 2006; Higson, 2006; Hjort & Petrie, 2007; Hobsbawm, 1996; Ipsos, 2013; Kil, 2015; Lee, 2008; Limbrick, 2007; Malphurs, 2008; Mandal, 2012; Maslowska, 2014; McAulay, 2012; McCarthy, 2001; McFarlane & Mayer, 1992; Megaw, 1985; Moore, 2017; Morris, 1988; Naficy, 2006; Norris, 1975-6; Novrup Redvall, 2013; O'Regan, 1982, 1996; Patriche, 2003; Ransom, 2014; Routt, 1984; Shefrin, 2006; Shohat, 2006; Smith, Choueiti, & Pieper, n.d.; Su, 2011; Tiffin, 1994; Tobin, 2016; Trivundza, 2010; Turner, 1993; Vanderschelden, 2007; Whitaker, 2005). Thus the grid was developed to reflect both the aspects of screenwriting craft which are cited in every screenwriting manual I have ever read (Aronson, 2000; Dancyger & Rush, 1995, 2002, 2007, 2013; Field, 1982; Heys & Turnbull, 2000; Howard, 1993; McKee, 1999; Seger, 1987) including more academic works (Aristotle, 1998; Batty & Waldeback, 2008; Koivumäki, 2016). The resulting categories reflected craft areas and filmic conventions which are generally understood by scholars and the general public, and also reflected specific areas in which cultural-national signification are most likely (Language; culture; history; geography; Politics; philosophy/ideology). I sketched the grid in the first instance, as shown here (Figure 11). I then created a more formal grid in an electronic format (Figure 12 below).
Figure 11. Sketched Grid of elements of national inflection depicted in *Big Hero 6*

Figure 12. Formal grid, shown with its categories for national inflection (right hand columns)
**Cashflow** had taught me how the small and everyday items within a filmic frame (such as cowboy attire) could signify a culture or nation. As shown, the grid was useful for identifying these elements when named / depicted, and could capture their relationship to cultural / national identity. However, I discovered that listing the elements was a time-consuming job, and defining the relationship between each item and voice was more like guesswork in some cases (what does a hat tell us about the voice?). Items often belonged in several categories, in that they could be related to language, culture, history and so on, but were also representative of the genre (for example, a cowboy hat). What was needed was a way to sort and categorise, and therefore prioritise, which items were most meaningful. I created a Table of Supplementary Elements (Table 2 below) which organised the reporting of these items under pertinent categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplementary elements which may evidence national inflection (explicit or implied) in a screen text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural and Built Environments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Art and Design elements</strong> (can be valued as narrative elements, or as filmic effects)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public administration and Social Infrastructure</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Supplementary elements which evidence national inflection
For the purposes of the framework for screenwriter’s voice however, the grid exercise showed me that it was more practical to simply sort all items under language, images or sounds. This provided open categories under which everything which was expressed would fit (see Figure 13 below). It also referenced the audiovisual medium the framework pointed towards.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 13. The Framework for Screenwriter’s Voice**

These methods of listing, sorting and categorising, and the critical experimentation and reflection they entailed, had clarified much about how voice could be meaningfully defined, described and spoken about. The formal craft areas from the manuals encapsulated general notions about how a film is understood in the wider context of all filmmaking. The areas Language, Images and Sounds spoke directly to the target medium of film, but allowed for observations from a verbal text. These craft areas also fell into two convenient levels: the type of story the screenplay told; and how that story was told in material terms. I had two strong and meaningful ‘levels’ to my depiction of voice. And yet still I felt that some elements of voice which were important to its power and meaning were not cued through this schema. Voice
was in fact, still more than these formal craft areas skilfully executed, and more than the visual/aural imagination to describe a three dimensional world. What seemed to be missing was a way to report on meaning and affect.

Creating a third level in the diagram which names Tone, Content and Mood as important aspects of voice was inspired through my search for a suitable definition of ‘tone’ from amongst screenwriting literature. It seemed that scholars spoke of tone, but could not give an adequate definition or description of all its aspects. I knew how powerful tone had been in my reflection and practice on *Cashflow’s* voice. In that case I had not been able to bring Ted Griffiths and Derek the Bank Clerk into *Calico Dreams* because their comic characterisation set a tone that was intricately related to the genre, comic western, and that genre was central to why *Cashflow* came across, to Australians, as American. This gave me a huge clue about the ways in which tone (and mood, which is largely set by the tone) govern the impact a screenplay has on its readers (viewers) through embodied responses, in short, through effect. Tone and mood both needed to be incorporated as aspects of voice.

I chose content as the third area, because the term is familiar in screenwriting and film studies scholarship. Content implicates *everything* in the screenplay, and yet its positioning within the grouping of tone and mood gave it extra *gravitas*, and complemented ‘look’ and ‘feel’ with *meaning*. As an area too, content was open enough to allow for *any* element which impressed a reader to be named and accorded importance for the voice. Content could imply material objects, the overall design, or specific building blocks to the design which a reader found meaningful. Content could also include mythologies, iconography, symbolism and other elements expressive of meaning, in whatever way these were expressed. I was satisfied that through the areas Tone, Content and Mood, readers were invited to use their own responses to the screenplay text—both intellectual, and importantly, embodied—as cues to understanding the voice through its effect.

Content is an extremely open criteria, and therefore it allowed readers to notice things that I had noticed in the grid exercise, that is, things such as cultural or historical resonances which bring meaning to bear in screenwriting. However, I felt that readers may require some guidance towards identifying this content as an
instance of voice. For this reason, I devised the five specific areas of content, each of which can focus readers’ observations in terms of their own responses to a text. The five categories I decided upon were: moral and emotional content; philosophical /ideological frame; creative and imaginative ideas; craft competence; and sense of humour. These five headings were informed by the practice through the grid exercise, and were also supported in scholarship in my readings on voice, identity and related topics. I felt that this framework would adequately capture all the observations about voice that may arise from analysis of a screenplay.

The arrows within the framework diagram show that the areas mutually condition each other and represent a system. The headings ‘what type of story it is’ and ‘how it is told,’ direct the reader (viewer) towards how to interpret the areas named. The relationship between the framework, its named areas, and a reader (viewer) is made implicit within these headings. In this way, the framework design intimates the relations amongst the screenplay elements and voice, and includes readers. This design achieved all that I set out to achieve. It has proved to be a workable model which has aided me to ‘parse’ aspects of screenwriting voice in the screenplay *Calico Dreams*, as described later. Through the grid exercise on *Big Hero 6*, I have also successfully used the framework to suggest the characteristics of the ‘voice of a film’ (see Ferrell, 2017).

Insights

Self-observation and reflection on my practice has provided many insights on voice, two of which I will share here. While screenwriting is often spoken of in terms of specific craft areas (structure, plot, character, theme and so on), and certain edicts are often repeated (‘action is character,’ ‘show not tell,’ ‘one minute per script page’ being common examples) some of the most profound discoveries I have made about voice seem obvious and self-evident, are foundational to gaining the deepest understanding of voice, and yet do not generally receive much attention in manuals. One of these discoveries is that dramatic design is the central vehicle, essence and fundamental concept inherent in the term voice. ‘Dramatic design’ is rarely invoked in screenwriting manuals, where the terms ‘structure’ or ‘plot’ are used to discuss the mechanics of screenwriting. ‘Drama’ and ‘design’ however, are both central concepts which encapsulate the deepest purpose and consequence of voice. Voice
needs to be understood firstly as an instance of dramatic design, which produces a story told in specific ways. The framework aids us to parse those ways, and therefore reveal voice.

A related insight is that choice is the mechanism by which voice is inscribed in any screenplay. Choice is so obviously an aspect of using language that it is easily overlooked. Moreover, many of the choices in everyday language are habitual or unconsciously made. However, because screenwriting is intentional writing, the importance of choice is amplified. Every idea and the mode of expression of those ideas has ended up on the page because a screenwriter intended it to be that way. Screenwriting is a great degree more intentional, and a greater number of the choices are consciously made, than in other forms of everyday writing. This gives the writing more opportunity to carry the mark of its maker in varied ways, leaving a clearer trace of the writer within the text. Language is a "living, breathing artefactual poetic of the writer" (Grierson, 2009, p. 21). While these insights are simple, the profoundness of their meaning, for me, suggests that new knowledge need not always refer to new-ness of itself, but can be equally true when what is new is the deeper understanding of a familiar concept or idea.

Here I have argued that this research has evolved through dynamic processes in which critical practice has generated theory and theory has informed (and generated) practice, and where practice and the practitioner are at the heart of the research (Gray, 1996, pp. 15-16). In the next section, I expand upon screenwriting as it is positioned within the field of film studies, to explain why it is that a discourse of screenwriting is the necessary lens through which screenwriter’s voice needs to be contextualised.

Summary of Part I
In this Part, I have introduced the concept of screenwriter’s voice. I have suggested that every piece of writing is an instance of voice, and that within any screenwriter’s voice aspects of cultural-national heritage and belonging can be subtly present. These can be detected through the worldview, values and practices which are depicted, and seem taken for granted within the screenwriter’s conception of the drama, are implied in language, nationalities of the characters, location of the
storyworld (if a depiction of a real world situation), and many other smaller cues related to people and their practices, governance, social infrastructure and hierarchies, belief systems and many other aspects of everyday life. I have exposed the voice of the screenplay Cashflow, arguing that the inflection inscribed there is American, and finally, I have given an overview of the practice methodology, arguing that the research has been conducted through practice, that the researcher is a vital component of the research subject in this method. I have described aspects of the practice research to illustrate the methodology as creative practice. In the following part, I discuss the screenwriter’s questionnaire as the basis upon which I sought to receive confirmation of the concept of voice in screenwriting. I argue that the concepts of dramatic and narrative voice, as theorised by Dancyger, Rush and Baughman, are inadequate in their treatment of screenwriter’s voice, and I discuss the rationale behind the project and its significance.
Part II - An Introduction to the Field

Introduction to Part II

This part describes and contextualises screenwriting within two overlapping fields. The first is film studies which, as a discipline, was developed during the mid-twentieth century (Bordwell, 1996; Grant, 1986). The second, screenwriting research, is an emerging body of theory (Baker, 2016; Maras, 2009, 2011; Nelmes, 2010). This section argues that within film studies, screenwriting and the screenwriter have been marginalised, and it describes the way that rhetoric within film studies discourses has inadvertently caused this. Finally, it suggests the significance of this research to screenwriters, the academy, and the broader arts industries within national and international contexts.

Foundational scaffolding: fellow screenwriters’ attitudes to voice

The neglect of screenwriting in scholarly discourse generally (Macdonald, 2004; Nelmes, 2010; Maras, 2009, 2011) and the absence of a comprehensive theory of screenwriter’s voice specifically, has been the major rationale behind this research. However when, in the early stages of the research, I realised that the nature of voice in screenwriting had not previously been comprehensively investigated and reported, I felt a certain responsibility towards the field to approach the topic in accordance not only with my own sense of what voice is, but to represent voice in a way which takes account of the views of other screenwriters. This led me to create a questionnaire on the topic of screenwriter’s voice (see Appendix E), which results have guided my approach to voice in this research.

The questionnaire was divided into two parts which were designed to canvass attitudes and beliefs about voice, and to excavate the experience of personal voice in practice. I devised questions based on the experience of my own writing practice and on reading screenplays and observing voice in films. The questions were also informed by preliminary research into voice in literary theory.
The questionnaire was distributed through the Australian Writers Guild electronic bulletin, which provided a link to the questionnaire on Google Chrome. A link was similarly posted to the Screenwriting Research Network email list between June 2013 and April 2014. Half the respondents were Australian, and half were from Britain, Europe or the U.S.A. The questionnaire was also posted on the Australian Writers Guild and the Australian Directors Guild facebook pages.

The total number of responses was small (22 responses), though pleasing in comparison to an official Federation of Screenwriters in Europe / International Affiliation of Writers’ Guilds survey undertaken amongst members in 2012, which received 159 responses from all screenwriters and guild members across the world (John, 2012). The quality of the responses I received suggested that the respondents were strongly engaged with the topic. Twenty-one of the respondents completed all questions, and the answers given were full and thoughtful.

I used the resulting dataset on the perspectives and approaches of other screenwriters to voice and to their practice in general (see Appendix F) to guide my own approach to the topic. It was reassuring that the responses to the questionnaire generally confirmed my own sense of voice, and confirmed the validity of a theory of voice. The questionnaire has provided confirmation that the topic is important, and that the methodological framework chosen, is appropriate.

Rationale

Screenwriting analysts Craig Batty and Zara Waldeback (2008) claim that screenwriting, despite being an art form which is “unlike any of its creative writing counterparts,” shares common qualities with drama and fictional writing in that it involves “storytelling, plot, and character” (p. 1). The authors also assert that a screenplay “can be written with a very unique writer’s voice and style” (p. 1).

However, a theory of voice has been noticeably absent from screenwriting research (notwithstanding Dancyger, Rush and Baughman’s contributions, which I address here). This is perhaps not surprising, given the relatively recent development of screenwriting as a focus of study in its own right (Nelmes, 2010, p. 3), the most
significant event of which may be considered the inauguration of the Screenwriting Research Network, which grew out of a symposium held in Leeds in 2008. At its heart, this research is concerned to illuminate how screenwriter’s voice is the source of the unique set of characteristics which are central to the screenplay’s artistry; characteristics which have been placed in the text through the voice. It seems proper that screenwriters should receive recognition for their effort in creating such voices. First, however, I must dis-entangle the screenplay and writer/s from the discipline of film studies.

Effaced narration, and dramatic and narrative voice in film studies

Though young in comparison to other academic disciplines, film studies is altogether older than screenwriting research. Bordwell describes film studies as “barely” existing prior to the 1950s in the United States. However, when “American studies began treating films as indices to social currents of a period” in the 1960s, Bordwell claims that film courses became attractive as an area within humanities throughout North American colleges and universities. Thereafter, the area grew and expanded in the United States and Canada, Great Britain and Scandinavia, and spread to France and Germany (Bordwell, 1996, p. 3). However, despite this relative longevity, less would seem to have been learned about the craft of screenwriting as part of film studies during these decades, than may have been expected (by screenwriters). In fact, screenwriter and theorist Dallas Baker describes a “problem of discipline” (2013, p. 5) which intervenes when film studies comes up against screenwriting. This problem is that within film studies, scripts are rarely seen as complete creative works but are considered “blue prints for a finished product, which is a film, stage production or television program” (Baker, 2013, p. 1-2). Edward Azlant (1980) has commented on the general tendency in film theory to devalue the writer’s contribution to filmmaking “in favour of looking at the film as an essentially visual entity” (cited in Maras, 2009, p. 48). Maras too, observes that “film studies does not always know what to do with screenwriting” (2009, p. 7). These observations suggest the ways in which film discourses collapse the screenplay into the director’s vision for the film, which I argue, is evidenced in Dancyger and Rush’s work on ‘dramatic’ and ‘narrative’ voice from 1995 on.
In their second and subsequent editions of *Alternative Scriptwriting* (1995, 2002, 2007, 2013), Dancyger and Rush note that mainstream American film seeks to “erase the evidence of a storyteller” by using structure to order events, and they name this *dramatic voice* (2002, p. 37). It is notable that the authors use the term ‘voice’ here in a way which dissociates voice from the writer. For example, they state: “we identify a scene that seems to tell itself, that plays without making us conscious that it is being narrated, as a scene that is working in the dramatic voice” (2002, p. 232). Dancyger and Rush go on to state that “even a scene using the dramatic voice must be given shape by some form of narrating agency that organises the presentation of events.” This they name *narrative voice* (2002, p. 232). The authors explain that the terms narrator and narrative voice are problematic in film for two reasons: because the terms are understood to mean ‘voice-over;’ and also because narrative voice is “deeply embedded in literature and refers to the manner in which the writer speaks directly to us” (2002, p. 232). Though stating that “such simple and direct address is not possible in most films because there are too many intermediary agencies in the mass media production process to speak of a unified, singular filmmaker’s voice” (Dancyger & Rush, 2002, p. 232), the authors still use the term “filmmaker’s voice” to imply narrative voice (pp. 232, 236), and speak in terms of filmmaking processes when speaking of voice. This is exemplified in this quotation:

> Clearly, much of what we are calling voice in film is under the control of the director. Things like the relative realism of colour scheme, the lighting contrast ratios, the set design, the casting, the balance of ambient sounds to dialogue, and the final editing pattern are beyond the realm of the writer. (Dancyger & Rush, 2002, p. 236)

Here the authors are very clearly associating voice with filmmaking, and not screenwriting. From a film studies perspective, everything that Dancyger and Rush have expressed is unproblematic. This is because film studies generally fails to apprehend the screenplay as anything more than a draftsman’s plan, and considers the *filmmaker* the storyteller who creates *narrative voice* in the text which is the film. The screenwriter is an effaced narrator, the screenplay text is obscured by being conflated with the film, and the filmmaker is credited with the narrative voice.
From a screenwriting perspective however, several flaws are evident in this dissociation of the concept voice from the writer when speaking of the screenplay text. Though effaced, the writer does create the structure of the screen story through the screenplay, which organises each element to construct the whole through acts and scenes, even to the extent of anticipating a shooting plan (Batty & Waldeback 2008; Dancyger & Rush 2007; Sternberg 1997). This creates both dramatic and narrative voice, as Dancyger, Rush and Baughman describe them. The screenwriter also defines the film’s genre, storyworld, characters, themes, tone and mood in the screenplay, and most often does this in advance of the involvement of production personnel. They also imply many details regarding the realisation of the drama on film within the screenplay text. My point here however, is the way that the language and arguments presented by Dancyger and Rush expose the mechanisms within film studies discourses which marginalise screenwriting and the screenwriter through conflation, while championing the filmmaker’s narrative voice (which I argue could be differentiated from writer’s voice through use of the term ‘vision,’ or be de-personalised, as in ‘voice of the film’).

The concepts of effaced narration, dramatic and narrative voices as first described by Dancyger and Rush were further refined by Jeff Rush and Cynthia Baughman in a paper published in 1997, and some of these problems were overcome (though not all). These authors describe dramatic voice as “the pro-filmic event—what would supposedly happen in the story world even if we were not there to film it,” and narrative voice as “the shaping the filmmaker brings to the story” (1997, p. 30). In their article, Rush and Baughman offer a sample from the master-scene screenplay from *Blue Velvet* (Lynch, 1986) to show how writer-director, David Lynch comments on and problematizes the storyworld through narrative voice. They argue that the narrative voice achieves this through the way that the writing is “strongly inflected” to poetic and dramatic effect using nuanced language (Rush & Baughman, 1997, p. 28). In the script excerpt, the authors claim that the repeated use of modifiers such as “clean”, “happy” and “gorgeous” (1997, p. 28) teaches readers how to read the screenplay, and also how to read the film (p. 30). As Rush and Baughman put it, “the distrust with which *Blue Velvet* (Lynch, 1986) regards the surfaces of small-town life has been transposed to the language, and then from the language to the images
themselves” (1997, p. 31). *Blue Velvet* (Lynch, 1986) presents an ironic view of small town life, where nothing is as it seems. Above all, it is not clean, happy and gorgeous.

The authors state that the sense of this “intervening voice” will hit readers at different points, and that this too, creates a feeling of ambiguity towards the script, the deeper effect of which is irony (Rush & Baughman, 1997, p. 30). They also note that making the distinction between dramatic and narrative voice allows us to talk about the “shifting location of meaning from stories whose apparent centre is in the working out of events themselves to stories whose focus is on the tension between events and their telling” (1997, p. 30).

To some extent Rush and Baughman redress the conflation of film with screenplay when they note that the theoretical distinction between dramatic voice and narrative voice itself is deeply flawed, because “the writer shapes the drama to reveal narrative purpose, and there is no pro-filmic event outside the narrative” (1997, p. 30). They also succeed in illustrating how the writer is able to use language – even simple language – to shape the reading of the storyworld significantly. In identifying the two ‘voices’ they (and Dancyger and Rush before them) offer a way to speak about different functions the text performs at different times. Sternberg achieves a similar result when she describes the scene text according to “description,” “report,” and “comment” modes (1997, pp. 66-75). Moreover, these modes can be based on firmer evidence within the text than Dancyger, Rush and Baughman’s concepts, which I argue are imprecise.

I notice that Rush and Baughman use a writer-director’s screenplay – a fact which allows them to feel confident in aligning the screenplay’s language with the filmmaker’s visual imagination without compromising the director’s status. This side-steps the issue of authorship in the screenplay as opposed to the film. However, Rush and Baughman do advance the standing of the screenplay when they argue that narrative voice “shapes and at times comments on the story” and when “properly interpreted, embodies the nuances of directorial style” (1997, p. 28). They successfully avoid the question of narrative voice in cases in which a screenwriter
writes and a director directs however, and so fall short of claiming narrative voice for the screenwriter and screenplay in its own right.

I agree with Rush and Baughman when they state that screenplays “can be understood only as a form of writing that communicates much of its meaning through the connotative nuances of language” (1997, p. 28), and I see it as important that their paper illustrates the way that “inferential or evocative language functions to determine meaning and focus in screenplays” (1997, p. 28). However, I argue that the authors hold back from the bold move of addressing dramatic and narrative screenwriter’s voice, which would be unpalatable within a film studies discourse. I also argue that dividing screenwriter’s voice between the ‘dramatic’ and ‘narrative’ functions ultimately serves to weaken the argument for screenwriter’s voice as a singular, observable and kinaesthetic phenomenon which performs both the functions they describe. Arguably, Sternberg’s schema of “descriptive,” “report,” “comment” and “speech” modes (1997, pp. 62-76) is a more useful way to achieve the same analysis of screenwriting.

A further danger in distinguishing the dramatic from the narrative is that dramatic voice can continue to be thought of as belonging to structure, rather than being attributed to the screenwriter’s skill and labour. While at times it may be useful to distinguish between dramatic and narrative ‘modes’ within screenwriting, it is important to stress that these are functions performed by the language at different points, both of which evidence the screenwriter’s authorial presence in a screenplay. I continue to argue for a unified concept of screenwriter’s voice, conceiving of it as a phenomenon which brings coherence and unity to a screenplay text. Voice achieves this through its stylistic continuities, as it engages a reader with the ideas it expresses, the emotions it excites, and by the way these are expressed through language to imply a three-dimensional world of sound and images which a filmmaker can realise.
Significance

This thesis represents new knowledge which belongs to an emerging discourse of screenwriting. The theory and particularly its major tool, the framework for screenwriter’s voice, can be a reference for screenwriters who seek to gain deeper understanding of their writing voices, and for students, academics, critics and fans who seek a deeper understanding of films. Its content has implications for the standing of screenwriters in film industries worldwide, as is foreshadowed in Batty and Waldeback’s (2010) observation that certain eminent writers’ voices (the authors name Richard Curtis) can be likened to a brand (Batty & Waldeback, 2008, p. 161). This thesis is important for scholarship, in the way that it challenges dominant discourses in film theory. With further development, its arguments regarding cultural-national inflection in voice could become relevant to cultural debates around transnational filmmaking, influencing cultural policy.

Importance to a discourse of screenwriting

As part of his doctoral research on the screen idea, Ian Macdonald (2004) noted that amongst books published during the 1990s on the screenplay, screenwriting practice, or film-making practice in the UK and USA, little was published which “concerned direct research into screenwriting,” and few of what was available were academic works (p. 13). He concluded that “scholarly work is scattered, submerged, isolated and sometimes self-referential” and does not represent a sustained body of work dealing directly or comprehensively with screenwriting and theory (2004, p. 13). Editor of the inaugural Journal of Screenwriting (Palgrave Macmillan), Jill Nelmes (2010) claims that until recently, few arenas have “allowed for writing and discussion of the screenplay with an academic focus” (p. 3). Australian scholar-practitioner Dallas Baker refers to screenwriting research as an emerging discourse (Baker, 2016, p. 71).

Nelmes describes screenwriting research as having been “recently re-discovered” (2010, p. 3). Since 2008, an international web-based forum for screenwriting practitioner-researchers and academics, called the Screenwriting Research Network (SRN), has existed largely through the efforts of Macdonald and his British and European colleagues. The Network holds annual international conferences and has
initiated the publication of the Journal of Screenwriting, and other works on
screenwriting theory. The Screenwriting Research Network, and my active
engagement with it since 2012, lends this research a natural home as well as a robust
collegial testing ground. Through this, the research has significant potential to be
incorporated within a discourse of screenwriting, and therefore to reach a wider
audience internationally.

In a wider academic sense, this research is significant because of the particular ways
in which screenwriting is thought of within its parent-discourses, film theory and
criticism. I suggest that film is one of the most important art forms to arise out of the
industrial and technological revolutions, and its impact on the world is
immeasurable, because culture is, “in profound ways,” about identity, power and
ideology (Scott, 2002, p. 971). The practices and disciplines surrounding filmmaking
are important not only to an understanding of film as art, but also to the
understanding we have of ourselves, since performances “represent ourselves to
ourselves and to others” (Edensor, 2002, p. 140). However, film’s sensual,
multimedial and embodied impact eclipses the importance of its most foundational
origin in written form – the screenplay. Developing a theory of voice and national
inflection can add an important strand to film theory and criticism, and encourage
informed dialogue between these and screenwriting.

When Maras claims that film studies does not know what to do with screenwriting
(2009, p. 7) his answer is to imagine a *discourse* of screenwriting, which would draw
together “skills, performance, concepts experiences and histories,” all of which
encompass the broader aspects of screenwriting (2009, p. 12). The relevance of this
research to such a discourse is increased because it focuses on the screenplay
through writing *practice*, which research, Maras notes, is rare (2011, p. 180).
Moreover, its central focus on voice embraces many of the relationships which are
proposed through a discourse of screenwriting, straddling the most personal
relationships between writer, text and reader, and the most public, between
screenwriting and film business, governmental policy, academic discourses, and
entertainment and vocational understandings of screenwriting and film. This
research clarifies major questions regarding screenwriter’s voice: how voice comes
about; how it may be perceived; and its central importance to the creative work.
Through its interrogation of craft this research addresses a gap in scholarship surrounding the screenplay and its creation in a ‘conception’ stage. It also addresses the gap between an academic perspective on screenwriting and the many ‘how-to’ books available. It answers the absence of a theory of voice in screenwriting in contemporary (English-language) scholarship, and repositions screenwriting in respect of dramatic and narrative voice (Dancyger & Rush, 2007; Rush & Baughman, 1997). It offers a fuller discussion of voice which complements Batty and Waldeback’s insights (2008, pp. 162-166).

Further significance of the research inheres in the fact that the research proposes relations between screenwriter’s voice and a national inflection, where “national identities are dynamically constituted around discursive practices and cultural resources” (Edensor, 2002, p. 168). This aspect of the research is made particularly significant given the accelerating interconnectedness of film industries around the world through globalisation (Australia has 11 co-production treaties with other nations to jointly develop film properties and is negotiating more (Screen Australia, 2014, p. 16)). The significance of such globalisation is testified to by the growing body of work investigating transnational filmmaking (see Ezra & Rowden, 2006; Goldsmith, 2010; Hjort & Petrie, 2007, particularly pp. 1-19). This subject can only become more relevant in Australia through the “outward-looking” Australian-international film industry of the early 21st century (Goldsmith, 2010; Verhoeven, 2010).

I strongly support the idea that a discourse of screenwriting is essential to deepen understandings of the screenplay. I argue this must be achieved outside film studies itself, while drawing on its more useful aspects. This research represents a significant contribution to such a discourse. It may be that only through a discourse of screenwriting, can screenwriters discover/uncover/recover their voices, and gain recognition for their craft. A discourse of screenwriting has the potential to contribute much to a deeper understanding not only of screenwriting, but also of screen culture in general.

Summary of Part II
In this short part, I described the questionnaire on screenwriter’s voice, and how it supports the concept of voice for a small sample of screenwriters, and also confirms indirectly that a practice methodology is a highly suitable way to investigate the topic. I also outlined my contention that dramatic and narrative voice, as theorised by Ken Dancyger, Jeff Rush, and Cynthia Baughman, is not equivalent to the concept of screenwriter’s voice as described here, but is in many ways tangential to this research. This underpins my argument that the knowledge uncovered through this research is new to scholarship. Finally, I argued for the significance of the research for practicing screenwriters while also suggesting its relevance for the academy. Over time these ideas may be influential in film industries and for governments through question of cultural exchange. In the next Part, I define voice as the pervasive authorial presence of the writer, and discuss several concepts which are related to voice in order to differentiate them clearly from voice as it is understood here. I then discuss several issues which arise around the topic screenwriter’s voice, as it is placed within the wider context of scholarship and industry. Finally I argue that describing voice is best achieved through brevity, and through transmitting as much of the effect of the voice being described as possible.
PART III - Voice in the Context of Screenwriting

Introduction to Part III

In ‘Origins of the Research’ and ‘An Introduction to the Field’ I argued that the description of narrative and dramatic voice in Dancyger and Rush (1995, 2002, 2007, 2013) and Rush and Baughman’s (1997) writings does not adequately explain voice as the sense of presence of the writer within a screenplay text, but conflates the screenplay with the filmmaking, thus effectively erasing the screenwriter as the source of the voice within the screenplay. Part I included an excerpt of the screenplay, *Cashflow*, arguing that the voice which was inherent there could be identified as American. In this Part I define screenwriter’s voice as the pervasive authorial presence of the writer/s (Abrams & Harpham, 2015, p. 288) whose consciousness “filters” ideas and language to create the screenplay text (Luce-Kapler, Catlin, Sumara, & Kocher, 2011, p. 169). This places the text as the total expression and evidence of the voice. I argue that voice need not be associated with ‘quality’ or ‘mastery,’ but can be understood as an aspect of the phenomenon, writing. I also raise other problematics of the industrial context of screenwriting, and the craft’s skewed understanding in scholarship.

Defining Voice

The term voice is intimately associated with being human. Italian philosopher Adriana Cavarero (2003) argues that voice identifies an individual more truly than vision, since voice manifests the *unique being* of each person. When a voice’s unique *timbre* is experienced, it is always experienced as present (Cavarero, 2003, p. 173). Cavarero contrasts ‘voice’ with the philosophical categories ‘man’ ‘subject,’ and ‘individual’, showing that these have been stripped of their individuality through the abstraction of thought. Voice, on the contrary, maintains its metonymic association with an individual. She argues strongly that voice is relational (Cavarero, 2003, pp. 173-174), since its existence and the performance of voice presupposes another who can receive, recognise and interpret it. The sense of voice as described by Cavarero has many synergies with the sense of voice as described and implied within this thesis, and is tightly wound up with the screenwriter’s presence in their text through the choice of words and ideas.
Voice to Cavarero is a powerful concept, describing a metaphoric and symbolic field as much as it defines a physical phenomenon. The metaphoric resonance of voice is displayed in many of the ways we use ‘voice’ in colloquial speech. Many things which cannot speak are described as a ‘voice’ or as ‘having voice;’ voice can be lost, and found. Voice can be given, or can give. ‘Voice of the people’ implies a collective viewpoint, representing a widely-held stance or opinion. This viewpoint need not refer to people alone, however. Anna Zaluczkowska (2009) implies the ‘collective’ when she connects Northern Irish film with finding its voice, in an essay in which she argues for the ‘maturity’ of film products/the film industry in Ireland after 30 years of internal unrest (p. 1). Thus voice is a medium for human expression, is both form, through vocality, and content, through what is expressed, and can be applied to ideas and things (‘films’).

Voice when referring to an artistic endeavour often implies the attainment of a high level of skill or craftsmanship (Alvarez, 2005; Ross, 1989), while for some it intimates a private relationship which exists between the arts creator and some power that works from within to inspire or shape the art created (Bayles & Orland, 1997; Aronson, 2000; Novrup Redvall, 2013). Screenwriter Dana Biscotti Myskowski (2006) speaks of “writing from her soul” and then describes this experience as having “found her voice” – a voice which is unique, recognizable, and which can be further developed (pp. 44-45).

Voice’s medium, language is not inert (Allerding, 2009; Bakhtin, 1981; Hambly, 2016; Holquist, 1981; Ross, 1989), and neither can voice be. As Bakhtin (1981) argues, “every word . . . betrays the ideology of its speaker” (cited in Holquist & Emerson, 1981, p. 169). Voice is ideologically-charged through the values and worldviews expressed in its language (Allerding, 2009, p. 2). For example, Helen Gilbert (1994) politicizes the term when she argues that Indigenous Australian playwrights (Jack Davis, Kevin Gilbert, Jimmy Chi, and Bob Maza) use orality in performance to speak resistant post-colonial discourses despite their “conscription into the language of [colonialism, ] English” (p. 99). Here the concept of voice links physical voice to collective opinion, and also points to voice as a tool for writers and performers which can critique and subvert dominant culture even whilst working within it.
From a screenwriting perspective, voice in a screenplay may be presumed to be inherent, but this principle is not necessarily accepted within film studies, in which the screenplay can be viewed as a crude raw material awaiting the shaping completed by the filmmaker (Baker, 2013, pp. 1-2). Film critic Jean-Claude Carriere (1995) argues that once the film exists, the screenplay disappears: “It is the first incarnation of a film and appears to be a self-contained whole. But it is fated to undergo metamorphosis, to disappear” (cited in Maras, 2009, p. 48). Statements such as this one present a deep-rooted issue for screenwriters regarding their uncertain status in film production generally. The legacy of the auteur theory, which arose in response to Francois Truffaut’s seminal essay (Truffaut, 1954), published in the French film journal Cahiers du Cinema, and was popularised in the United States by critic, Andrew Sarris (Cheu, 2007; Gerstner, 2003; Maras, 2009; Staiger, 2003; Wollen, 2003) cut deep. After all, screenwriters (in the United States) had already lost out to directors in labour disputes over possessory credits (Kipen, 2006, pp. 63-64) on more than one occasion. From the writer’s perspective, the auteur theory, which popularised the belief that the director can be considered the author of the film (Corliss, 1975, p. xvii), was at best, misguided, and at worst, a slap in the face for screenwriters. While some argue that the auteur theory led to a “precise and detailed form of film criticism” (Caughie, cited in Gerstner, 2003, p. 7), others suggest that "auteur criticism is essentially theme criticism; and themes--as expressed through plot, characterisation, and dialogue--belong primarily to the writer" (Corliss, 1975, p. xxii). While the auteur theory was at the height of its popularity in the 1970s (Kipen, 2006, p. 43), the fact that it has not yet been replaced by a more substantial (and even-handed) system of analysis and criticism, has allowed this legacy to remain. This can cause writers to feel that their achievements go largely unrecognised. This is likely to be most acute in industries whose labour relations are patterned on or most strongly guided by American practices and legal principles, under which writers even lack moral rights over their works once sold.

In light of the above, and given that voice is linked to authorship, the lack of a comprehensive theory of screenwriter’s voice is unsurprising. It may also be unsurprising given the paucity of scholarship focused on screenwriting (Maras, 2009; Macdonald, 2004; Nelmes, 2010), though this is changing quite rapidly. It should be stated, that the central premise of this research is that the screenwriter can rightly be attributed the voice of a screenplay, even as a director is credited with realising its
vision through filmmaking. Such delineation is supported through the following definition of ‘voice’ by Meyer Howard Abrams (1993) in the context of literary works:

[Voice] in criticism points to the fact that we are aware of a voice beyond the fictitious voices that speak in a work, and a person behind all the dramatis personae, and behind even the first-person narrator. We have the sense of a pervasive authorial presence, a determinate intelligence and moral sensibility, which has invented, ordered, rendered, and expressed all these literary characters and materials in just this way. (Abrams, 1993, pp. 156 [italics added])

Abrams and Geoffrey Galt Harpham (2015) state that it is "the overall sense of a convincing authorial voice and presence, whose values, beliefs, and moral vision serve implicitly as controlling forces throughout a work" which persuades readers to yield imaginative consent to engage with a fictional work (p. 288). In some forms of fictional writing, voice as authorial presence takes a very personal form. However, due to the effaced narrative style (Dancyger & Rush, 2007, p. 36) in screenwriting, this presence can be better understood as a reflection of the controlling consciousness (Abrams, 1993; Abrams & Harpham, 2015; Luce-Kapler, Catlin, Sumara, & Kocher, 2011) which governs the screenplay text’s expression.

Whether voice is taken to mean ‘pervasive authorial presence’ of the writer or ‘the screenplay as expressed,’ any voice is strongly personal to the writer who originates it. The concepts of presence, authenticity, sincerity and similar concepts suggesting personal character are often invoked in voice scholarship (Abrams, 1993; Abrams & Harpham, 2015; Alvarez, 2005; Aristotle, 350 BC; Elbow, 2007; Luce-Kapler et al., 2011). That the voice in screenwriting seems less personal relates to the way that the reader’s focus is retained within the fictional world, and not on the reflection of the writer as separate from the text.

Voice is inscribed through choices

When understood as the reflection of a cohering consciousness which “invents, orders, renders and expresses” the screenplay (Abrams, 1993, p. 156), voice can be thought responsible for all aspects of a screenplay text. This is so because every idea
great screenwriters are distinguished by a personal storytelling style, a style that’s not only inseparable from their vision, but in a profound way is their vision. Their formal choices - number of protagonists, rhythm of progressions, levels of conflict, temporal arrangements, and the like - play with and against substantive choices of content - setting, character, idea - until all elements meld into a unique screenplay. (McKee, 1999, p. 9)

There is a direct link between the writer and their voice. However voice, like any performance, includes subtleties which are not always reproduced over sequential ‘performances’. Every text is different, and represents only a subset of the writer’s many capacities as inspired through the context of the expression of the voice. It is the controlling consciousness of the writer reflected in the text which governs all its aspects, and which is the central concern of this study. McKee speaks of a storytelling style and vision, but he never refers to voice. The work he describes, however, extends our understanding of Abrams’ terms “invent, order, render, and express” (1993, p. 156), suggesting labour with purpose and focus. McKee also claims that this personal ‘style’ is inextricably linked to (“inseparable from”) the screenwriter’s vision (1999, p. 9). Each expression of fictional elements adds to the sense of the voice in the text. A result of this is that the specific screenwriter’s voice resides in the characteristics of its text, not in the person who wrote. The bulk of the thesis to follow describes and illuminates the many levels on which screenwriter’s choices define the nature of a unique screenplay.

In the case of multiple writers either writing in partnership or through sequential, contractual processes of rewriting, I argue that the voice which inheres in the text reflects both writers (though often to differing extents which are unquantifiable). The voice there may be best labelled the ‘voice of the screenplay.’ In the case of a film text, I argue that the voice must always be understood as the ‘voice of the film,’ due to the many minds which have contributed to the film’s realisation (Dancyger & Rush, 2002, p. 232).
Foundational Statements on Voice

All writing has voice

I contend that all writing – in fact, all writing – has voice, and conversely, that voice is a characteristic of all writing. This statement is in opposition to some understandings of voice in which voice is considered transcendent, a mark of mastery which not all writers achieve (discussed in Alvarez, 2005; Bayles & Orland, 1993; Novrup Redvall, 2013; Ross, 1989). Such arguments for voice tend to hold that voice is different from writing. I argue that the sense of difference comes about through the differing skills of writers, and the differing responses to voice of readers. That voice and writing occur at the same time and are coterminous is not prescriptive of the type of response which any voice may elicit, and does not preclude voice being present in writing on the basis that readers cannot agree on its exact nature or characteristics.

Writer and critic Al Alvarez (2005) suggests that when a writer achieves a certain longevity of practice, his technical skills become so perfect that they are instinctive, and the writing “takes on a life of its own” (p. 19). This idea originates in ancient beliefs suggesting that voice is inspired through a spiritual or metaphysical intervention, for example, that a Muse takes hold of the writer to compose the text (Aronson, 2000, p. 13). I argue that such statements overly sentimentalise writing craft, and dismiss the labour and experience that is involved in writing well. Alvarez’s stance however, may be based on a common misunderstanding. Stephen Ross (1989) asserts that “for many critics voice means authorial distinctiveness or personality” (p. 6). However, the terms ‘authorial,’ ‘distinctiveness’ and ‘personality’ need not be understood to imply greater or lesser aesthetic value. A person who is unskilled in written expression may well write in idiosyncratic ways, giving their writing a distinctive authorial voice, though not a polished one. This illustrates how writer’s voice can include cues which identify the writer or invoke a presence, whether skilled or not.

To clarify: in arguing for voice I do not claim any particular strength or qualities of voice. Voice as used here does not imply approbation or special praise. Writing and voice are two concepts, embodied by the same object, a text. Here, voice may be understood to refer to the characteristics of language, grammar, vocabulary, style, and so on through which readers gain a sense of coherence and wholeness. Writing
can impress readers as coherent because it is unified through ideas, language and style.

The purpose of this thesis is to illuminate the phenomenon of voice, to uncover its mechanisms and characteristics. Some writing/voices may gain praise, and others may not. In all cases, voice is conceived in the mind of the writer and perceived through the mind of the reader. Observations about voice are valid for whoever observes them. Thus, the experience of voice is always personal, rather than universal, as is any judgement of voice’s aesthetic value.

Voice originates in the mind

I argue that voice originates in the mind because the mind is the source of the unique personhood of the writer. Though similar in meaning to the more specialist term, the Self (Jung, 1973), I use ‘personhood’ to indicate the totality of the individual’s characteristics and identity which make them who they are. Personhood, as distinct from the Self, embraces the physical, emotional and psychological processes and experiences which have shaped any writer, including their worldview, skills, strengths and weaknesses in all areas. Entwined with these, are the familial, social, cultural, national and world contexts which have shaped the conditions of the writer’s life in all its aspects. Here I argue that characteristics of personhood are the raw materials which inform the text, and that these inform and create voice and its cultural-national inflection.

Here I must digress to clarify that arguing for national inflection points to the connection between identity and cultural-national belonging, and rests on the assumption of the socialising nature of the nation which is “facilitated by the state’s legislative framework” (Edensor, 2002, p. 20). Through such socialisation, values and attitudes are taught, and meaning is assigned. Amartya Sen (2007) implies values and attitudes when he notes that “identity can firmly exclude many people as it warmly embraces others” (cited in Aldea, 2012, p. 169). With regard to the influence the state or nation can exert on an individual member, Edensor understands national sights, sounds, and experiences as “shared resources” which form a matrix of national signification. However, he is careful to also assert that such resources are not fixed in their meaning, and can be “recombined and reinterpreted” by different
individuals and groups (2002, p. 139). It is these shared resources, expressed through “spatial, material, performative and representational dimensions of everyday life” (Edensor, 2002, p. 20) which I argue can form the foundation for cultural-national inflection as a part of a screenwriter’s voice.

Phelan argues that “writers create versions of themselves as they write,” and express “values, beliefs, attitudes . . . [and] features of identity” (2005, p. 46). He adds that writers may also be more or less conscious of the textual image of themselves they create as they write (2005, p. 45). In taking up this point, I argue that whether or not conscious of features of their own writer’s voice, writers write from their own worldview, which is intimately entwined with their personhood including cultural-national identity.

Here I do not intend that nationality should be understood to absolutely fix identity for any particular voice. I use the concept as Ilija Trivundza (2010) uses it, as a point of reference against which “debates about the nation’s governing principles, goals, heritage and history” can be formulated (Hjort & MacKenzie, 2000; cited in Trivundza, p. 663). For my purposes here I am looking beyond these debates of principle to suggest the ways that individuals live within the conditions which bring such debates into existence, and are impacted by the flux of ideas and lived experience of nation. Any aspect of those ideas and experience may influence a writer and may become evident through the voice. An argument that a single writer’s work may reflect some aspects of national belonging through cultural-national inflection is sustained because such things as language, cultural practices, ethnic and social allegiances, political and historical backgrounds act together to form ideas, values and ideologies which can create an impression of nationality in the voice. This was seen in Cashflow.

Returning to the statement that voice originates in the mind, I draw several connections between the mind and creative / dramatic writing. Writer-researchers Rebecca Luce-Kapler, Susan Catlin, Dennis Sumara, and Philomene Kocher (2011) have explored the “relations among voice, text and consciousness” (p. 161), and noted that even when they consciously attempt to write differently, “filtering the story through our minds colours it with our perspective” (p. 166). Through their research the authors found that writing in various genres and styles offered different
ways to explore the connections between voice and consciousness (the mind) through practice. They expressed that “not only did the creation of personae such as narrators and characters give us the opportunity to imagine other minds, but our experiments with genre also afforded the experience of shifting states of mind” (p. 162). They arrived at the conclusion that consciousness was the source of their writing voices (p. 169). They state that

voice is constructed using literary techniques that we have learned from ‘reading’ the minds of characters/narrators in other texts and from years of crafting our own texts. We have learned how to sift and negotiate meaning and we use those skills to communicate a version of consciousness, what we might call ‘our voice.’ (Luce-Kapler et al., 2011, p. 169)

In contrast to this statement, Mark Turner (1996) contends that the mind does not work in the ways it appears to, and that consciousness, particularly, misrepresents itself to our understanding. He claims that

Consciousness is a wonderful instrument for helping us to focus, to make certain kinds of decisions and discriminations, and to create certain kinds of memories, but it is a liar about mind. It shamelessly represents itself as comprehensive and all-governing, when in fact the real work is often done elsewhere, in ways too fast and too smart and too effective for slow, stupid, unreliable consciousness to do more than glimpse, dream of, and envy. (Turner, 1996, p. 6)

So while Luce-Kapler and her colleagues describe voice as a “version of consciousness” (2011, p. 169), I argue that consciousness is a function of the mind, rather than a fixed value or voice itself. Jung (1973) speaks of consciousness as a process, a state and as a concept or thing, when he describes mental elements coming into existence “only when we become conscious of [them]” (p. 132); speaks of a “state of consciousness” (p. 160); and of “consciousness being represented” by something else (p. 160). Luce-Kapler and colleagues note that their stories were “filtered” through their minds (2011, p. 166). I propose that consciousness is the interface which functions to filter ideas, impressions and language. This allows me to argue that personhood is more accurately described as the source of voice within the
mind, since that term refers to the raw material of experience and identity which provides the substance of stories, while consciousness represents the process of filtering this material.

Its association with the mind and the Self suggests that personhood is based upon (though not synonymous with) personal identity. This makes identity and its formation relevant to the question of voice. Charles Levine and James Cote (2002) consider identity through the analytical framework called the ‘personality and social structure perspective’ (PSSP), in which identity is understood on three levels: personality, interaction, and social structure (p. 6). As well as this, Levine and Cote argue for three taxonomies of identity: personal identity, social identity, and ego identity (2002, p. 8). While it is outside the scope of this research to deeply examine the interactions between these terms, I note them because I wish to suggest the complicated nature of identity, and yet show how relevant these levels and designations may be to the creative work of screenwriting. Since identity is formed over the wide spectrum of interior to exterior life (as lived within a social world), I argue that concept of identity and identity-formation in any writer provide much raw material from which writers can creatively invent characters, situations, worlds.

My overall argument is that voice is an expression of the writer which draws on many centres in the mind, and is informed by experience and identity. These centres are speech, memory, emotion and other response centres, the imagination, and the unconscious, all of which form the psyche, which Jung sees as extending from the particular (personal) to the collective unconscious (Jung, 1973, p. 161). These centres are coordinated and filtered through consciousness (Jung, 1973, p. 399) to create voice. Therefore voice may express elements of language, of imagination, of the unconscious, and of remembered experience, and the expression of these is guided by the emotions and other responses which arise as voice is created.

Through the fuller involvement of the mind’s parts there is a direct relationship between the writer and the voice in any writing. This does not mean that the writer is equivalent to the voice however, nor can the writer necessarily become perfectly understood through the voice. James Phelan (2005) argues that a text represents a “streamlined version of the real author, an actual or purported subset of the real
author’s capacities, traits, attitudes, beliefs, values, and other properties that play an active role in the construction of the particular text” (p. 45). I argue that the mind, through consciousness, acts like a prism. It not only filters, but it focuses specific aspects of personhood to create the text. While it is easier to speak of voice in the singular, Phelan’s idea of a “subset” (2005, p. 45) suggests that any writer’s voice is more aptly thought of as promising a range of possibilities. Dancyger and Rush also suggest this when they speak of the different ways the writer can use tone when writing within certain genres (Dancyger & Rush, 2013, pp. 181-192).

Origins and significant ideas about voice

Having laid the foundations for the understanding of screenwriter’s voice elaborated through this thesis, this section offers a general overview of the concepts which are implied in the term ‘voice.’ I briefly introduce ethos, persona and tone, and effaced narration. I then discuss the ways in which the implied author concept (Booth, 1983), and ‘mind-reading,’ from Theory of Mind (Zunshine, 2006), contribute to the understanding of voice within this thesis.

I recognise a debt owed to structuralism, post-structuralism and other literary movements of the last half of the twentieth century, particularly the work of scholars such as Roland Barthes, Michel Foucault, and others. Their insights opened up questions of authorship and readership, which are an important backdrop to this research. However I do not address these scholars here. My focus is instead narrowed to those theories which add to understandings of creative processes implied in writing, in the relationships between a writer and her text, and the ways this impacts readers through voice.

Ethos, persona, tone and effaced narration

The terms and concepts in this subsection are tangentially related to voice. Nevertheless, I describe them here to differentiate them from the concept of screenwriter’s voice. The Ancient Greeks proposed that orators projected a personal character in their oration which was called ethos (Abrams & Harpham, 2015, p. 286). Aristotle (350 BC) believed that ethos coloured the effect of the rhetoric and added to its persuasive power because “we believe good men more fully and more readily than others” (p. 4). Abrams notes that the term voice “has come to signify Aristotle’s ethos in imaginative literature” (1993, p. 156). Ethos is strongly related to the
concept of voice as understood in this thesis, because it signifies characteristics of
the writing which reflect its source and which go beyond the grammatical features of
any text. However, in the understanding of ethos as a personal character of the
writer, ethos places greater focus on the source – the orator / writer – than on the
text. For this reason, I argue that ethos is not interchangeable with the term voice.
Rather, ethos stands in relation to a spoken text, as voice stands in relation to a
written one.

Ethos is better thought of as an aspect of voice, which can be read through the
morals and values suggested through the text. Persona, tone and style are not
synonymous with ethos, though they can be elements which create the sense of
ethos in a text. Similarly, persona, tone, and style point to aspects or characteristics
of voice, and carry effect when mobilised through voice and yet again, these
concepts are not synonymous with the concept, voice.

Persona and tone are linguistic devices which can create effect in a work (Abrams &
Harpham, 2015, pp. 286-288). Persona refers to the use of a narrator-character who
tells the story, who may or may not appear in the diegetic world (Abrams &
“quality or character of sound,” and also associate it with voice. In writing, it takes on
the sense of “expression of some meaning, feeling, spirit, etc.” (p. 1545). Because of
this association with meaning, tone is used in literary studies to refer to implicit
attitudes to the subject matter, the characters, and to readers, which are embedded
in a text through the language used (Abrams & Harpham, 2015, p. 287).

In screenwriting, tone is a difficult concept to explain, because its effect is multi-
layered, and it is inscribed through language which in turn points to other signifiers
which may be visual or aural, or to do with screenwriting craft, such as character,
structure and so on. In their early editions of Alternative Scriptwriting Dancyger and
Rush suggest that tone refers to the level of realism of the fictional storyworld (2013,
p. 340). However, they complicate the concept when they tie it to “directionality,”
which they also call “voice,” and which they describe as “leading the reader, and
later, the viewer, to interpretation” (Dancyger & Rush, 2013, p. 340). This last
sentence suggests the concept of point of view.
As Sternberg notes, point of view is a concept which is particularly associated with film because of its connection to viewer or camera perspectives (1997, p. 141). However, the term straddles both writing and film. In practice, the writer chooses to adopt a tone in their linguistic expression which assumes (and seeks to construct) a future reader’s experience of the story from moment to moment in a way which is relevant to the emotion, mood and genre. Tone also performs the function of unifying the disparate elements within the story through its consistency, so that the story appears as a coherent whole. While the emotions excited can change, the readers (and audience of the film) are taken smoothly between these mood moments because their expectations of the story established through its form fits the story’s mode of telling, and its tone. Tone is closely related to writing style, and these two terms can sometimes be used interchangeably.

Style can also refer to the characteristics of linguistic expression which accompany or form the voice, though style tends to suggest a wider reference to other writings, and carries associations with artistic movements, not only in literature or film production, but across many other areas of creative endeavour. Therefore the term resonates beyond language and texts. Screenwriters use tone and language style heavily, but rarely insert themselves into the story through persona. Such “authorial non-interference” is spoken of as “effaced narration” in both literary theory (Abrams & Harpham, 2015, p. 288) and in film theory (Dancyger & Rush, 2007, p. 36). As discussed previously (P. 10), the screenwriter is effaced almost completely in classical Hollywood screenwriting (Dancyger & Rush, 2007, p. 36), leaving structure in place of a narrative agent. While the implied author concept (Booth, 1983) operates in a similar way to persona, and therefore is less relevant in screenwriting, as noted, some observations made around the concept are applicable to voice in the screenplay.

The Implied Author and Voice

Abrams claims that the implied author is another term for voice (1993, p. 156). According to Wayne Booth (1983), the implied author is the “ideal, literary, created version” of the writer who writes the text (p. 75). This suggests a persona, and is therefore at odds with the narrative style of screenwriting. However, some of
Booth’s other insights about the implied author also illuminate the relationship between writers, readers and the text, and can usefully be applied to voice in screenplays. One such idea is that in the case of collaborative texts the voice is an amalgam of each writer’s voice, as these mutually condition each other (Booth, 1961, cited in Shen, 2011, p. 9).

Booth suggests that readers respond to an ‘implied author’ not only because of the explicit meanings in the text, but also based on the “moral and emotional content of each bit of action, [including the] suffering of the characters” (1983, p. 73). I propose that voice elicits responses to screenplay texts in the same way, and that Booth’s concept of “moral and emotional content” is at play when, as American theorist Lesley Goodman (2010) contends, readers recognise the writer as the source of a characters’ dilemmas and hold the writer responsible for the action and events which cause fictional characters pain or uncomfortable feelings (p. 168). These responses to screenplays, whether positive or negative, evidence the effect, through moral and emotional content, of screenwriter’s voice. Booth also speaks of “bonding” between a writer and their readers, describing it as “admiration” and “love” (2005, pp. 76 - 82). I contend that bonding too, is an important concept in reading screenplays, though add that bonding can also manifest as a strong personal dislike of the writer, based on assumptions of the type of person the writer is. Either response can be the result of voice in the work. These concepts suggest and describe the ways in which voice may carry affect for readers.

Theory of Mind

Related to questions of voice in a text is the question of how readers gain impressions of the writer through voice. Cognitive literary theory, which has grown out of cognitive psychology, explains the responsiveness of readers to fictional texts through Theory of Mind, also known as mind-reading (Zunshine, 2006, p. 4). I suggest that the same mechanisms are used to read voice in a screenplay.

Theory of mind refers to a cluster of evolutionary adaptations within our cognitive architecture (minds) which allows us to interpret people’s behaviour “in terms of their thoughts, feelings, beliefs and desires” through the state of mind implied through behaviours (Zunshine, 2006, p. 6). A more familiar form of this idea is that of
reading body language, a concept which has found general acceptance in western societies. The adaptations which lead to mind-reading are believed to have been developed because humans have needed to live and work cooperatively with other humans in order to survive (Zunshine, 2006, p. 4), and therefore, have needed to read behaviours to understand the motivations behind human actions on a deeper level.

Theory of Mind proposes that we use mind-reading in an infinite number of ways whenever we interact with others or make meaning ourselves. For example, we use it when we ascribe a mental state to a person based on their actions; when we intuit a complex state of mind from an expression of few words; and when we imagine how others will respond (Zunshine, 2006, p. 6). Zunshine argues that we seem to mind-read automatically and effortlessly because we “learn and practice mind-reading daily, from the beginning of awareness” (2003, p. 271). She notes that while our actual interpretations of other people’s mental states are not always correct (2003, p. 271) we enjoy flexing our mental muscles in this way (2006, pp. 24-25), and she argues that it is mind-reading which “makes literature, as we know it, possible” (2003, p. 270). I extend this statement to include screen drama in all media, including screenwriting.

Zunshine (2003; 2006) and other scholars (Goodman, 2010; Phelan, 2005; Rabinowitz, 2010) argue that readers mind-read to interpret the behaviour of fictional characters and the writer, because “writers have been using descriptions of their characters' behaviours to inform us about their feelings since time immemorial,” and we expect them to do so (2006, p. 4). While mind-reading refers to a cluster of behaviours, Zunshine identifies two central concepts. The first is that we understand “bodies as animated by minds” when we recognise self-initiated action (Brook and Ross, 2002, cited in Zunshine, 2003, p. 271). The second is that as readers we can keep track of “who thought, wanted, and felt what and when” (Zunshine, 2006, p. 5) by storing received information with a source tag. Not only that, our sense of the trustworthiness of this source colours our response to the information and therefore our reactions to it (Zunshine, 2006, p. 60).

Zunshine argues that a novel is a meta-representation whose source is understood to
be the writer, though she notes that the source tag ‘the writer tells me’ is most often omitted in the process of reading (2006, p. 80). Thus, while we follow the fictional characters and track their states of mind through their behaviour to make meaning, in the back of our minds we also understand that it is the writer who has designed and described the story. If the characters or story elements prove to be unreliable, Zunshine asserts that readers will go back to the text to scrutinise the writer’s intentions and motivations in misleading us (Goodman, 2010; Zunshine, 2006). I propose that these features of reading are also true when a reader reads a screenplay. Theory of Mind illuminates two phenomenon regarding voice in screenwriting. The first is the way that characters are taken so seriously, that in many cases their ‘voices’ eclipse that of the writer whose voice created the text. The second is the way that under certain circumstances readers do recognise the voice of the writer and mind-read who is speaking to them, even to the extent of attributing blame for ill-treatment of fictional characters (Goodman, 2010; Zunshine, 2006).

I argue that Theory of Mind offers a powerful framework for understanding the relationship between readers, text and voice, and how it is that readers ‘read’ voice in screenwriting. This works in tandem with the way that writers inscribe their personhood through creating and depicting characters whom they ‘act’ upon (Goodman, 2010, p. 168). I also argue that the screenplay’s success at representing actions and events as if they were happening in real time (Boon, 2008) works against readers of screenplays recognising the overall authorial voice amongst the many voices and activities of their characters. Readers therefore, often overlook the extent to which the screenwriter/s is responsible for the text. This is further complicated when the screenplay becomes a film, where the high cultural visibility of the director in orchestrating the drama obscures the fact that generally the dramatic ideas, structuring, characters and storyworld have been invented by the screenwriter/s before the director is attached to the project.

The arguments above have contextualised voice as the metonymic designation for the writer who writes (Ross, 1989, p. 6) since the time of the ancient Greeks, notwithstanding changing times and new disciplines, each of which have addressed the concept voice from new perspectives. In interpreting voice for screenwriting, new understandings are built around old ideas at the same time as theories are
combined and applied in new ways. However, several issues which are attached to voice in screenwriting relate to its location within much larger industrial, economic and cultural complexes: the film industries of each nation. The issues entangled in any argument for voice in screenwriting make the topic particularly dense. I describe these issues in what follows.

**Issues in Screenwriting**

Issues of reading in screenwriting scholarship

Claudia Sternberg (1997) focuses the question of reading under three headings which represent different stages in the life of a screenplay. The first she calls the ‘property’ stage, in which the screenplay is for sale. The second stage is the 'blueprint' stage, in which the screenplay is the foundational document on which all planning, shooting and post-production processes are undertaken to complete production of the film. The third stage is the ‘reading material’ stage, in which the screenplay is prepared for publishing (Sternberg, 1997, pp. 48-59). Sternberg specifically references scholarship based on U.S. understandings of screenwriting practice within a more industrialised ‘studio’ system of production. This means that these terms and stages do not exactly reflect the processes of writing, selling, realising and publishing one of my own screenplays in an Australian context. For scholars who are not aware of local differences in practice, scholarship can seem to suggest a normative practice (Maras, 2009, p. 171) which in fact is not the case.

Sternberg’s scholarship is thorough, and yet important stages are missing, most specifically, a pre-‘property’ stage I call *conception* in screenplay development. This stage is more closely related to an artisanal understanding of screenwriting practice. The two screenplays discussed in this thesis are late in the conception stage, and yet are not yet ready for the property stage. In conception stage, the screenwriter makes the most important craft decisions about the content and form of the screenplay, and the ideas, characters and world are imagined, explored and developed into a story. From these imaginings, other documents successively substantiate the screen idea (Macdonald, 2004, p. 5) into screenplay form. Such work most often occurs prior to any industry attachment for the majority of writers in the Australian, and arguably other, contexts. Explication of this stage fills the gap which exists between a screenwriter’s practice and the exposition of screenwriting in its various industrial
contexts. This stage is often overlooked in scholarship (and in practice) however, because it is generally undertaken by a writer on ‘spec’ (Thompson, 1999, p. 130). Creative practice research therefore, whose focus is screenplay-based and writer-informed, is often best placed to explore this stage.

A related issue regarding screenwriting and film studies scholarship in general, is the way that it can tend to base its knowledge in the industrial context of filmmaking, by which I refer to the ways that films are written, produced, distributed and exhibited using technology and on a scale considered national and international, rather than local or personal. To view screenwriting from an industrial perspective obscures its nature as an artisanal practice, and complicates it through association with technological advances, social and economic conditions, and cultural and institutional organisations and discourses (Maras, 2009, p. 14). Related to this is the way that English-language industrial understandings of screenwriting are most often based on systems operative in the United States which are not generally applicable to other contexts.

This inadequacy in scholarship can be remedied by a discourse of screenwriting which contextualises screenwriting through the many ways in which “individuals and groups encounter and 'know' screenwriting” as both practice and industry (Maras, 2009, pp. 11-12). Screenwriting is a practice, a “layered activity, drawing together skills, performance, concepts, experiences and histories” (Maras, 2009, pp. 11-12). As such it can only be partially understood if it is informed only by its industrial context.

It is clear that whether or not the stages are exactly as Sternberg describes, the screenplay text does pass through many ‘moments’ in which it is read for specific purposes. Because these purposes differ, the text is often altered according to the needs of readers, production personnel or other parties. This leads to the existence of a number of drafts of the same screenplay (Sternberg, 1997, pp. 36-40). This proliferation of drafts has sometimes been an issue for scholarship, which has been uncomfortable with the lack of certainty about which draft is the definitive screenplay text (Morsberger & Morsberger, 1975, pp. 50-51). In response, Stillinger (1991) and McGann (1991) have argued for a theory of versions which values each version under its own terms (cited in Sternberg, 1997, pp. 39-40). Sternberg claims
that now “scholarship generally refrains from the search for the final text” and recognizes the legitimacy of each different version of a screenplay (1997, p. 39).

Shooting script versus master scene script format

Related to this proliferation of drafts are the different labels by which scripts are known, shooting script and master scene script being the two most commonly used in the United States (though given the time lag between changes in practice, and scholarship’s recognition of these, the shooting script may be less prevalent than scholarship suggests). These two appellations relate to script formatting, and the way that screen stories can be described shot by shot (the shooting script), or scene by scene (the master scene script). The master scene script format has long been the standard format in Australia. Craig Batty and Zara Waldeback explicitly state that "technical directions should not be included in a script" (2008, p. 54), suggesting that the shooting script is out of vogue generally. The master scene format is also the standard format supported through common screenwriting software programs such as Final Draft and Celtx.

The master scene script defines scenes which indicate continuous time spent in a single location (Rush & Baughman, 1997, p. 29). This script format is “similar to that established in the 1910s in the USA and the UK” (Macdonald, 2004, p. 18). It allows the writer to describe the dramatic elements more fully, to show the development of plot and character, tone and mood, within the natural constraints of document length. While Maras quotes some scholars, critics and others who have claimed that screenplay format is unreadable (2009, p. 63), I argue that master scene screenplays can be a pleasure to read, while also being suitable for their industrial purpose. It may be that those commentators who claim ‘unreadability’ were referring to shooting scripts.

While Maras uses such comments to discuss screenwriting from several perspectives, reiteration of such negative comments can seem to justify the lack of access which general readers, and even practitioners, have to screenplays based on the perception that screenplays are unreadable industrial documents. The lack of acceptance of the screenplay as a form of literature (Cheu, 2007; Price, 2010; Maras, 2009) may explain why “screenplays are rarely published” (Corliss, 1975, p. xx). However, Fischer (2013)
also acknowledges this to be due, in the United States, to legalities where “corporate interests have increasingly embraced the romantic notion of the author as a hegemonic discourse to press their interests as intellectual property owners against the interests of artist creators” (Larsen, 2005; cited in Fischer, 2013, p. 7). Paul Goldstein (1994) notes the difference between a European culture of the “author’s moral rights” which places the “author ‘at the centre of production,’” compared to the ‘American culture of copyright’ which places ‘copyright producers,’ often meaning corporate interests, central to production in the place of an author (cited in Fischer, 2013, p. 7). In effect, in the United States the screenwriter sells their copyright ownership in the screenplay, as opposed to merely selling the rights to produce a film of it. The result is that in the U.S. system, corporate interests most often control the right to have works published.

The editors of an early anthology of American screenplays noted that “some films were omitted because of legal tangles or difficulty in clearances” (Gassner & Nichols, 1977, xi). Morsberger and Morsberger have observed that “while a number of foreign screenplays are now available in multiple editions, most distinguished American ones have not been published at all” (1975, p. 50). This suggests that such legalities play a role in the availability for publication of American screenplays.

This practice can bleed into other industries such as the Australian one through unofficial policies of secrecy or restricted distribution of screenplays. Nevertheless, there have been some in-roads into publication in Australia, one notable example being the special issue of TEXT (2013) which sought to “address the absence in journal publications of unproduced scripts for either stage or screen” (Beattie, 2013, p. 1). This move was seen as promoting the screenplays’ “valued material culture in, and of, themselves” (Beattie, 2013, p. 1), and Maras speaks optimistically of the “many publishing ventures to do with screenplays today” (2009, p. 62).

While the lack of published screenplays makes it difficult to develop “authentic and deep criticism” of screenplays in general (Morsberger & Morsberger, 1975, p. 54), the question of readability and versions can hamper an argument for voice in specific ways, when scholars insist upon a definitive version of the screenplay in order to ratify voice, or seek to match the voice in one version exactly to the voice in another
version. I argue that voice resides in the screenplay's text, and relates specifically to that text. The voice in one draft may be different from the voice in a different draft, though it derives from the same source, the screenwriter. This is to be expected, since a voice is never ‘fixed,’ and can exhibit as wide a range of possibilities as its author has mental/emotional capacities. If part of the value of a specific work of art is its uniqueness in other fields, this principle can also apply in the case of screenwriting.

**Reading voice when the screenwriter is effaced**

I argue that the screenplay form creates different responses in the reader from other fictional formats due to the effaced narrator, the screenwriter (Dancyger & Rush, 2007, p. 36). In this section I explore the impact that a screenplay may have on readers when voice is effaced. While any reader may find voice in any text, and in some cases voice can be foregrounded so that it can seem to be the most obvious feature of the text, for example, in poetry or imagistic prose, voice is not always easy to read. As previously suggested, this is particularly so in the screenplay text, in which, I claim, voice can best be apprehended through its embodied effect on readers. While Alvarez applies the term ‘listening’ to voice (2005, p. 19), describing it as an “undeniable presence in your head” (2005, p. 15), I suggest that listening may not be the most appropriate metaphor to describe how a reader discerns voice in screenwriting.

Maras describes the screenplay as functioning as an audio-imaging device in the way that readers experience the storyworld as a preview of a film (Maras, 2009, p. 67). Kevin Boon (2008) concurs, claiming that “experience is the controlling determinant in the screenplay” (pp. 264-265). The use of present tense, and focused and active images in which characters move and act without a narrating presence, adds to the sense readers may have that they are watching dramatic events as they unfold. The sense of immediacy created causes embodied responses to the fictional world, meaning that readers visualize and experience the world viscerally. This contrasts steeply with Alvarez's description in which a private space in the reader is entered by a voice through “listening” (2005, p. 15).
Little attention is drawn to the artifice of writing as style within screenwriting, as more focus is put on creating this vicarious experience (Mehring, 1990; cited in Maras, 2009, p. 71). While the imposition of the scene line is a notable addition to the screenplay format, some conventions from other forms of fictional writing disappear altogether and with them, the obviousness of the writer. For example, Ross notes that readers tend to accept written dialogue as reported speech within prose fiction (1989, p. 68). However, screenwriting form takes this even further, representing dialogue as undifferentiated on the page, without tags such as ‘he said’, and symbols such as parentheses (" ... ").

A further consideration in reading voice in screenwriting is the dialogic nature of the screenplay text. Russian philosopher and literary critic Mikhail Bakhtin (1981) developed a concept of language based on a sense of opposition and struggle (cited in Holquist, 1981, p. xviii). Amongst the ideas proposed by Bakhtin was that language is stratified into dialects which are "socio-ideological: languages belonging to professions, to genres, languages peculiar to particular generations, etc" (1981, p. 272). Bakhtin saw the novel as writing in which a rich diversity of languages and voices interact, creating a “multiplicity of divergent and contending social voices” which achieve significance through their interactions (Abrams & Harpham, 2015, p. 88). I argue that the rich diversity of characters and opinions which are expressed in a screenplay mean that meanings are not fixed by the screenwriter, but are open to interpretation. This produces an effect: the multiplicity of fictional voices means that the screenwriter’s own voice can become lost in the crowd.

Other factors are also at play. Screenwriting is not about who the writer is. On the contrary, a screenwriter must express many personalities who each seem credible and believable. Ironically, the more vivid the characters and writing, the more easily the writer’s voice may be to overlook. This, plus the general activity and 'busyness' of many screen stories, ensure that the screenwriter/s remain in the background of screen stories as effaced narrators while the readers / audience experience characters as if they exist in a three-dimensional world. These factors also explain why voice in screenwriting is less about the presence of the writer and more about the voice as a central principle which unifies and coheres the text through its stylistic continuities—those continuities in ideas and language which derive from patterned and consistent use of formal and idiosyncratic linguistic expression and points of
craft. As well as this, a well-crafted artwork, in which each detail has been carefully shaped in light of its relationship to the whole, forms a façade which makes it difficult to see the maker’s marks, so flawlessly are the elements ‘joined.’ Despite the greater difficulty of reading through this form to discover voice, I argue that voice is form and content – the complete expression of the text. This argument holds true whether there is a single screenwriter, or the voice is the result of a collaboration of writers.

**Describing Voice**

If voice can be perceived, it is natural to seek to describe it. However, describing voice is not like describing a concrete thing. Discerning and describing voice are processes of indexing tendencies rather than calculating empirical answers. If a reader has access to a screenplay text, their experience of voice and description of it can be based on an analytical approach to language, as well as their own embodied responses to the ideas in the text. If a viewer, the voice can be discerned and described through recollection of the story and characters and, more immediately, through the embodied responses to the screened drama, which of course, is an interpretation of the voice of the screenplay. By describing voice in a way which stimulates an affective response in listeners, more can be communicated about how the voice achieves its effect. When it comes to describing voice, the impact will be greatest if the description can reflect the original voice in one or many of its aspects (language, style and effect). Whether experienced as a verbal text or a visual one, I argue that it is the understanding of the story and characters, and the embodied response in a reader/viewer which attests to voice’s strength, clarity and impact. There is no right or wrong in describing voice. As a principle, personal observations made about a voice are always valid (though perhaps not universally agreed upon or relevant).

**Summary of Part III**

In this Part, I have offered a definition for voice as pervasive authorial presence and have argued strongly for the discussion of voice as an aspect of screenwriting despite the effaced narration of the format. I have laid down a basic understanding of voice in the context of this thesis, arguing that it originates in the mind through the choices a writer makes. I contend that all writing is voice. I have discussed some of the issues which relate to screenwriting’s industrial context and the ways that scholarship at
times represents screenwriting through assumptions of homogeneity of practice where this is not necessarily the case. In Part IV, I turn to a discussion of the creative practice methods which were employed in writing the screenplay *Calico Dreams*, specifically focusing on the ways in which the voice reflected the “determinate intelligence and moral sensibility” (Abrams, 1993, p. 156) of its writer, myself, in production of the text.
PART IV ~ Discovering/Uncovering Voice in Craft

Introduction to Part IV

Part III presented my argument for screenwriter’s voice in theoretical terms through defining voice, and describing something of the wider context within which screenwriting is positioned. Part IV looks to practice methods to illustrate how voice was discovered through screenwriting practice, and how these discoveries were supported in theory. Having concluded that voice was both superficially evident in language, and was present through ideas and meaning—including through iconography and symbolism—in *Cashflow*, it was necessary to write a new screenplay of a different genre in order to write what I judged to be an ‘Australian’ voiced screenplay. This section describes how the discoveries during this phase of the research developed my understanding of voice including crafting a voice while writing *Calico Dreams*.

This phase of the research required me to draw on my experience and understanding of screenwriting craft and practice. In doing so, I made many notes as I acted as an observer to my own process in a way similar to Downton’s description of a “me” doing the practice, and a “meta-me” watching (2009, p. 112). At the same time as I annotated my work in the Inventory of creative practice, I continued to write in the Journal of Reflections, where I explored theoretical issues which arose.

The outcome of the practice in terms of a theory of voice is the conceptual framework for screenwriter’s voice, which is a diagrammatic schema through which the relations amongst craft aspects and voice are displayed. Overall, Part IV illustrates the ways that voice is influenced by personal knowledge, perceptions and values of the writer. Through illuminating the writing process, it also shows the ways in which the writer mediates ideas and language to produce the voice which is active in any text. The Part also describes the multi-dimensional framework for screenwriter’s voice, through which aspects of voice can be located within any text through textual (linguistic) analysis, and interrogation of the ideas and values presented.

Creating Voice through Craft

The analysis I undertook of *Cashflow* showed that voice was embedded across *all*
craft areas, and impacted the screenplay through its linguistic expression, suggested images, and even through sounds such as accented dialogue. This section explains the ways that the screenwriting practice raised and answered questions as to the production of voice within screenwriting craft. The section also substantiates the ways that the craft areas named in the framework are not superficial cues to listing elements of story, but on deeper levels present particular issues and create specific effects within the text which can impact readers through their responsiveness to certain elements.

Stages in screenwriting: Conception

In ‘Issues in Screenwriting’ in Part III, I note three stages in the life cycle of a screenplay, those being the ‘property,’ ‘blueprint’ and ‘reading material’ stages (Sternberg, 1997, pp. 48-59). I also argue that these represent an industrial view of the screenwriting process, and do not adequately describe the screenwriter’s experience of the process of screenplay development, which I understand comes at an earlier stage, a stage I call conception.

Conception spans the first inspiration to tell a screen story, to its development as a screenplay “property” which can be sold (Sternberg, 1997, p. 48). Macdonald has developed the concept of a “screen idea” (2004, pp. 4-5), which is the kernel of the story idea which is then taken through subsequent stages of development to produce a final draft screenplay. However, even this idea is embedded within a model which implies the industrial context of production of a script, and does not completely interrogate nor illuminate my own personal experience of developing an idea into an original screenplay when the screenwriter is working alone in an Australian context and on ‘spec,’ as has been the case with both Cashflow and Calico Dreams. For this reason, I argue that some aspects of the conception stage as described here represent new knowledge with regards to screenwriting practice which, while not necessarily new to practitioners, may be new to the academy.

Conception itself moves through a number of phases which are described in such terms as: “pitch; outline; treatment; step outline; [and] first draft script” (Batty & Waldeback, 2008, p. 12). Maras notes that creative practice research begins the process of “speaking about screen-writing research on its own terms” rather than
having it “spoken for” by other disciplines (2011, p. 277). Here I describe a more personal approach related to my own creative practice methods, to begin such a dialogue.

There are many different approaches possible to writing an original screenplay. As Batty and Waldeback state, “it is useful to think of development not as a linear but circular (or spiral) process” (2008, p. 12), where stages are revisited. As many as twenty or more draft script versions (Batty & Waldeback 2008, p. 12) may be written over the life cycle of a screenwork. Many of these may be written in the conception stage. The stages and documents named above are encompassed in what I am calling conception, though each screenwriter may skip some documents or modify the processes implied to suit their own ways of working with the particular material. The stages may also be revisited in the context of the property stage, and with the involvement of agents and potential or actual production partners and financiers. It is worth noting that other writing and designing tasks and practices, often borrowed from creative writing (Baker, 2016, p. 74), are often adapted to support the invention and development of the characters and world. These methods and activities are secondary to producing the screenplay, and yet facilitate it.

The idea which stimulates the writer to write may take any form, but will quickly lead to choices of main character/s and storyworld. Many of these choices can be decided as principles even before much else is known about the story, and can relate to the writer’s personal preferences. The writer may also decide on a premise which expresses the ultimate ‘message’ of the story. Dramatic beats arise as the writer sketches character, actions and events in the first iteration of the story. (A beat is the smallest dramatic unit, and can be understood as an instance of new information, revealed through the drama, which forwards the story). These ideas progressively flesh out the screen idea.

Structure: five sentences

While character is often considered the heart of screen stories (Batty & Waldeback, 2008, pp. 18-19), defining the story through plotting the structure is the point at which the screen story starts to take shape. Batty and Waldeback describe a “tent pole” structure (2008, p. 31) which names the major beats which together form a
conventional, three-act film structure. Individual screenwriters may read many manuals but generally work according to their own idiosyncratic methods. I incorporate the beats of the “tent pole” (Batty & Waldeback, 2008, p. 12) into a sketch of the story through a ‘five sentence structure.’ The five sentences are: 1. dramatic set-up (the world, and who the protagonist is in it); 2. disturbance (implying a goal, and consequential action); 3. first act turning point and subsequent intention/action; 4. second act turning point and subsequent intention/action; and 5. climax and resolution. As can be seen, each sentence relates to a major beat which gives definition to the story and suggests the three dramatic acts. Working this way allows me to develop a clear framework around the screen idea in advance of plotting the many individual beats of a full length screen drama.

Once these sentences are tested based on the premise or screen idea (itself a lengthy process), I flesh out the storyline by asking who, what, when, where, and why for each sentence. New characters may be added as events, major actions and plot points are clarified. The story is embellished with further beats through the addition of confrontations, complications, revelations, obstacles, events, and further actions which together form the plot. Using this method I can quickly sketch a story. It also becomes easy to play around with different ideas before fixing on the storyline to be developed.

Figure 14 shows a sketch of the process of redesigning Cashflow through an early five sentence structure. The left hand column shows the structure for Cashflow, while the right hand column shows my attempt at developing a structure for the new draft of Cashflow (not yet named, nor differentiated through dramatis personae). At this point in drafting Calico Dreams, I was testing different story premises as a way forward (This turned out to be inconsequential to the Australian voice). This illustrates the work involved in developing a concept into a workable storyline.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5-Sentence Struct Draft I</th>
<th>5-Sentence Struct Draft II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-U Cagney hides out in the brothel where the MADAME wants her to become a prostitute</td>
<td>S-U Cagney works as kitchenmaid in brothel where MADAME wants her to become a prostitute ... Lures her w. $s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist Attempted rape by TED</td>
<td>Dist Attempted rape by TED MAD (Madeline) asks to buy CAGNEY out MME claims Cagney stole, therefore owes her CAGNEY finds Jimmy in loo. TED asks Mr X to find Jimmy, but CAGNEY takes job instead CAGNEY hides Jimmy in bedroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act I &amp; result Cagney makes deal with TED to bring him the bankrobber, Jimmy Cashflow, but Jimmy refuses to do this job, so the deal is off.</td>
<td>T.P. MME makes CAGNEY’s appointments MME finds Jimmy, Jimmy flees MME (reluctant) makes appt ‘off-premises’ with TED on Cagney’s behalf. CAGNEY skips appt to look for Jimmy – meets WILD BOB instead (doing deal with GLOSSUP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t II &amp; result Cagney gives Ted counterfeit $s to ‘look after’ but when Auditor arrives Ted refuses to give them back</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act III, Climax &amp; resolution When her deception is discovered by Ted, Cagney robs the bank herself, pays off the Madam &amp; ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14. Brainstorm of Five Sentence Structure Excerpt from Inventory of Creative Practice

On the left hand side of the figure, the major beats of *Cashflow* are shown as a five sentence structure. Here the set-up describes our main character’s situation in the opening scenes as a girl trapped in a brothel. The disturbance occurs when Ted attempts to rape her, which motivates Cagney to act on her plan to escape the brothel. The Act 1 turning point results in Cagney becoming involved with Ted as she offers to find the bankrobber, her lover Jimmy Cashflow, for a fee. However, when Jimmy refuses to cooperate in the course of the act, Cagney must decide upon another course of action. The Act 2 turning point sees Cagney, in disguise, give Ted
counterfeit money, which she hopes to retrieve in *bona fide* bank notes. Later in the act Ted refuses to return the cash because the Auditor has arrived, leaving Cagney vulnerable to discovery as a forger. The third Act begins at the point where Ted discovers ‘Clarabelle Rockford’/Cagney’s deception and confronts her, at which point Cagney escapes Ted, robs the bank herself, and buys her freedom from the Madame (with Jimmy’s help).

As is shown through this short description, the five sentence structure is a shorthand way to trace the major beats which form the dramatic arc of the story. As may be clear, in this form many of the intermediate story beats which lead up to the major beats are not described in the five sentences themselves, but are held in the mind of the screenwriter. The five sentence structure can only stand in for the whole, and acts as a *sketch* of the design of the story.

This point illustrates one of the major issues which is ever-present in screenwriting practice. The story is inevitably more complex in the mind of the screenwriter than can be easily described in words or on paper to others. In the flow of practice I am constantly shifting perspective from the whole to smaller parts and back again, spending a large amount of time readjusting my focus and re-acquainting myself with the minutiae. I also spend time trying to map the whole, which increasingly requires mapping many important fine details. This in itself, becomes an often daunting and time-consuming task, which has been partially illustrated by the figure ‘Mapping the text,’ described in the Methodology section. Even now, having completed a rough first draft script for *Calico Dreams*, I do not have such ready knowledge and level of familiarity that screenplay. This makes working on any screenplay a lengthy process. As with any concentrated work, longer periods of intense focus are preferable to working ‘part-time,’ where the writer loses the benefit of remembering many details and how they fit with the whole.

On the figure’s right hand side, a new story arc was to be described as a five sentence structure. However as may be clear, the right hand side includes the headings SU (set-up), Dist (disturbance) and TP (turning point), but does not continue with Act 1 and results and so on, as a full five sentence structure requires. The sentences describe this: an attempted rape by Ted; Madeline asks to buy Cagney out; the
Madame claims that Cagney stole money from her, and therefore owes the Madame; and so on. What is achieved here is a list of the smaller beats of the new story. This turned out not to be a five sentence structure of a whole screenplay, but represents an attempt to plot each beat of the new story. Though I set out to design a five sentence structure, I did not have a ready picture of the whole and its major beats in place at the time. I could not complete the task. There was nevertheless, benefit to this exercise for the practice at the time. It indicated what I did know, and what was still to be fixed upon. I recognised that I did not know enough about the story to sketch its overall structure, and I turned to a different task which would fill in those gaps.

In the five sentence structure exercise I was attempting to turn *Cashflow* into an Australian story, and for this I was modifying as few elements as possible. It can be seen that I am still retaining ‘Cagney’ as the main character, and Ted, Jimmy and Mr X as important characters in story terms. I became worried however, that I was not going far enough in my attempt to tell a story which was clearly Australian. I had been alerted to the problem of genre in analysing *Cashflow*, and it became increasingly clear to me as I worked on the exercise, that by retaining Mr X and Wild Bob, I was suggesting a similar generic tone to the comic western. I felt I was in danger of having my audience jump to the same conclusion as previously – that the screenplay’s voice was ‘American’ (or worse still, a failed attempt at an Australian voice). I began anew to re-concieve an Australian storyworld.

Throughout the screenwriting process which finally led me to *Calico Dreams* as it appears here, I was continually hampered (ironically), by my intimate knowledge of the American-voiced screenplay. Several things were at play in this. The first was the strength of my familiarity with an American mythology of the frontier—a mythology so powerful that it counteracted my own experiences of the Australian outback, which were quite substantial. I had also become aware of the influence of traditions and conventions of filmmaking, which I had learnt through viewing American screen stories, which had been incorporated into my screenwriting ‘toolbox’. And on top of this, something else was at play which I can only describe as loyalty.
Characters as family

In devising a new screenplay, I sought to keep as many of the original elements from *Cashflow* as I could. I believed that this would better support comparisons between the two screenplays’ voices, and would make the writing process easier. The situation and premise remained centred on a young girl who was being forced into prostitution against her will. Booth postulated that readers can bond with writers (2005, pp. 76-82), and Goodman describes the way that readers bond with characters (2010, p. 168). I discovered the ways in which a writer bonds with their characters, and characters can become like ‘family’ in the writer’s mind. This points to the personal involvement the writer has with the fictional world she is creating. I discovered the extent to which writers can correspondingly feel responsible for their characters, as Goodman proposes readers hold them to be (2010, p. 168). In creating characters in my own practice I find that certain of them can become like ‘children,’ who are often loved by me despite my awareness that they are fictional. Rabinowitz notes that reading fiction involves “inhabiting a double position where we both believe and disbelieve at the same time” in the reality of the fiction (2010, p. 355). This describes my experience as a screenwriter, and I suggest is the cause of the slippage of language through which I speak of my characters as if they were independent beings, who may be infuriating, who are loved, who are recalcitrant, and whom on some level, I experience as existing. This is an aspect of the relationship between a writer and her characters which has implications for voice (explained below). This occurs because fiction elements acts as stimuli in our minds in the same way real events do, and this explains why readers who apprehend voice strongly often believe that they know the writer (Elbow, 2007, p. 180), despite the fact that their only evidence is words on a page.

With regard to characters as family and the loyalty which this excites, I spent much time at the ‘five sentence’ stage, trying out storylines which would allow Ted Griffiths the bank manager, and his clerk Derek to remain in similar roles in the Australian-voiced story, bringing their twisted logic and comic (and criminal) antics to bear on Cagney’s situation in the Australian storyworld, Kalgoorlie. I at first adopted the new genre historical melodrama, and allowed Ted and Derek to remain. However the result remained too American through Ted’s characterisation and the comic tone. Elements in the plot such as Cagney dressing as a Southern Belle to charm Ted were
also out of keeping with Australian iconography and social relationships. These difficulties were exacerbated by the ‘frontier’ location, which had already led readers to read *Cashflow* as American because of associations between the terms (‘frontier’ is thought to be American). I realised that in order to ensure readers understood the story to be Australian, I needed to base it in a storyworld which could only be identified as Australian. I adopted the genre historical realism to cement this, and I now state the location as a subtitle in the film.

In *Calico Dreams* as it stands, the vestiges of melodrama are still strongly present (leading me to later argue that the screenplay is generically a hybrid). While I finally had to abandon Ted and Derek, two characters who were closely tied to the comic western genre, I was able to retain some of *Cashflow*’s characters where I could disengage them from a comic and/or western style and setting. However, I was unsuccessful in dissociating my protagonist, Cagney Fraser, from *Cashflow* until I renamed her ‘Caroline Frank’ and designed a full backstory for her. This was only partially successful, in that I still think of Cagney and Caroline as if they are the same people or perhaps sisters, though Caroline’s backstory is significantly different from her family and social history in the fantastical *Cashflow*. (And in this sentence it becomes clear the extent to which I see them as connected, since I now notice I have slipped easily between associating Cagney with Caroline, and Caroline with Cagney’s backstory, as if they were the same character!). The concept of Cagney and Caroline as sisters confirms my place as ‘mother,’ thus confirming the ways they are part of a ‘psychic’ family to me. Conceiving characters is like birthing a child for me, and leads to such psychic-emotional sense of connection, though the strength of this varies greatly dependent upon the character’s characteristics and traits.

Consequences of bonding with characters

Building on my responsibility towards characters, I also discovered that I was uncomfortable with putting them in certain situations. This revealed certain moral and ethical positions from which I wrote. Graeme Turner (1993) argues that narratives are produced by culture through the way they assume forms that articulate values and beliefs (p. 1). However, I argue that narratives articulate the values and beliefs of the writer, as much as that of the culture. With regard to formulating a visual representation of voice, as I did in developing the framework.
Discovering my own moral values in the text pointed to a need for any representation of voice to allow a place in which values and morals could be acknowledged as a factor. This is answered by the general area ‘content’, and by the specific five areas within that category in the framework.

I discovered the power of moral and ethical stances in voice when a range of dramatic possibilities were cut off to me because of the way I cared about the characters. The strongest influence was felt around the question of plot when I found myself unwilling to cause the women in my story indignity, pain and humiliation. This showed how the voice behind the work was oriented towards particular dramatic problems and solutions, and was constrained in the telling by moral issues about which I personally care.

In Cashflow I was able to negotiate this stance when I allowed Cagney to use (comic) violence to defend herself. I was not able to do this in Calico Dreams however, because the story was written to be realistic. Caroline’s characterisation as a timid and passive girl suggested she would become a victim rather than fight back. In planning Calico Dreams I avoided storylines in which Caroline was violently raped, despite the fact that this would have been a realistic action from other characters who wanted to demoralise and defeat her. The “moral sensibilities” Abrams speaks of with regards to voice (Abrams, 1993, p. 156) had strong implications for the choices I could make in terms of the plot. This presented a dilemma, because as a realistic genre (and because of the ever-present need to raise stakes), I had to acquiesce to the possibility of some level of violence towards Caroline (and towards the other prostitutes). This became an attempt to rape her, which Caroline escapes through the desperate act of jumping out of a second story window.

In devising this scene I came up against another ideological stance, related to the first. I was unwilling to let Caroline be rescued by a man or men. This was also related to voice, in that through Calico Dreams I seek to show young women their own power, and a different and independent way of being. Allowing Caroline’s rescue would have kept her disempowered, since it was her dependence on others which was her character flaw (again, a choice of voice). My own values and beliefs impinged on the writing process and shaped the possibilities of the voice. This sensitivity to
underlying beliefs and ideologies later led to the recognition of philosophical and ideological content as an aspect of voice.

Another aspect of voice, is the worldview. *Calico Dreams* is told from a woman’s perspective, and younger women figure amongst its target audience. This is evidenced not only by the setting in a brothel, and the large number of women characters including the main protagonist and antagonist, but also by the level of detail and focus given to the women’s lifestyles and experiences. Its worldview is also coloured by an Australian perspective. The most obvious manifestation of this is the location and nationalities of the characters, and the detail and care taken to describe the world, even to the particular multicultural mix of characters which reflect the historical reality. Apart from this however, the worldview is shown through the ways that the characters are taken seriously, and are drawn with some sympathy—an ‘us’ perspective, rather than a distanced ‘them’. This is obvious in the lack of ridicule of the characters’ failings and weaknesses *in the writing*, which is carried in the tone, content and mood. Even the depiction of an ambivalent character such as Nathan Honeycombe shows some attempt to convey that Nathan is struggling with his demons, gambling and alcohol (scenes 2, 53, 148), and is haunted by what happened to his sister (scenes 2, 36, 37, 93).

Seeking to write from a woman’s perspective also affected the type of hero Caroline could be. As mentioned, I required Caroline to save herself through her own capacities, rather than appear as a ‘damsel in distress’ who waited for a masculine rescuer. In this I was attempting to formulate and depict a form of heroism which was unlike that of a fictional hero in the masculine sense but depicted a form of female heroism. Many storylines were rejected at the five sentence stage because they did not fulfil my need for Caroline – that she should rescue herself through her own actions and attitudes. I also wished her to show courage, determination and persistence in defence of herself and others (particularly Louisa) without recourse to violence or intimidation. I felt it was not in keeping with her character to act in violent ways, and I also do not consider violence towards others an ‘heroic’ act. For me there was a disjunct between traditional concepts of ‘hero’ and the type of hero I was writing in Caroline.
One of the consequences of this was the importance in the planning stages to find ways in which the antagonists caused their own downfall because, as characterised, Caroline was unlikely to use violence or act in a punitive way to ‘right wrongs.’ A related problem was how a passive character like Caroline, who is limited in physical strength, can defend herself. The answer in earlier drafts of the script was can-can dancing.

The can-can is historically associated with the goldfields through the French prostitutes who came with the gold rush in 1892 (King, 1988, p. 76). In an early storyline Caroline was taught can-can dancing by the character of Lisette, the French dancer-prostitute. The can-can dance answered my need for Caroline to be seen to have physical abilities, and kicking became a realistic action she could use in self-defence. Above I have described some aspects of the conception stage which relate to the choices which create the form and content of the screenplay. I have also outlined ways in which the writer is personally involved when crafting a story, through the values and attitudes which direct the choices made. This is important to voice because of the ways that voice is informed by the worldview of the screenwriters, whose mind and person realises a dramatic world of their own imagining on the page. This world is imbued with the writer’s own “determinate intelligence and moral sensibility” (Abrams, 1993, p. 156). Though taken for granted, and often inscribed through unconscious choices in the practice of writing (Bordwell, 1997, p. 150), this worldview is the substance from which written text is composed which displays a “stream-lined version” (Phelan, 2005, p. 45) of the writer through the dramatic design which emerges from their labour. It is this dramatic design which is woven from the craft aspects described in the framework below.

A Framework for Screenwriter’s Voice

Overview of the framework

Having described the ways that aspects of my own values, attitudes and worldview influenced the choices made while writing Calico Dreams and contributed to the specific qualities of the voice, here I describe the conceptual framework for screenwriter’s voice which was informed and developed through this practice. The framework focuses observations of a text towards the choices which make up any voice, and through this, enables voice to be more specifically located and described.
In recognising that the choices which make up any voice represent options within a range of possibilities, it becomes possible to compare these against other choices, and form a snapshot of the particular writer’s voice embodied within a screenplay. Thus, screenwriter’s voice can be understood more deeply through close interrogation of the screenplay text it has produced. This requires attention to the ideas expressed within the text, the linguistic expression, and the choices amongst the language, images and sounds described in the text which create both form and content in a screenplay, anticipating the audiovisual experience offered by the film (MacDonald, 2004; Maras, 2009).

In developing a framework towards locating voice, it has been necessary to bridge the gap which exists between a text expressed in words, and the imagined film text, which is expressed through images and sound. While screenwriting craft areas define the type of story within broad parameters, ideas, language, images and sound constitute the ‘how’ of the telling. In this way the framework recognises the components of screenwriting both as concepts, ideas, and conventions, and cues to physical elements which will appear in the film.

The flow diagram below (Figure 15) represents the conceptual framework for screenwriter’s voice (seen previously under ‘Methodology’). Under ‘type of screenplay’ the writer chooses the formal craft components of genre and structure from amongst a set of filmic conventions, while storyworld, characters and major themes are chosen based on the writer’s particular conception of the screen idea. Under ‘how the story is told’ the writer chooses the language used to express her ideas, and the types of images and sounds which depict the story and its meaning. All choices of ideas, language, visual and aural cues have implications for tone, mood, and content. Conversely, choices of tone, mood and content also inform and condition all choices above. Though tone, content and mood are open-ended categories, they are important areas because within each, specific interpretive and affective meaning is created by the way elements are combined to create such tone, and mood through specific content.
The overlapping arrows on the left hand side are intended to indicate that formal craft skills and personal ideas are both present in all areas of screenwriting, though the comparative influence each exerts varies. Though the choices made regarding the type of screenplay are commonly understood as ‘filmmaking’ choices, and are therefore thought to be made by the director, in the case of an original screen story written on spec these are choices the screenwriter makes, generally before any involvement by producers or a director. It is also the screenwriter who invents a satisfying and dramatic screen story which conveys meaning and elicits affective responses in readers (viewers) by combining elements in specific ways through the dramatic design.

This thesis proposes that voice in screenwriting is created and read through cues embedded within the text which reflect the cognitive and imaginative capacities of the writer. Despite misconceptions of the writer’s role, and given that there will also be instances where writers write together, and/or under the direction of producers and/or directors, I argue that, particularly in the case of an original screen story, the choices represented by the framework are generally made by the screenwriter who is
responsible for the dramatic storytelling in advance of the process of filmmaking. It is
this voice which is embodied in the screenplay text, and which lays the foundation
for the screen story’s realisation on film. In the sections below, I describe the
framework terms more fully, to indicate the choices possible from among which the
screenwriter creates the unique voice of her screenplay.

Description of the Elements - Genre

Genre divides screenplays into types according to a known set of storytelling
templates based on differences of subject, setting, and values (McKee, 1999, p. 87).
Genre can define such elements as: the nature of the protagonist, the nature of the
antagonist, the shape of the dramatic action, the catalytic event, the resolution, the
narrative style, the narrative shape, and the tone of a screenplay (Dancyger & Rush,
2002, p. 52). For the screenwriter, these translate directly into types of character,
action, dialogue, setting, costume and props. While genre is associated with
filmmaking, Sternberg notes how “thematic and aesthetic elements” particular to the
chosen genre are written into screenplays (1997, p. 167). While not all genres are
equally strongly codified, and genres can be blended or hybridised, reader (and
audience) expectations are strongly based on perceptions of genre. Kenneth Burke
(1945) developed a theory of genre which described genres as scenic (defined
through their setting, for example, the western); based on an agent (for example, the
gangster film); or based in agency (through their mode of representation, for
example, the musical, which includes song and dance) (cited in Perez, 2002, p. 190).
In this schema, scene and agent can both implicate a national context, and worldview
through the specifics of the scene or agent chosen where these are culturally or
nationally specific. Using Cashflow as an examples, the genre of comic western,
being a derivative of the western, carries a strong association with the United States
through that nation’s historical period when the ‘west’ was being opened to settlers
and the Native Americans were being displaced.

The power of genre is its patterning, which is both loose enough to allow stories to
be varied, and yet similar enough to be identifiable. McKee lists 25 main genres (e.g.
the Love story, Western, etc.) and extends these with others such as the 'Maturation
Plot,' and others he simply calls dramas (e.g. Historical Drama) (1999, pp. 80-86). In
addition, Andrew Tudor (1986) claims that genres are “sets of cultural conventions” (p. 5). Daniel Chandler (1997) notes that “assumptions about the 'ideal reader' including their attitudes towards the subject matter and often their class, age, gender and ethnicity,” are embedded in genre texts (p. 5) which are designed to “produce a certain emotional response in [their] audiences” (Batty & Waldeback, 2008, p. 83). This was the case in *Cashflow*, where I saw my most sought after audience as American readers, since I hoped to interest an American studio. This persuaded me to allow the American voice to remain through my desire to please this group.

Behind the pre-supposition of audience characteristics is also the assumption of specific worldviews. These define an individual’s perspective and orientation to the social and material world, and screenwriters partly rely on being able to anticipate the worldview of their readers in this way. By doing this, they can inscribe that worldview into the screenplay (as I did in *Cashflow*), and genre decisions are one important way in which worldviews (meaning values, attitudes and beliefs), are written in to screenplay texts.

Genre decisions are made at the earliest stages of script development, and can be used to characterise screenwriter’s voice in several ways. The *form* of adherence or divergence from expected genre characteristics can characterise a voice. Writers can hybridise genres or otherwise seek to negotiate their own worldview and the ideology inherent in a generic form by adopting and mixing genre characteristics.

In summary, genre is displayed through the writer’s choices of setting, central character or subject matter, and through the mode of representation. Genre itself, is formulated around values, worldviews and ideology which has originated in specific historical, social and political circumstances (Malphurs, 2008; Coogan, 2003; Routt, n.d.; Moran & Vieth, 2006). In Australia, many films do not display strong genre patterning (Dermody & Jacka, 1988; Hambly, 2016; Moran & Vieth, 2006; O’Regan, 1996; Turner, 1993), and generic hybridisation is common (O’Regan, 1996, p. 237). Some choices can imply a cultural-national context from the first expression of a screen idea, as I claim is true of the western’s association with the United States (Coogan, 2003; Dirks; Frayling, 1998; Malphurs, 2008; Moran & Vieth, 2006; Rotha, 1967; Walker, 2001).
Structure

Making genre choices often implies structural choices. Structure answers ‘how the story is told’ with reference to how information is ordered and shaped to “reveal story facts and events” to the reader in the sequence which carries greatest dramatic effect (Batty & Waldeback, 2008, p. 134). Any film narrative has two levels of structure: the ordering of events, called plot, and the emotional development, called story or emotional arc. Plot defines the physical action, while story refers to the character’s emotional journey (Batty & Waldeback, 2008; Dancyger & Rush, 2007; McKee, 1999). Though readers tend to think only of the broad choices reflected in the formal craft areas, beneath these are myriad layers of decision-making which supports the screenplay as a coherent whole, which requires many thousands of choices (Catmull, 2008, para 6).

The smallest unit of both plot and story structure is the ‘beat,’ understood as an instance of new information which forwards the story. The concept of beats imply the way that each piece of information inches the story towards its conclusion through the consistent development of character, action and themes, and the emotional weight of these. A beat may be realised in a glance, through a gesture, action or event or through dialogic exchange. Beats can also include moments within the character’s body or consciousness, such as a moment of realisation, or a strong emotional response. Anything which can be realised in the filmic frame may function as a beat. The achievement of a satisfying screen story attests to the writer’s ingenuity in choosing and placing hundreds of minor and more major beats in a logical and meaningful order to build plot and story into an affective whole.

While structuring a screen story, many choices are made unconsciously on the basis of the writer’s experience of the world and their taken-for-granted worldview. This is necessary because of the huge number of choices which must be made in screen storytelling. Making choices is cognitively expensive for the writer. It is natural then, for the writer to allow default understandings to remain within the text. It is often through these default ‘choices’ that the national inflection which coincides with the writer’s context is written into the text unconsciously. The writer can also choose in
any instance to deliberately write against this default inflection, and therefore, writers can write from other worldviews and display alternative national inflections of a culture with which they have some familiarity (as I did in *Cashflow*).

Beats can be small, and are organised into larger units in scenes, sequences or acts. The ‘tent pole’ schema defines the function, positioning, and relative strength of the eight major story beats which form the skeleton of a three act structure (see Batty & Waldeback, 2008, p. 31). These major beats can only fulfil their privileged roles when supported by many smaller beats before and after them. In choosing story beats, the writer imbues the story with voice and also injects national inflection into the screen story through real world associations which accompany ideas objects, behaviours and settings.

Structure can be influenced by national inflection

American Joseph Campbell studied the legends and myths of many cultures and theorised that there was one human myth which is reproduced in the storytelling of all cultures. He articulated this in several books, including *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* (1941), and *The Power of Myth* (1988). Based on *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*, American Christopher Vogler developed a structural paradigm called ‘the hero’s journey,’ which he argues is a pattern which can be applied to any story, and which has universal appeal to people of all cultures (2007, p. xix). This is based on the claim that this monomyth is a distillation of stories from all cultural groups, and therefore are timeless and universal (Vogler, 2007, p. xix). This claim is also based on the emphasis put on the inclusion of characters who display archetypal characteristics (Vogler, 2007, p. 24). However, Tudor contends that structural patterns are cultural forms, and are specific to certain cultural/national groups (1986, p. 5). The hero’s journey has as its central character a hero whom Seger associates with an American worldview based on the “Pilgrim’s Progress” story (Aronson, 2000, p. 30). Since the nature of the hero defines a range of structural possibilities, this suggests that screenplays can reflect cultural sensibilities through genre and structural forms which match hero types (Aronson, 2000; Coogan, 2003; Malphurs, 2008; Tudor, 1986).

Batty and Waldeback note that “structure is one of the most important storytelling
tools, as it creates pace, rhythm, atmosphere, narrative flow, point of view, a context for meaning and a fundamental way to interweave subtext” (2008, p. 29). Structure is complex and different for each story, and requires focused attention to fully understand and appreciate how structure serves the story in each different case. It is a common misconception that a filmmaker ‘structures’ the film through shooting and editing. However, it is at the script stage that the screenwriter makes all decisions regarding the ordering of events, rhythm, pace and beats. While these can be altered during the processes of filming and editing, in most cases the screenplay substantially defines and guides which story is shot during production, and alterations in production by and large serve to ‘polish’ the storytelling, rather than create it anew (although there may always be cases where alternative methodologies and practices or extenuating other circumstances mean that this is not the case). Major structural characteristics, such as the inciting incident, the turning points and the climax, can be described as a way of understanding the strategies which create the voice of one screenplay, while a deeper understanding of structure and familiarity with multiple screenplays by the same writer may reveal further patterning and other idiosyncrasies which reveal the voice of a particular writer through structure.

Storyworld

While genre defines certain characteristics of a screenplay, and structure speaks to story design on both micro and macro levels, the storyworld is the body which contains the screen story, both in the sense of defining its parameters, and in the sense of ‘fleshing out’ ideas into a physical form. Storyworld answers the question ‘where does this story take place’, and embraces every facet of the world as it is depicted. McKee, who uses the term ‘setting,’ notes that it “sharply defines and confines” the story’s possibilities (1999, p. 69).

The choice of storyworld is key to making sense of many aspects of the fictional world and is a strong way ‘in’ to screenwriter’s voice for the reader. It is one of the major choices which can encapsulate a worldview and can also define a national inflection through the location of the story (though as discussed, it is not always the case). The points of view expressed by the choice of hero, villain and goal may also evidence values and ideologies which are associated with a particular society, national or cultural group, and may indicate the national inflection aspect of any
Though the storyworld can embody many of the values, attitudes, beliefs and points of view which define the voice of any screenplay, the relationship between a storyworld, its worldview, and the writer’s own values and attitudes is not necessarily straightforward and linear, nor sympathetic. Choosing a storyworld provides an opportunity for the writer to explore ideas, issues and concepts. In all cases, the choice of storyworld and particularly the drama as it is played out within that milieu, can offer insight into the screenwriter’s voice through the worldview, values and attitudes which are embodied, promoted or negated through the outcome of the story. Sometimes this worldview may strongly reflect a specific local, national or regional context, and identification with a specific society or nation will almost certainly be depicted whenever life-as-lived is shown, since many taken-for-granted elements from the writer’s own context are included in the unconscious choices a writer makes even when the storyworld is not intended as realism.

Characters

If the storyworld embodies a screen story, it is the characters who give it life. In choosing which characters are heroes and which are villains, the screenwriter exhibits voice, and in a host of other ways, characters can embody speech, behaviours and values, all of which signify the screenwriter’s voice. Character as a term and concept addresses two central questions: ‘who is in this story;’ and ‘who is this story about?’ It also addresses what type of people inhabit the world. The answers to these questions relate closely to how the story unfolds, and carry issues of genre, structure and theme, the nature of the dramatic problem and how this is resolved. Characters are a main area of choice in which the screenwriter’s voice can be demonstrated. Though not absolute, the correlation between gender of writer and gender of main character has been shown to be strong (Smith et al, n.d. p. 23).

The choice of main and secondary characters is one of the foundational choices a screenwriter makes which displays voice and can often lead readers to assume much about the writer who wrote the work (Booth, 1983, 2002, 2005; Goodman, 2010; Phelan, 2005; Rabinowitz, 2010; Shen, 2011; Zunshine, 2002, 2003, 2006). While the
storytelling will suggest many aspects of the personhood of the writer, the question of national inflection in the writer’s voice can arise often with reference to character choices, because people are used to reading nationality from other people’s speech and behaviours (and for the duration of the fiction, characters are held to be people (Hernadi, 2001, cited in Lisa Zunshine, 2006, p. 166). The storytelling and theatrical traditions of a culture may influence writers’ characterisation, as may the degree of exposure to American films and screenwriting manuals (as was shown through Cashflow). Characters often embody a nationality which is fore-fronted as important to the story, whether intended as realism or not. Characters can also often embody a default nationality more subtly on the page, through the nuance and idiom in dialogue and described behaviour. The nationality of the actor who plays the character in filmed drama can also overlay national-cultural idiosyncrasies onto a screen story which may or may not be part of the writer’s intentions for the story. Character configurations can also relate to cultural-national group through traditions and conventions of character and performance (Edensor, 2002, p. 143), as was described in relation to Ted Griffiths in Cashflow. Therefore cultural-national identity can be an aspect of writer’s voice which may be discerned through choices of character.

The main characters in a screen drama are the hero or protagonist, and the antagonist who opposes him/her. Protagonists can be thought of across a spectrum of active to passive. An active protagonist “takes action in direct conflict with the people and the world around him” (McKee, 1999, p. 50). A passive protagonist "pursues desire inwardly, in conflict with aspects of his or her own nature" (McKee, 1999, p. 50). Screen stories are thought to require active characters, since action and spectacle have been the hallmarks of large screen entertainment since its inception.

Screenplays also ‘fill out’ the world with other character ‘types,’ who function as representatives of a class or group (Sternberg, 1997, p. 114), or are ‘mass and weight’ characters who simply fill out the fictional frame to create believability (Seger, 1987, p. 213). The number of developed characters with individual stories define the screenplay as either single protagonist, ensemble or other. Aronson argues that character configurations are becoming increasingly complex as multiple protagonist and parallel story forms proliferate (2000, p. 51).
One of the most useful ways to think of characterisation is through the continuum which places stories between fantasy and reality. Dancyger and Rush define characters using the terms “movie characters”, “dramatic characters” and “real life characters” (2002, p. 95). Movie characters are less realistic than dramatic characters who are less realistic than real life characters (Dancyger & Rush, 2002, p. 98). The complexities of everyday life “are alien to [movie] characters”, who resolve issues in an exaggerated way and with great energy and activity (Dancyger & Rush, 2002, p. 98). ‘Dramatic’ characters are “intentional characters” who are “active, energetic and goal-directed” (Dancyger & Rush, 2002, pp. 95-97). In contrast, real life characters include “the full gamut of characters - from active to passive, energetic to depressed, happy to angry, frustrated to fulfilled” (Dancyger & Rush, 2002, p. 97). Real life characters are often more difficult to work with because they do not necessarily have strong goals, and can be less active protagonists (Dancyger & Rush, 2002, p. 97). This has been the case with Caroline in Calico Dreams. The nature of the protagonist chosen by a screenwriter may be an element of the screenwriter’s voice displayed in a single screenplay. If the same choice is made over multiple works by the same screenwriter, the case for using this index to characterise an aspect of that writer’s voice becomes stronger.

While the spectrum of fantastical to realistic can be used to define types of characters, it also affects budget range. Many national cinemas cannot support the large budgets required by (fantasy-based) action movies, making it necessary for screenwriters to write only realistic characters and stories. Therefore in some cases a correlation can be drawn between national inflection, genre and character types (and screenwriter’s voice) which is budgetary in origin. Choices of types of main character can be strongly indicative of national preferences, and can therefore link screenwriter’s voice to a cultural-national context. For example, some scholars argue that Australians prefer reticent heroes and ‘noble failures’ (Aronson, 2000; O’Regan, 1996; Vogler, 2007) rather than aggressive and individualist warrior-heroes who may be preferred by Americans (Coogan, 2003; Malphurs, 2008; Vogler, 2007), and Ilija Trivundza describes Slovene male heroes as characteristically “weak” (2010, p. 678) in the sense of being impotent against the larger forces which challenge them.
Amongst characters, speech and behaviour illuminates many elements of social practice (etiquette, customs, social relations and hierarchies) which can reflect screenwriter’s voice and taken for granted aspects of social-cultural life which can suggest a national inflection in the voice. The screenwriter can describe the smallest gestures and behaviours from which readers “draw conclusions about the feelings, thoughts, personality structures and attitudes of the persons interacting with one another” (Korte, 1993; cited in Sternberg, 1997, p. 115). Characterisation is also written into the screenplay through choices of costumes, props, spatial and design relationships, and proposed images, sound and the performance styles implied. These material aspects of a screen story can act as cues to the voice and in some cases, may suggest a national inflection.

Readers’ engagement with characters

Conventional ideas of pleasure in film narrative suggest that characters are the heart of screen stories. Readers are taken on a “journey with the characters, and see them develop and grow as they are faced with difficult decisions” (Batty & Waldeback, 2008, p. 145). Readers can also experience catharsis through satisfactory closure of a screen story (Batty & Waldeback, 2008, pp. 149-151).

Catharsis in film studies is often described in relation to an audience’s identification with film characters, and is largely unexplored with regards to reader’s responses to a screenplay. This is partly explained by the general unavailability of screenplays to the reading public (Baker, 2013; Beattie, 2013; Corliss, 1975; Morsberger & Morsberger, 1975). However, based on the viewing of films, Murray Smith (1995) argues that the term ‘identification’ is not specific enough to describe the varied responses to characters. Smith posits a structure of sympathy (1995, p. 5) with three levels of engagement with fictional characters, termed allegiance, alignment, and recognition (pp. 5-10).

Alignment “gives [viewers] access to the actions, thoughts, and feelings of characters” (Smith, 1995, p. 6), through point of view. Allegiance “attempts to marshal [the viewers’] sympathies for or against the various characters in the world of the fiction” (Smith, 1995, p. 6) through story design and often point of view.

Recognition involves characters who are both ‘individuated’ and ‘continuous’ (Smith,
meaning characters are seen as unique; and yet are recognisable over time within the drama (Smith, 1995, p. 110). These characters can also be recognisable in the sense of displaying human characteristics which we recognise because true to our own life experience. Smith also interrogates the relationship between identification, sympathy and empathy (1995, pp. 76-96). These concepts are relevant to readers who seek to describe their responses to characters, and can be used to describe the effect of the voice.

Dancyger and Rush (1995, 2002, 2007, 2013), McKee (1999), Vogel (2007), Jacey (2010), Seger (1987) and Aronson (2000) amongst others, offer approaches and ways to talk about the functionality of characters within screenwriting, and this can reflect aspects of the voice. Sternberg’s question of non-verbal behaviour and Smith’s concepts around the structure of sympathy make it possible to interrogate more directly the methods by which the voice presents characters to readers and the meaning implied by this. Close scrutiny of the screenplay text can illuminate the screenwriter’s voice through these theoretical frames. The presentation and development of characters can characterise the voice of a screenplay. The voice can also be characterised by its sympathetic, ambivalent or antipathetic treatment of those characters, and by its treatment of readers (Goodman, 2010, p. 168).

Ezra and Rowden claim that the “performance of American-ness” is increasingly becoming a “universal” or “universalizing” characteristic of cinema globally (2006a, p. 2). This relates to the dominance of international screens by eight major US Studios, through their complex of distribution and exhibition networks (Crane, 2014; Davis, 2006; Hjort & Petrie, 2007; Lee, 2008; Scott, 2002; Su, 2011). This is disturbing given that Irish researcher, Susan Liddy (2014) notes that “the ‘worth’ of characters can be symbolically communicated by their absence or presence on screen” (Lauzen & Dozier, 2005; cited in Liddy, p. 2). For this reason, who is represented remains an important issue (Liddy, 2014, p. 2), and it is an issue which is entangled with voice through the cultural-national belonging which influence the screenwriter’s worldview. While Smith et al (n.d.) found a strong correlation between the gender of the writer and that of the protagonist (p. 23), the same is not necessarily true of nationality (as was shown in Cashflow). This speaks to an issue raised in scholarship (Ezra & Rowden, 2006; Maslowska, 2014; Ransom, 2014) regarding the common
reflex amongst young screenwriters (Maslowska, 2014) to depict stories which will be thought to gain attention from American production partners. This was also the case in *Cashflow*. Whose stories are told, and therefore whose values are most often seen on screens is affected by the imbalance in power and prestige of film distribution and exhibition globally, as Lauren Carroll Harris (2013) explains as occurring in Australia. For this reason, I encourage other to research the connections between screenwriter’s voice, characterisation and beliefs, values and worldview more specifically than can be achieved here.

Themes

While characters are often thought to be at the heart of screen stories, stories are unified by themes. Themes are often based around values, and can therefore carry strong ideological potency. The attitudes—both positive and negative—which are demonstrated by the story through theme/s reveal the deeper meaning of a screenplay. Therefore the choice of theme in any screenplay suggests something about the voice. David Bayles and Ted Orland (1993) support this statement when they suggest that in the process of artmaking, artists declare what they feel is important (p. 108), and display preoccupations to which they return over series of works (p. 116). This can be seen in my own writings, where my protagonists include woman, indigenous, and dis-enfranchised characters—the underdogs—who are not typical heroes in the sense of masculine warriors. In these stories, overcoming obstacles more often results in a moral victory, rather than a physical reward, and this is often a victory for a community, rather than an individual.

Themes strengthen the power of the story to communicate its ideas (Batty & Waldeback, 2008, p. 22) by addressing “the problem of what a film is ‘about’” (Aronson, 2000, p. 196). Themes link story elements and add to meaning, and so are particularly active in multiple narrative forms (Aronson, 2000, p. 196), where the theme is a key to understanding the screen story from a broader perspective. Themes can be expressed through story content in all its material forms, and through poetic devices and visual or aural motifs (Sternberg, 1997, pp. 163-164). Through this, themes create symbolic meaning which enriches the screen story, and can be a characteristic of voice.
Themes offer another way of characterising a screenwriter’s voice related to tone, mood, and general worldview, and are often “behind the most passionate writing” (Aronson, 2000, p. 33). It is not surprising then, that patterns in the theme or social concerns of screen stories can illuminate the preoccupations of the screenwriter (Bayles & Orland, 1993, p. 116). Because themes can strongly reflect beliefs and values (Aronson, 2000, p. 33), they can offer readers clues to the personal values of the writer through their moral and emotional content (Booth, 1983, p. 73), and can be highly charged ideologically. The material forms through which themes are expressed can also reflect taken-for-granted aspects of life which link to the screenwriter’s voice through worldview.

How the Story is Told: Language, Images and Sounds

The previous sections discussed the formal craft aspects of screenwriting to describe how voice can be inscribed in the screenplay form. This section addresses the material manifestations of voice through ideas and choices of language, images and sounds in the screenplay. The language, images and sounds described in a screenplay text are essentially ideas and yet they imply physical forms. Thus, this level in the framework, focusing on how the story is told, bridges areas of both form and content.

Ways the voice is inscribed

Screenplay prose is made up of scene text, which describes all characters, actions and events; and spoken dialogue, and while both work together to enrich the storytelling (Sternberg, 1997, p. 107) the patterns revealed can also characterise the voice. The prose can be further interrogated under four functions or modes: description; report; comment; and speech (Sternberg, 1997, pp. 66-76). Description refers to the description of setting and events; report, like stage directions, refers to actions and elements occurring within the frame and described in a ‘flat’ way, without editorial embellishments; comment refers to editorial comment by the writer which colours the reader’s understanding of diegetic elements. Comment can be either directed at the reader or the filmmakers. Speech refers to dialogue. Sternberg asserts that patterns of distribution of these reveal something about the “writer’s individual style” (1997, p. 76), as does the ratio of scene text to dialogue. For example, American writer-director, Woody Allen often positions a central character,
sometimes played by himself, as a neurotic Jewish male [for example, in *Annie Hall* (1977)]. The nature and large amount of dialogue in these films is characteristic of Allen’s screenwriter’s voice, and the New York Jewish worldview is often a characteristic of Allen’s stories and voice.

The important difference in screenwriting prose from other long fictional formats is the extent to which it must describe its content through discrete images (Horne, 1992 PAGE). While early scenarios were often lists of shots (Price, 2010, p. 2) the master scene script format describes the action scene by scene. In this format, images and technical directions are also expressed through the prose, since describing objects and their placement *implies* that they are seen, and often how they are placed in the frame. Accompanying sounds are generally assumed, though sometimes these are noted in the text (Sternberg, 1997, p. 183).

Images can be suggested by the language used even to the extent of expressing camera angles; shot sizes; framing of people, objects and actions; beat, pace and rhythm, within the text (see discussion in Dancyger & Rush, 2007, pp. 227-246). The description of image after image after image gives a continual sense of rhythm and movement, for even if these images are static the constant shifting of the camera between subjects and angles ‘dynamises’ the scenes. Putting images into sequences of words suggests the order in which such images will appear. In addition, describing those images in short, terse or punchy sentences or long meandering ones ‘writes’ the rhythm of the camera movement or picture editing into the text. Scene text descriptions are thus often directly related to how the screenwriter expects the scene to be ‘covered,’ and explains how the screenwriter can design and anticipate the shooting plan for the drama at the scripting stages. As Sternberg claims, “technical knowledge and aesthetic intentions converge in the screenplay” (1997, p. 207), and the patterns these create allow readers to get a sense of the visual style of the intended film. Cues to visual coverage can be an obvious aspect of some screenwriter’s voices.

The anticipated tone of the film-to-be is also reflected in prose style and dialogue, as writers "make use of the scene text to mirror the film genre or the overall mood of the film story" (Sternberg, 1997, p. 82). Because of the requirement for brevity, every
object mentioned in a screenplay imparts information about the story’s intended 
realisation, enriches the story and characters, and conveys meaning. This is a 
foundational discipline of screenwriting.

Reading visual information in the screenplay text

To demonstrate the above, I include this example from Batty and Waldeback (2008). These two sentences below describe the same shot; and yet one illustrates the power of description to set up a scene and character, and convey voice:

“She wanders along the water’s edge, a small solitary figure in a desolate landscape;”

“Long shot of Lynette walking along the sea.”

(Batty & Waldeback, 2008, p. 55)

The description of a ‘small solitary figure in a desolate landscape’ implies much about the first image. We know that the distance between the subject and camera must be large because we see her as ‘small.’ This indicates that the landscape dominates the image. Seeing her as a ‘figure’ is impersonal. Her action - to wander - is weak and unspecific. Neither her expressions nor gestures are the source of story information here. The language: ‘wanders;’ ‘small;’ ‘solitary;’ and ‘desolate,’ suggests both the emotions engendered by the image, and implies what the woman feels. The spatial relationships and their emotional effect is the purpose of the image. The second sentence, though technically accurate, imparts much less information.

James Phelan argues that readers

follow the movement of instabilities and tensions [in a fictional work, and] they engage in many kinds of responses: judging characters, developing hopes and desires, and expectations for them, and constructing tentative hypotheses about the overall shape and direction of the narrative. (2005, p. 20)
The first sentence invites engagement from the reader, and the effect the scene creates through spatial indicators and emotional tone offers dramatic information. In the second sentence, the reader is given few clues to know how to interpret either the drama or the shot (Batty & Waldeback, 2008, p. 55). This lack of context impoverishes the words, making the second sentence almost meaningless with regard to the story in comparison to the first. The voice in both impact strongly on the emotional response and engagement readers may feel in both examples, an impact which is achieved through mind-reading.

As previously noted, Theory of Mind suggests that "writers have been using descriptions of their characters' behaviours to inform us about their feelings since time immemorial" (Zunshine, 2006, p. 4). Here scene and setting represent an extension of the character’s state of mind. Theory of mind emphasises the way that readers infer states of mind of fictional characters from their behaviour (Zunshine, 2006, p. 4). In the example above the cumulative effect of the emotive words in the sentence leads the reader to conclude feelings of desolation in the character. However it is the visual language of the text which conveys this meaning through described images. This extends Zunshine’s thesis on mind-reading into the realms of visual fiction and demonstrates how meaning can be conveyed through descriptive language which suggests images, mood and spatial relations. Zunshine states that writers often rely on this human propensity to infer information, and use it to engage readers (2006, p. 4).

Readers can also assess the writer’s involvement with the character through mind-reading the author (Booth, 1983; Goodman, 2010; Phelan, 2005; Rabinowitz, 2010; Zunshine, 2006). The first sentence carries the sense that the writer is personally engaged with the woman because of what we may feel is emotional content (Booth, 1983, p. 73) inherent in the description of the scene. The second sentence is detached and impersonal, making it more difficult to care about the character. It is easy to imagine that the writer cares about the character in the first sentence, and does not in the second. The nature of the description can lead readers to mind-read the screenwriter through treatment of the character (Goodman, 2010, p. 168).

The example of sentence one demonstrates several things: how readers may mind-
read to guess the intentions of the writer; how described images convey spatial and psycho-emotional information; and also how readers can become engaged in fictional worlds through their own responsiveness to cues in a text. Screenwriters use all of the skills they possess to impart this richness in every sentence in a screenplay. To the extent that a reader becomes aware of the writer behind the words, that reader may be aware of the writer’s voice. However, even when the reader is not conscious of the voice, he still may be impacted by it. Voice inheres in the text and can impact the reader through his embodied responses to the story, whether these are positive or negative.

While screenwriters were traditionally urged to speak in plain language only, screenwriters do use literary devices and anticipate technical effects (Sternberg, 1997, p. 231). Literary devices, such as ‘as if,’ ‘like,’ and ‘as though’ evoke word-pictures which embellish the understanding of an action or scene. Screenwriters also use specific details about such things as sound cues, colour tone, lighting effects, setting or mise-en-scene as this helps to connote the world they are describing (Sternberg, 1997, p. 231). Though working in words, screenwriters are mentally involved in weaving complete, coherent and three-dimensional worlds. Because of this, to speak of the range of a voice is not simply to speak about the use of language. A voice’s range can include characteristic use of all of the elements described here, including dialogue, scene, setting, props, lighting, rhythm, pace and more. A screenwriter’s voice is not limited to words, though words are its raw material.

According to Batty and Waldeback, “some of the most powerful emotive experiences and memorable storytelling moments are enabled through the use of sound” (2008, p. 157). However, sound often goes unmentioned in screenwriting. This may be partly due to the way that natural sounds are taken for granted to exist and are expected to be recorded at the same time as the vision. Therefore screenwriters write details of sound only if they “go beyond natural acoustics … [or] … have to be modified technically” (Sternberg, 1997, p. 183). And yet sound plays an important role in the effect the drama has on its audience by “underlining the essence or the emotion of a scene” (Sternberg, 1997, p. 183). Batty and Waldeback go so far as to suggest that sound is the “unconscious of the cinema” which enables the story to be more “richly experienced” (2008, p. 157, italics in original). As such, sound is an
important element in the writer’s voice.

Dialogue as crafted screenwriter’s voice

All sound in film is used to "comment, to provide clues, to create a background and to interpret the story and characters," (Sternberg, 1997, p. 182) and forward the plot. The most common form of sound cue is dialogue, and it performs all these functions at different times. Gerard Genette (1980) compares a ‘narrative of events,’ where the writer tells a story; with a ‘narrative of words,’ where (readers believe) the writer merely reports an oral utterance (cited in Ross, 1989, p. 68). Rabinowitz notes that an authorial audience takes a work of art as “somehow ‘real’” (2010, p. 355). Ironically, it is the vividness of the writing which leads readers to believe in the reality of the fictional character’s words more than in the reality of the screenwriter. This tendency is exaggerated when actors embody the fictional character on film. Nevertheless, dialogue is equally screenwriter’s voice, even when spoken through the voices (and performances) of fictional characters.

Dialogue in screenwriting suggests a “natural” conversation because everyday language is used, many can speak at once, and the characters inhabit ‘real’ spatial environments and use normal speaking volume (Sternberg, 1997, p. 93). However dialogue is carefully crafted and performs several functions: displaying character and emotional states; relations between characters; posing questions; and giving information which forwards the plot. Other outcomes of dialogue include introducing irony, comic moments, or heightened emotion. Dialogue need not always be synchronous with the scene being played out, but can still be relevant through the characterisation displayed or tangentially through the storyline. Song lyrics, thought subtitles, ‘signing’ or gestures may stand in for dialogue. While film is considered a ‘visual’ medium, and a "surplus of dialogue" is sometimes considered undramatic (Sternberg, 1997, p. 92), smart dialogue can add much to the appeal of a screenplay. Some genres are particularly reliant on the quality and quantity of dialogue. Similarly, dialogue can characterise a screenwriter’s voice through the patterns in its tone, positioning and general interrelationship with other elements of the drama.

Dialogue allows the screenwriter to express a range of emotions, and to momentarily ‘live’ in the drama as they imagine their characters speaking. When so much
screenwriting practice involves planning and analysis, I find writing dialogue refreshing and freeing as I speak in new ways that are not my habit. I particularly enjoy writing carnivalesque characters (Robinson, 2011), who are playful and unconventional in their engagement with the world. For me, writing dialogue is a way to live the drama vicariously as I write. When these moments happen, the dialogue which results is often surprising and has an immediacy which feels to me like authenticity. Interestingly, in these moments I feel the dialogue reflects less of my own personality and more of the character I am creating as I write. It is this feeling which leads me to suggest that there are many parts of the mind at work in devising a dramatic script, and that parts of the unconscious – even shadow personalities – take part in the writing which creates screenwriter’s voice.

Amidst the dialogue, ‘mood’ cues can suggest how lines are delivered. Two common dialogue cues are voice over (V.O.) and off screen (O.S.), both of which show the screenwriter’s intended coverage of a scene. Removing the source of dialogue from the diegetic frame affects pace and rhythm, and can smooth transitions between shots and scenes during editing. These forms of dialogue are also used to introduce an unseen narrator, who prefaces a story, invites connection with the world or offers a thematic perspective (Batty & Waldeback, 2008, p. 158). Dis-embodied dialogue can also indicate apperception or metaphysical or supernatural intervention in the character’s mind. The use of voice-over can be assessed for its dramatic function through how it fits with the images presented and this can offer an understanding of how the voice impacts on the aesthetic whole. Other types of mood cues are directions for performance, which can be embedded within the scene text or dialogue to suggest the tone of delivery. Since intonation affects meaning, these are important ways that the voice directs the drama through specifying the intended tone and mood.

Music as cue to voice and national inflection

Musical and sound cues are not always considered the concern of the screenwriter, however, many of the functions they perform are integral to audiovisual storytelling. These include highlighting the drama, increasing tension, engaging the emotions of viewers, offering comment either through lyrics or effect, developing themes, creating bridges between scenes and smoothing emotional transitions. Screenwriters
can also incorporate ‘sonic flashbacks’ and ‘flash forwards’ into their dialogue or sound cues, as a further form of apperception in the mind of a character. The musical score is generally the decision of the director and producers. However, the screenwriter can write musical interludes into their scenes through diegetic elements (e.g. a radio playing, locations) and characters’ actions, and can cue music and sound effects through notes in the text.

Sound can act subtly, and yet can add strong effect, explaining Batty and Waldeback’s statement that it is related to our “unconscious” experiences of the cinema (2008, p. 157). Diegetic sound can assist in developing setting, theme, tone and mood. For example, dialogue can be ‘drowned out’ by other sounds; points of view and impressions can be emphasised by the use of sound, and sound can be distorted to create fear or suspense. Sounds comment and add irony or pathos, so it is unsurprising that particular genres use sound for particular effect (Batty & Waldeback, 2008, p. 158). There are common conventions around sound, such as a ‘ticking clock’ to signal time running out, or the blast of an ocean liner or train to signal an arrival or departure. Sound can fix the national inflection of scenes through references to ethnicity and culture achieved through musical ‘riffs’ interwoven in the musical soundtrack, through vocal style and choice of instruments (for example, a sitar to suggest ‘India’). In all cases the introduction of music and sound effects can have a strong effect on the viewer’s experience through rhythm, melody, tone and mood (Bordwell & Thompson, 2004, p. 356), and these are expressions of the voice of the screenwriter.

There is much to consider when using language to characterise a screenwriter’s voice, since language embraces both the words used and the ways in which ideas are expressed, and it also invites interrogation of what is expressed. Fundamentally, language is the form of the screenplay, and to the extent that the screenwriter ‘directs the film’ through their language, it also reflects the screenwriter’s aesthetic and technical conception of the intended film (Sternberg, 1997). As Sternberg notes, it is “the individualism of the author” which is inscribed in the screenplay text (1997, p. 84), and may be interpreted through any or all of the areas described above.

The way that a screenwriter imagines and describes a screen story using linguistic
style, images and sounds can be an important way of understanding and characterising the voice. Within the language, the screenplay can embody literary awareness and qualities: competence; poetic aptitude; attitudes; worldview; and assumptions about readers and audiences. The description of images show not only visual imagination, but can show specific idiosyncrasies of characterisation, performance, sense of visual style, rhythm and pace, tone and mood in the voice. As demonstrated, screenwriters can use the scene and setting in ways which extend the principles of mind-reading into areas of visual literacy. Readers may discern cues to a national-cultural context behind the drama, and infer a deliberate or taken-for-granted (unconscious) national inflection in a voice. Readers however, should remain alert to the fact that the national context of the drama is not always aligned with the inflection in the voice, and expectations created through the reader’s association of the screen storyworld with a real-world cultural group may not be fulfilled in ways which the reader feels is realistic to their own understandings and beliefs about the culture/nation portrayed.

Dialogue, sound and music cues add to the rich experience of the drama, even when only imagined through reading. Screenwriter’s voice can display characteristics in sound design through what is said where dialogue is used, and how the spoken words play with or against the images. Other sound cues enrich the drama through tone and mood, and can assist in the development of themes, attitudes and worldview through the emotive power of sound. Competence in use of sound can suggest a more general competence and familiarity with screen stories and the potentials of film as a medium. A consideration of the sound cues can add a broader understanding of screenwriter’s voice in any screenplay. In my own case, my experience as a sound recordist and editor (see Appendix A) has directly influenced my concern to cue sounds in the screen story, making sound a more obvious feature of my own writer’s voice. As with all craft areas, the features of the writing which are outstanding in language, images and sound may be found in other screenplays by the same writer, identifying the range of the screenwriter’s voice, a general national inflection, or an overall level of competence.

Tone and Mood

Language, images and sound as placed in the framework are areas which relate to
the screen story as a description of a film. The headings tone, content and mood offer opportunities for the reader to define in greater detail the array of smaller, yet significant elements which interact with the formal craft areas and reflect the more idiosyncratic aspects of voice.

Tone refers to the psycho-emotional *ambience* of a screenplay; what Dancyger and Rush call ‘atmosphere’ (2007, pp. 291-292). It is often described in terms of the overall placement of a screenplay across the spectrum from realism to fantasy, and is also spoken of in relation to the depth of feeling engendered through the screenplay’s subject matter, leading to descriptions ranging from ‘light’ (cheerful, comic) to ‘heavy’ (dark, depressing) (Dancyger & Rush, 2007, p. 31). ‘Tone’ therefore, is central to the literary style of the story as a whole and also carries visual impact through its association with the *look* and *feel* of the intended film.

Mood is a consequence of tone, and again, refers to the affective power of the text. However, mood tends to be described in terms of emotions, and therefore offers more nuanced descriptions of the drama at any point. Because ambience is often described using ‘mood’ terms, tone and mood are often confused or conflated. The terms ‘look’ and ‘feel’ are also used when talking about mood. In any screen story, other aspects such as the language used, images and sounds described, all contribute to the strongest impressions of tone and mood.

The effect of tone and mood

Tone and mood are closely related to the affective power of a fictional work. Tone is a critical factor in establishing the ground covered by a screen story (Dancyger & Rush, 2007, p. 289) because it sets parameters for the sorts of interpretations which are possible in the world of the screen story (for example, is it funny or serious?) (Dancyger & Rush, 2007, p. 310). To be intelligible, all stories must have tonal consistency (Dancyger & Rush, 2007, p. 31) or risk losing credibility in the reader’s mind. When the tone remains reliable, readers are more likely to believe in the story, to become involved with the characters and to remain stimulated and engaged (Dancyger & Rush, 2007, p. 289).
Tone and mood are both created through the choices of genre, character, events and narrative structure (Dancyger & Rush, 2007, p. 289) and are reinforced through the language, images and sounds. Though diegetic elements set the tone and mood broadly, it is the cumulative effect of all story elements working together, which lead to the necessary suspension of disbelief which enables immersion in the storyworld. Tone and mood are evidenced through response in the reader, making it possible to conceive of the voice ‘acting on’ the reader, as Goodman proposes writers ‘act on’ characters (2010, p. 168). Focusing on the fine details and impressions tone and mood leave gives a deeper insight into the values and worldview which are inherent in the screenplay, and can add to the understanding of voice.

Characterising the voice through tone and mood

One of the ways to assess tone is to interrogate the prose and dialogue, noting the specific use of words and phrases which reflect levels of realism, emotions, humour or depth. Mood has a different relationship to screenwriting through its relationship with the emotional flow of a screenplay. As an emotional response, mood is less of the mind than of the body, and semiotic elements described in the text can strongly evoke moods, as was shown in the example of the two sentences.

Indications of colour, lighting, sets and dressings can carry mood, and therefore can be a defining feature of a story’s or a genre’s unique stylistic qualities. The choices the screenwriter makes which create tone and mood not only create voice, but are strongly associated with the emotional impact of the screen story. In addition, mood also has consequences for structuring screen stories, because while the screenwriter orders information to make a story intelligible, they must also move the reader smoothly from one ‘mood’ moment to the next (Batty & Waldeback, 2008, p. 135).

There is much to note in the ways tone and mood characterise screenwriter’s voice. The tone illustrates emotional depth and level of realism. Whether the dialogue is witty, pithy, or at cross-purposes will have implications for tone. The scene text illuminates other aspects of tone through the amount and type of action and events, the nature of the relationships and interactions, and the nature of the storyworld which is depicted. The spatial relations between characters and the spaces they inhabit; the use made of objects, colours, textures, light and shadow and their
symbolic or thematic resonance; the mise-en-scene; and ways actions are staged, all have a bearing on whether the mood is dark or carefree, intense or shallow, deeply meaningful or light and playful. Cumulatively, these elements will define aspects of the tone and mood within screenwriter’s voice, and support the overall effect and credibility of the story. Because tone and mood are about emotion, the voice uncovered through this type of interrogation can suggest elements of a personality, leading readers to assume knowledge of the writer. However as a streamlined version of the writer (Phelan, 2005, p. 45), voice need not be reflective of the writer as they are in life at all.

Content

Content is, quite literally, all ideas and signifiers which make up the screenplay text. This includes its conceptual and dramatic design, its linguistic expression, and everything which is expressed about the lives and worlds represented by the story and text. It includes person, place, events and objects, as well as gestures, behaviours, actions, pace, rhythm and mise-en-scene, whether implied or explicit or a natural effect of the writing style. Content involving everyday life situates characters within socio-economic, political, religious, historical and cultural milieux. Readers understand stories according to their personal knowledge and experience. For this reason, readers can assume a national context for each story—whether intended by the writer or not—regardless of whether the story is realistic or completely fantastical.

While I have stated that everything is content, content is more than these elements, because content creates meaning. In Abrams’ definition of voice, he notes the role of a “determinate intelligence and moral sensibility” (1993, p. 156) in fixing authorial presence. In this he implies the connection between ideas, design and purpose linked to a real person communicating with readers (Rabinowitz, 2010, pp. 355-356). Meaning signals the presence of the screenwriter through the design the writer imposes through ideas and elements of content.

Five areas of content

Content is a sprawling concept, so as mentioned, I focus it through five conceptual
areas which are at play when readers ‘read’ voice. These five areas are: moral and emotional content; philosophical /ideological frame; creative and imaginative ideas; craft competence; and sense of humour.

Booth associated ‘moral and emotional content’ with the action, and suffering of the characters (1983, p. 73) which is created by the writer in composing the text, and felt by the reader who responds to the text. Goodman proposes that when writers ‘act on’ characters they also affect the readers who engage with those characters (2010, p. 168). Moral and emotional content includes the values, attitudes and mores which are evident in the storyworld. How the characters behave, what behaviour is considered normal or reasonable, and the outcome for characters are all moral and emotional content which can affect the reader. The values displayed add to the sense the reader gathers about who or what voice is speaking to them. Moral and emotional content can dove-tail with the reader’s personal concerns and philosophies, leading to a sense of community with the writer, or conversely, repulsion when the ideas and philosophies expressed are in opposition to the reader’s own ideas/philosophies.

The idea of a philosophical or ideological frame which defines the storyworld references the ways that stories are mostly grounded in something which is already known. We have access to a wealth of stories, folktales, legends and other narratives and we use these to make up new stories. Philosophical/ ideological frames are common, taken-for-granted sets of ideas, values and attitudes which form the foundational social (and subsequently, material) frameworks for the storyworlds we create which ‘house’ new stories. This notion is particularly important because it points out what is assumed in the world of ideas which are formed around values, and which are naturalised through their portrayal in screen stories. And yet these ideas (values and philosophies) are not universal, but are subtly or manifestly different across different cultural/national groups (Cattrysse, 2017 p. 2).

Arguably one of the most common examples of a philosophical / ideological frame which grounds storyworlds (and forms the basis of many commercial mainstream Hollywood pictures) is the image or myth of a certain type of ‘nationhood’ which is based on the way things are in the United States. With this comes a set of behaviours.
and ‘norms’ which are based on values which are portrayed as ‘natural’ to society in
general. In turn these are based on discourses of capitalism, democracy, social
welfare, public and private infrastructure, and heterosexual and gender normativity. I
draw attention to these discursive or ideological frames because the stories these
underpin locate their readers within a hierarchy of socio-historical and cultural
constructs which powerfully value (and devalue) subjects and objects – including
their readers - in certain ways. Most often these values and attitudes are not
questioned because of their fictional status. Nevertheless they function to normalise
such hierarchies, values and attitudes, through their iteration and acceptance in the
public sphere and can influence and affect readers. The choice of a philosophical/
ideological frame may in some cases be an index of national inflection in voice.

Philosophical/ideological frame need not be described and understood in a
sophisticated way. Many successful screenplays are based on fairytales (for example,
Pretty Woman (1990) is based loosely on Cinderella). This may not be the result of a
conscious philosophical or ideological choice as much as it is a practical decision.
Fairytales are easy to come by, are generally understood across a range of cultures,
and present ready-made characters and dramatic situations which can be creatively
re-invented without re-inventing the wheel. The impact of the naturalisation of
philosophies and ideologies is difficult to quantify, and yet, I argue, can be powerful.
Clarissa Pinkola Estes demonstrates the power of stories to deliver philosophical /
ideological messages to the psyche through fairytales in her book Women who run
with the wolves (1992). Choices of genre are inherently ‘philosophical/ideological’
because genres are founded on value-systems which are presumed to be widely
accepted, understood and shared (Chandler, 1997; Coogan, 2003; Grant, 1986;
Malphurs, 2008; Tudor, 1986). Therefore genre is ideology in action, and as such
constitutes a philosophical/ ideological choice. Because many genres are also
associated with specific nations or national-cultural traditions, there may be an
association between national inflection in a voice and the philosophical / ideological
frame of a screen story.

There are two good reasons to become alert to philosophical/ideological frames. The
first is as a way of acknowledging the cultural origins of voice, which can be displayed
in the value systems underlying a story. These can have significant consequences in
story terms. Secondly, this taken-for-grantedness or normalisation of worlds or behaviours has powerful effects. When screenwriters develop story and consciously or unconsciously anticipate their audience, they make many assumptions about what is normal, what is acceptable, and what is desirable (Chandler, 1997; McKee, 1999; Tudor, 1986). Over an extended period the naturalisation of specific worldviews within a population can effect cultural change for better or worse. It is not possible to write without embedding assumptions and values, philosophies and ideologies. However, it is wise to recognise that stories may attract or repel audiences based on these frames. Stories can also be more interesting when these assumptions are challenged.

Identifying philosophical or ideological frames aids in interrogating voice because these frames are founded on core beliefs and ideas which situate the story within human history, culture and ethnicity. By recognising what is taken for granted as normal, acceptable and desirable in a screen story, philosophical / ideological frame can offer an insight into screenwriter’s voice.

The final three areas in which content can be interrogated are creative and imaginative ideas; craft competency; and sense of humour displayed. These types of content share a relationship to voice in that each engenders a response in the reader (admiration, respect, pleasure or more negative feelings) which work directly on the reader’s emotions (Batty & Waldeback, 2008, pp. 149-150), making them ‘open’ to experiencing the voice. As in the case of bonding (Booth, 2005, p. 76), these responses can have the effect of creating loyalty to the writer in the reader.

Creative and imaginative ideas and craft competency both elicit responses such as admiration and respect for the writer through pleasurable sensations created in the reader (Aristotle, 1998; Batty & Waldeback, 2008; Schreiber, 2003) when storytelling is competent and stimulating. Ingenuity, cleverness, and competency impress the reader based on their own recognition of these as much as through recognition of the writer’s talent. This exemplifies Donald’s (2001) concept of “one human mind being aware of other minds, and noticing that these minds are also aware of other minds” (cited in Luce-Kapler et al., 2011, p. 164).
In the case of craft competency, beautiful language, images and stories that move us engage readers strongly, and readers can feel admiration for the writer or privilege to share such experiences. Booth speaks of ‘liking,’ ‘admiring’ and ‘loving’ authors because of their work (2005, pp. 76-82). Craft competence also allows readers to suspend their disbelief in the reality of the fiction without experiencing anxiety or frustration that their expectations will not be met.

Sense of humour induces the pleasure of comedy, and through a mind recognising another mind (Donald, 2001, cited in Luce-Kapler et al, 2011, p. 164), gives a strong sense of a personality behind the voice. Humour suggests a mind which intuits something about the reader, and this both surprises and pleases the reader, who responds by feeling that they are being more personally addressed (Schreiber, 2003, pp. 32-33). The reader also experiences an emotional release, catharsis, (Batty & Waldeback, p. 150) through laughter, joy and surprise which is delivered through the pleasurable experience of comedy (Schreiber, 2003, pp. 32-33).

The three areas creative and imaginative ideas, craft competency, and sense of humour, are each based on valuing skill, ideas and imagination, and are also based on the pleasure a reader receives from apprehending good writing. The five areas of content I have described are conceptual, and each has the potential to affect a reader viscerally as well as emotionally and mentally. All content is stimulus. The process of identifying voice in these five areas requires the reader to pay particular attention to responses felt within the body and cues identified through the analytical work of the mind. Cues to moral and emotional content, philosophical / ideological frame, creative and imaginative ideas, craft competency and sense of humour are especially personal, and can be found in any aspect of the screenplay text, and amongst any of the elements described. Therefore, observing these is not limited to important story details, overall significance or even strong dramatic impact. Subtle markers can also carry the sense of the screenwriter for any reader. It is in their responses to writing that the impression of voice may be experienced strongly by readers. The basis upon which voice (and its national inflection) is perceived is always personal.
Summary of Part IV

In this Part I began by explaining elements of practice, and how these led to the specific choices made in the writing of *Calico Dreams* which created its voice. I explained how these choices reflected a “streamlined version” (Phelan, 2005, p. 45) of my own ideas, values and knowledge which are based in a particular personhood. This led into the description of the conceptual framework for screenwriter’s voice. I presented the flow diagram representing voice, and discussed each of its levels beginning with the formal craft conventions in screenwriting, the language images and sounds which relate to the intended medium – film – and finally I discussed tone, mood and content, through which the nuanced voice (Rush & Baughman, 1997, p. 28) shapes the screen story to a high degree to produce its meaning. I argued throughout for the ways in which the voice can be discerned and described through reference to these aspects of craft and the ideas and preferences shown in the voice of any screenplay. In the next Part, V, I present *Calico Dreams*. I then apply the framework just described to this screenplay, and through analysis, demonstrate why I describe its voice as female and Australian.
PART V - Screenwriter’s Voice in Calico Dreams

Introduction to Part V

Part V introduces the screenplay, Calico Dreams, which is a research outcome and demonstrates voice in screenwriting. The screenplay is prefaced by a one sentence synopsis and a paragraph synopsis, and is then reproduced in its entirety. The screenplay text is later discussed, as I use the framework as a guide to locate instances where the voice can be described as female, and Australian.
Synopses

One Line Synopsis
Kalgoorlie, Western Australia 1906
Caroline Frank, a naïve and sheltered country girl, is forced to grow up fast when her first job is with a vicious Madame who plans to sell her into prostitution.

Paragraph Synopsis
Kalgoorlie, Western Australia 1906
When Caroline Frank (16) arrives in Kalgoorlie to take up her first job as a housemaid she is distressed to discover it is in a brothel. Persuaded to stay, she works as a housemaid and it is discovered she is a talented pianist. The Madame arranges an audition at the prompting of the lawyer, Wallace, at which he attempts to rape Caroline. Caroline escapes, and is now convinced that she must leave the brothel. However, when she discovers that her work mate, Louisa (12) is to be sent to Wallace in her place, Caroline must face the biggest challenge of her young life: to rescue Louisa from the fate Caroline herself has so recently escaped.
Calico Dreams

Written by
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An original work
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Title: Kalgoorlie, 1906

The cross, welded neatly above the huge galvanised iron water tank which has recently been put to use as a church seems to mock its new purpose. Still, stragglers - mostly working men - approach, then duck 'round the back. A small handwritten banner proclaims "Labour meeting 10am."

2. EXT. CHURCH BACKYARD - DAY
A melee of men in all styles and manner of dress close around the two-up circle as the call goes up. A well-dressed man of business, NEIL WALLACE (38) squats close to a rough-looking hand, JEM HANCOCK (34).

BERT V.O.
Come on men, place your bets. This could be your lucky day!

The coins spin and roll to come into sharp focus against the dirt, one showing its red cross. A sea of cries, both sorrowful and joyful rise up.

NATHAN HONEYCOMBE (28), kneeling at the forefront of the game in a coat which has seen better days, curses.

NATHAN
(Heavy cockney)
Damn an' blast it!

He glances at Wallace's watch and stands, but Jem confronts him. Leaning in to Nathan's ear, his comments - only partially audible in the din - are unwelcome. Wallace can't help but overhear. He becomes interested.
JEM
Honeycombe, heard you got a new job at Dream's. You can pay me back now you're flush.

NATHAN
Someone's pulling your leg.

Nathan pushes Jem away, but GAVIN (40) has heard too.

GAVIN
Dream's? The brothel? Illegal isn't it - a bloke in there? Bet there's some perks though.

Gavin smirks. Nathan looks Gavin firmly in the face.

NATHAN
Not my type. Now I gotta be somewhere.

Nathan would push his way out, but Jem blocks him.

JEM
That's not what I heard.. what about your sister?

Livid, Nathan grabs his collar. Their faces almost touch as Nathan's words spit like venom.

NATHAN
You leave her out of it.

The Keeper's voice rings out above the crowd. Sounds from the game pursue Nathan derisively. Neil Wallace watches closely as he leaves.
3. EXT. RAILWAY STATION - DAY
Steam is released from the engine in a deafening hiss as CAROLINE FRANK (16) steps down from the railway carriage and turns wide-eyed to face her future. Like a pox on the land, the litter of industry confronts her: gigantic headframes standing straight and phallic; gaping hell-holes which swallow all. Slag heaps dwarf the men who swarm like ants with picks and shovels and wheelbarrows amongst the tents no longer white, but swollen red with dust. This is Kalgoorlie. She gingerly steps down onto the street.

4. INT. EMPORIUM - DAY
Caroline enters an emporium, and has to stop at the door while her eyes adjust. OLD RILEY (68) looks up with an encouraging smile.

    OLD RILEY
    Can I help you, Young Miss?

    CAROLINE
    Can you direct me to Madame Dream's please?

Old Riley looks at her in disbelief. She holds out a letter.

    CAROLINE (CONT’D)
    I have a post - as a housemaid.

Old Riley is perplexed.

    OLD RILEY
    Housemaid?

    CAROLINE
    Please Sir, it's my first job. I’ll be late.
Caroline begins to open the letter. He shakes his head.

OLD RILEY
That's alright, Miss.

Taking her arm, he draws her to the window and points.

OLD RILEY CONT'D
Turn right .. then left, and straight on..

Caroline looks anxiously at his hand still on her arm.

CAROLINE
I have to go.

Old Riley lets go in embarrassment. Caroline hurries out.

5. EXT. HANNAN STREET - DAY
DANCE NUMBER #1

Caroline's way is blocked by a large crowd, who are watching a can-can display by LISETTE FLOREINNE(18). Lisette brings a man into the space, and with an impressive high kick knocks his hat from his head. The crowd cheers. Lisette bows and cheekily flicks her skirt, to lewd comments from some of the men. Caroline turns her face away in shock. Lisette chooses a YOUNG MAN.

At this moment four slovenly-dressed women round the corner and push their way through, throwing insults at Lisette. Caroline is engulfed by them.
VERONICA
You, French slut! This is our beat.
Ya got no rights 'ere. Push off.

LISETTE
(French accent)
You gonna make me? (to man) 'Ey you! 'Old up your 'at.

The young man backs away as the other women step forward.

LISETTE (CONT’D)
Coward.. Pah!

She spits at his feet. VERONICA lunges but Lisette dodges. Caroline is pushed to the ground as a brawl breaks out. The women pull at Lisette's hair and skirts, while she fends them off with her kicks.

A policeman bends to his partner.

MCDougall
(Scottish accent)
We'd better take her in - for her own good.

The two POLICEMEN, MCDougall and CROSSWATER jostle forward and pull the other women off Lisette, who resists their interference. The other women watch.

MCDougall
Ach,.. Lisette, ya turnin' inta a nuisance. (to Veronica) And you lasses go home. Or else!

In the midst of the scuffle McDougall offers Caroline his hand, but she scrambles to her feet and runs away.
6. INT. PRINCESS HOTEL, PRIVATE SITTING ROOM - DAY
SIR RICHARD GLOSSUP (42) reads the T'Othersider newspaper when MADAME DREAM (48) opens the door boldly, enters quickly, and seats herself opposite him.

GLOSSUP
Madame, I'm expecting someone for a private [meeting]...

MADAME
Sir Richard Glossup. I've been wanting to meet you.

Sir Richard is taken aback.

GLOSSUP
Why would a meeting with me have any consequence for you?

MADAME
You are planning to set up a Club for Gentlemen. You may need help.

GLOSSUP
Excuse me..

MADAME
If you plan to offer intimate services, I am willing to supply girls of a higher calibre..

GLOSSUP
You presume too much!

Glossup grabs for the bell to call the staff.
MADAME
There is a penalty, of course. A man cannot be associated with that type of business.

Sir Richard grabs its metal tongue, silencing it.

GLOSSUP
Are you threatening me?

MADAME
Merely an observation... A partnership, where your identity would be protected... could be to both (our advantages.)

GLOSSUP
I don't need your protection!

MADAME
Oh, but you do. Think on it. I have a fine girl arriving, and am able to secure others. I think you'll approve.

Glossup stands aggressively.

GLOSSUP
I suggest you leave before my solicitor arrives!

With as much dignity as she can muster, Madame Dream stands and leaves.

7. INT. PRINCESS HOTEL FOYER - DAY
As Madame Dream leaves the solicitor Neil Wallace pushes past her. She turns back angrily and recognises him. She starts to think.
8. EXT. CHURCH - DAY
Men pour out of the church building, among them Neil Wallace, who catches up to Jem Hancock and Gavin Ryan.

WALLACE
Hey, Hancock.. I’ve got a proposition for you.

Jem stops. Gavin and others continue on.

JEM
What sorta proposition?

WALLACE
I am interested in that man you were talking to.. Honeycombe.

JEM
What’s ‘e to you?

WALLACE
You said he was working in a brothel?

JEM
What if ‘e is?

WALLACE
Find out what you can. (Jem hesitates, Wallace brings out leather pouch) I’ll make it worth your while.

9. EXT. BROTHEL - DAY
Checking the house number again, Caroline surveys the galvanised iron building with its row not of doors, but of gates, each one puzzlingly close to its neighbour. She moves uncertainly towards a central entrance, but Nathan grabs her wrist
before she can knock. He freezes for a brief moment when he sees her face, but then continues.

NATHAN
What're you doing?

CAROLINE
I'm expected.

Caroline holds out the letter. Nathan pokes her in the shoulder.

NATHAN
I met you at the station, remember.

He takes her roughly down a side lane.

10. INT. BROTHEL KITCHEN - DAY
Madeleine (28) sits at the table, which is spread with cold foods. LOUISA (12) is carving cold corned beef, singing as she works, when Francine (23) and MARGUERITE (18) enter wearing petticoats only - unusual daywear.

FRANCINE
Give us a break, Louisa!

Louisa scowls, but stops her song. Francine grabs the newspaper and rifles through it. Marguerite sits and helps herself to the food.

FRANCINE (CONT’D)
Look. They're screening 'The Prince of Love' tonight!

MARGUERITE
Bugger! I can't take another night off.
FRANCINE
I'm gonna go! Haven't had a night off since..

LOUISA
(excitedly) Can I come?

FRANCINE
Not likely.

LOUISA
Pleeeaaase.

Just then, Nathan pushes Caroline forward into the room. Caroline, extremely uncomfortable, remains standing dumbly holding her bag while Nathan makes himself at home, grabbing a scrap of meat from Louisa's plate. She slaps his hand away and notices Caroline.

LOUISA (CONT’D)
You the new girl? Just come in from the bush? .. Bet you'd like to come to the pictures, wouldn't ya?

Francine and Marguerite look at Caroline, who is panicked. Francine rises and circles Caroline.

FRANCINE (SIMULT.)
How old are you then?

MARGUERITE(SIMULT.)
What's your name?

CAROLINE
Caroline.. Er .. sixteen.
FRANCINE
Sweet sixteen.. and never been to the big bad city, eh? Alright. You can come.

LOUISA
Not without me! It's my job to look after 'er.

FRANCINE
Alright. But I'm not lookin' after you! Have you finished cuttin' that meat?

LOUISA
(to Caroline) We'll have to sneak out.

FRANCINE
Shut it!

Louisa places the meat on the table, and looks at Caroline.

LOUISA
You can sit down.

Madeleine looks to Louisa..

MADELEINE
She may want to put her things away, Louisa.

LOUISA
Oh.. right.

Louisa wipes her hands on her pinafore and leads Caroline out. The women look at each other, saying nothing. Nathan helps himself to more food.
NATHAN
Ripe as a peach, green as they come.
What’s she doin’ here?

FRANCINE
That’s what I’d like to know. Looks a bit too squeaky clean for my liking.
Hey, maybe I can loosen her up at the picture show tonight.

She smiles conspiratorially, though the others don’t share her sense of fun.

11. INT. CORRIDOR / LOUISA’S ROOM - DAY
The door opens on a very plain room with two beds in it, one in disarray.

LOUISA
You share with me. You wanna unpack?

Caroline looks at the tatty furniture, a small bedside cupboard between two single beds and the small wardrobe.

Caroline hesitates, then opens her bag on the bed. Louisa looks at the contents with curiosity. Caroline takes a framed photo out first and puts it on the bedside cupboard.

LOUISA (CONT’D)
Is that your lover?

CAROLINE
No! That's my father.

LOUISA
He's a bit of a looker!
CAROLINE
No he isn't... was... He's...

LOUISA
Why're you here then?

CAROLINE
He's dead. (looks away)

LOUISA
Oh,... sorry. (awkward) Anyway, you won't have time to mope here. Too much to do.

Caroline unpacks. Louisa notices her sheet music.

LOUISA (CONT'D)
Can you play the piano?

Caroline reaches for her music possessively as Louisa does the same. Several sheets fall and Caroline lunges to rescue them.

LOUISA (CONT'D)
We've got one. Dunno why. No one here can play. Only the men.

CAROLINE
Men?

LOUISA
Yeah. Johns... er (guarded)... I mean, guests.

CAROLINE
The ladies have gentlemen visitors?
LOUISA
Ladies! (Guffaw)

Louisa looks at Caroline's serious expression.

LOUISA CONT'D
(empressed) Yeah. Sort of. Oh
gawd.. Aah, we better go. Madame
doesn't like us bein' in the rooms.

Louisa exits. Caroline quickly follows.

12. INT. CORRIDOR / KITCHEN - DAY
Madeleine is leaving the kitchen when Caroline and
Louisa are entering. Louisa pulls at Madeleine’s
arm with a nod towards Caroline.

LOUISA
(whispers) She thinks it's a 'ladies
boarding house' or somethin'.

Madeleine bursts out laughing.

LOUISA (CONT’D)
It's not funny!

13. INT. KITCHEN - DAY
Louisa and Caroline help themselves to some food.
Nathan leans against the bench, eating while
surreptitiously watching Caroline intently. Madame
Dream enters and looks at Caroline.

MADAME
Ah.. You’ve arrived. I see you’ve
met Louisa.

Caroline stands quickly. The Madame appraises her,
then holds up a letter accusingly.
MADAME (CONT’D)
Did you write this?

CAROLINE
(frightened) Yes.

MADAME
You have a very nice hand.

CAROLINE
(relieved) Thank you, Miss.

MADAME
You’ll call me Madame.

CAROLINE
Sorry Miss.. er Madame.

MADAME
Nervous. Good. Now, Louisa will show you the ropes. We’ll talk later.

Caroline, unsure, curtseys awkwardly. The Madame laughs humourlessly.

MADAME (CONT’D)
That won't help you here.

She moves towards the door.

MADAME (CONT’D)
Honeycombe, (pointed) when you’ve finished eating,.. I want to see you.

She leaves.
14. INT. MADAME'S OFFICE - DAY
Madame Dream is seated. Nathan stands.

MADAME
I want to know Richard Glossup's plans. Ask around.

NATHAN
It'll cost you.

The Madame looks up sharply.

MADAME
This is outrageous! I already pay you too much for too little!

NATHAN
You're asking me to ask questions for you. There's a risk... so there's a price.

MADAME
I've never heard anything more preposterous!

NATHAN
 Either cough up, or do it yourself.

MADAME
You'll burn in hell before I pay you another tuppence.

NATHAN
I'll be off then.

Nathan leaves quickly.
15. INT. DRESSMAKER'S SHOP - DAY

SFX Bell rings

Madame Dream pushes open the door and enters. The shop is crowded with costumes: dresses of all eras; hats of every description; boas, and gloves all cohabit the small space. She pushes through these to the large table where ISABELLA CONCETTA (54) flings out fine fabric and skilfully cuts it into perfect shapes to the fine grinding sound of the heavy dressmaker's scissors.

Isabella barely looks up, but does speak.

ISABELLA

Pietta! .. Sangria.

A petite girl PIETTA (14) appears with a ceramic jug and goblet. She hands the goblet to Madame Dream and fills it, then disappears again. The Madame gulps the lot. The women exchange a look.

ISABELLA (CONT’D)

Trouble?

The Madame doesn't answer, but flicks desultorily through a newspaper, then fingers the bright cloth Isabella is cutting. She looks at the partially complete garments and the colourful material draped about.

MADAME

You're making tutus!

ISABELLA

The French girls are having a soiree. Do any of your girls play the piano? They desperately need someone.
MADAME
No ..(mutters) I wouldn’t give her the time off anyway.

ISABELLA
They need some recreation, Magdelena.

Madame Dream exhales and sits heavily, dissatisfied.

MADAME
(exhale) Do you know if any premises have been let recently?

ISABELLA
I don't know of any. Maybe.. At the Block? What are you up to?

The Madame stands, ill-tempered.

MADAME
Do you have a dress: pretty, showing cleavage, with the impression of modesty?

ISABELLA
(raises an eyebrow) I presume it's not for you.

MADAME
I'm in no mood for jokes, Isabella.

Isabella leads through to an inner room. The Madame follows.
16. EXT/INT. SOLICITOR'S OFFICE - DAY

Madame Dream stands in front of a small brass plaque which reads 'Neil Wallace Solicitor'. She enters. Wallace looks up from his desk.

WALLACE
Ah, hello Madame. I didn't think I had any [appointments]...

Madame Dream steps forward.

MADAME
Mr Wallace, Magdelena De Vos. .. (pause) .. Known to you as Madame Dream.

WALLACE
(embarrassed) Madame, I don't recall..

MADAME
No, but one of my girls does. She came off second best.

Wallace stands defensively.

WALLACE
What are you doing here? I can call the police.

MADAME
I don't think that's wise. There were witnesses.

Wallace looks ropable.
MADAME (CONT’D)
But that’s not why I’m here. This morning I made a quite reasonable proposition to a client of yours.

WALLACE
Glossup? You were soliciting. No court in the world would find otherwise.

MADAME
I would like you to take a look at the girl.

WALLACE
Sir Richard Glossup is NOT interested.

MADAME
But you will be. She’s beautiful, young, a virgin..

Wallace comes around to the front of his desk.

WALLACE
Are you offering her to me?

MADAME
Certainly not! I simply want you to convey her advantages to Sir Richard..

Wallace grabs her arm aggressively.

WALLACE
Don’t play games with me.

MADAME
She is not for hire. She is for sale.
WALLACE
Shall I quote you on that?

Angry and panicked, the Madame moves to go.

MADAME
I am not here to be toyed with. It is a legitimate business proposition. If Sir Richard would like to discuss matters, he should contact me.

Madame Dream puts her business card down and leaves quickly.

Wallace paces in agitation.

17. INT. LAUNDRY - DAY
A copper is boiling in one corner, and there is a wicker basket of grubby-looking linen at its base. Caroline hauls sheets into the water under Louisa's supervision.

CAROLINE
Where do all these sheets come from?

Louisa looks at her strangely.

LOUISA
Use your imagination!

Louisa leaves.

Nathan leans against the doorframe. Caroline turns and jumps in fright.
NATHAN
Aren't you a jumpy one.

Caroline ignores him and keeps on working. Louisa barges through with another overloaded washing basket.

LOUISA
Outta the way, you. There's nothing to see here.

Nathan leaves.

CAROLINE
I don't like him. Why is he here?

LOUISA
Madame keeps him for.. well, ta keep trouble out.

CAROLINE
Trouble!?

LOUISA
Put it this way. He protects us.

Louisa turns and leaves. Caroline is worried.

18. EXT. BACK YARD / BACK LANE - DAY
Caroline is hanging sheets on the rickety line when she hears footsteps. A soft-ish object smashing against the back fence, which rocks violently. Caroline stops, alarmed.

JEM V.O.
Honeycombe.. It’s true then. So when do I get my go?
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NATHAN V.O.
I told you, I’m here to keep filth like you out!

There are choking sounds. A soft, heavy object hits the fence again. There is a heavy grunt. Footsteps retreat down the lane. Terrified, Caroline flees inside.

19. INT. SOLICITOR’S OFFICE - DAY
Neil Wallace is seated at his desk when Jem enters. He’s recently been in a fight. Wallace sits back.

JEM
It’s true.

WALLACE
Let me guess... Madame Dream’s?

20. INT. PHOTOGRAPHIC STUDIO OFFICE - DAY
A rosy-cheeked PHILLIP WEMYOUTH (33) opens the door and steps back to let Lisette enter the comfortable room.

PHILLIP
May I help you?

LISETTE
(French accent)
Phillip Weymouth? I have a business proposition.

PHILLIP
Well, you’d better sit.

They sit. Lisette hands over a set of cards. Phillip fans through them.
LISETTE
Have you seen postcards such as these?

PHILLIP
They're just playing cards.

LISETTE
No silly. The back.

Lisette grabs them and fans them to display semi-naked women in cheeky poses. Phillip is taken aback.

LISETTE (CONT’D)
I want to make some of these... With me in them.

21. INT. PHOTOGRAPHIC STUDIO - DAY
Phillip enters a giant space, whose roof and one wall is glass windows. Scattered comfortably are sets and furniture: a stern business desk and mantelpiece; a ladies’ sitting room settee, with painted conservatory background etc. Lisette follows.

LISETTE
(Gasp) This is beautiful!

Lisette moves behind an ornate Chinese screen and discovers a dressing area. She opens the screen out, revealing a small chaise longue and dressing table draped with boas, silken robes, scarves and other feminine accessories.

PHILLIP
Yes, it is rather an impressive space. It just doesn't get as much use as it should.
LISETTE
It would be perfect for re'earsals!

22. EXT. MINING OPERATIONS - DUSK
Hard metal struts and conveyors fall away giving a clear view of the vicinity: the sparks and fumes of the furnace chimneys spew angrily against the darkening sky.

23. EXT. BACK LANE - NIGHT
Louisa's head appears unexpectedly through a loose flap of galvanised iron in the fence. She nimbly skips out. Caroline follows with more difficulty. They run off down the lane.

24. EXT. BACK LANE/ROOFTOP/PICTURE GARDENS - NIGHT
In a darkened lane Louisa pauses, climbs some fire stairs, and jumps across a small gap onto the roof opposite. Caroline, startled, follows.

CAROLINE
What are you doing!?

LOUISA
Ssshhh! (points)

Caroline gasps. Below them is a lawned courtyard, the pink and white striped awning of the refreshments stand, and rows of seats which face an empty wall. The audience shifts in animated conversation.

LOUISA (CONT’D)
Great, isn't it! We could've come in the front.. but I love this view. Pull up a pew.
Caroline barely takes her eyes off the scene as she lowers herself onto the roof. The projector whirs, the lights click off, the music swells and the 'Prince of Love' appears on the wall.

Caroline gasps. Louisa watches her, her face shining with pleasure.

LOUISA (CONT’D)
Magic, isn't it?

25. EXT. BROTHEL - NIGHT
Policemen Crosswater and McDougall push through the waiting men as they approach the double doors, Crosswater using his cap like a shield against them.

MCDougall
.. Magdelena De Vos.. runs a tight ship.
We don't have any trouble with her.

Crosswater's expression suggests that he does.

MCDougall (CONT’D)
Jesus! You've gotta get over this obsessive.. Christianity.

They enter.

26. INT. ANTECHAMBER / FRONT CORRIDOR - NIGHT
KELLY leads a grubby-looking miner away as McDougall and Crosswater enter. Madame Dream's lips tighten, and she grabs the arm of a passing prostitute, JANICE (32).

MADAME
(hiss) Make sure the new girl is locked in her room!
Janice slips out through the velvet curtain behind the counter. Madame Dream turns to the policemen.

**MCDougall**

My favourite Dream! Thought I'd introduce our new man. Jesus, this is Madame Dream, the owner.

**Crosswater**

(for McDougall's benefit) Reginald, Constable Reginald Crosswater.

The Madame extends her hand but Crosswater nods curtly.

**Madame**

I see Constable.. Jesus.

**MCDougall**

Need to check your books Magdelena. I saw a new girl in town today.

McDougall watches closely. The Madame's face reflects professional cool.

**Madame**

Nothing’s changed, Inspector.

**MCDougall**

Of course not. Still, we have to treat everyone the same.

The Madame slaps a ledger on the counter between them.

**Madame**

(impatient) Take a look.
McDougall flicks through the pages quickly. Then closes the book and pushes it back.

**MCDOUGALL**

All seems in order.

**MADAME**

If there's nothing else..

McDougall doffs his hat and leaves with Crosswater, who ducks around a girl as if she had rabies.

Janice, who has been hiding behind the velvet curtain comes forward.

**JANICE**

She ain't there, Madame.

The Madame reacts violently.

**MADAME**

What do you mean, she isn't there!?

**JANICE**

They're not there. Neither of 'em.

**MADAME**

Where's Honeycombe!?

**JANICE**

I don't know Madame, .. haven't seen him.

Janice scurries away, leaving the Madame furious.

27. **EXT. BACK LANE - NIGHT**

Caroline and Louisa chat as they wander home.
LOUISA
Wasn't it great, when he kissed her. I thought he'd never get 'round to it!.. You ever been kissed like that?

CAROLINE
(Shocked) No!

LOUISA
What a boring life!

CAROLINE
It was just my dad and I.

The girls are joined by a throng of men and women also wending their way home. Francine comes up quietly behind them.

FRANCINE
Boo!

Caroline jumps in fright. Louisa berates Francine roundly.

LOUISA
That's not funny! Ya coulda gived her a heart attack! And me.

Laughing, Francine leaves.

LOUISA CONT'D
That Francine. Why is she always so mean?

They walk on in silence, till they arrive at their back fence. Louisa ducks to enter through the
flap, but instead of opening easily it remains shut, and Louisa's head rams full into it. She recoils, groaning.

LOUISA
Francine!

Louisa pushes harder against the flap, which won't budge.

CAROLINE
(panicked) What's wrong?

LOUISA
She's put a damn slab there. We gotta go 'round the front. .. Prepare yourself.

Louisa turns down the back lane. Caroline follows.

28. EXT. BACK LANE/STREET/BROTHEL - NIGHT
Caroline follows behind while Louisa explains their mission. She is in no way prepared for what she finally sees.

LOUISA
We gotta try 'n sneak in without being seen. That's the main doors. We gotta get through there without being seen.. an' we'll be home and hosed.

They arrive on the street.
The scene is as dazzling as a Christmas display, with flashing lights proclaiming "Madame Dream's House of Love." Grubby miners and slick young 'men-about-town' mingle eagerly in the street, jostling, joking, and peering down the stalls when a gate opens.
Caroline stares. Janice, Marguerite and other girls are sitting, barely clad, and doing suggestive movements or engaging in banter. When a man enters a stall, the gate closes behind him. Caroline reacts in horror when she sees Madeleine emerge from behind a curtain to take up her seat. With their focus fixed on the house, a man approaches from behind and speaks into Caroline's ear. She screams, falls forward into the street, and flees.

Louisa turns on the man.

    LOUISA (CONT’D)
    Scrawny! Now you've done it. Can you get Nathan out here.. quick!

SCRAWNY nods and enters the double doors.

29. EXT. STREETS - NIGHT
Caroline bursts onto another street and is confronted with rowdy men spilling out of the hotels. A swaggering group roils towards her. One man raises a bottle at her.

    DRUNKEN MAN
    Hey little lady! You up for a night of it?

He manically rubs the notes he holds aloft together. Caroline sees the emporium, and runs towards it. She hammers on the door, but inside it is dark and empty of life.

With her back to the door, she looks up the street and sees the station platform from which she so recently alighted. She runs.

30. EXT. RAILWAY STATION - NIGHT
Caroline runs up the steps to the platform. It is deserted. The single light bulb creates more shadows than it banishes. She disturbs a couple
who suddenly break from the shadows only a metre from her. In fear she screams, and runs.

31. INT. HOTEL - NIGHT
Nathan Honeycombe, with facial bruises, downs a whisky, stands, and moves slowly towards the door.

32. EXT. STREETS / LANE - NIGHT
Walking quickly, Caroline skirts the hotels and businesses along the main street.
She ducks across the road to a back lane.
She steps into it confidently, but as she moves forward its darkness enfolds her. Panicked she pushes at where the flap should be, but nothing gives way. Her breathing is shallow, but stops completely when she sees the silhouette of a man on the street looking her way. She freezes.

NATHAN
What're you doing out?

He walks towards her. She remains frozen as he grabs her arm.

NATHAN (CONT’D)
That's not the place. Let's go back, shall we?

Caroline doesn't resist as he pulls her onto the street.

33. INT. BACK YARD - NIGHT
Louisa and Madeleine are in the yard when Caroline almost falls through the fence flap. Louisa runs forward to greet her. Nathan steps in and walks through into the building.

LOUISA
Gawd you gave us a fright! What would she have said if I'd lost you on ya first night!?
CAROLINE
(to Madeleine) I'm just a housemaid. I took a position as a housemaid.

MADELEINE
(Shrugs) 'Course.

Madeleine returns inside. Louisa turns to follow, and looks back when Caroline isn't behind her.

CAROLINE
What will happen to me?

LOUISA
I dunno. But you don't wanna sleep out here, do you?

Louisa continues inside. Caroline hesitates, then follows.

34. INT. ANTECHAMBER / FRONT CORRIDOR - NIGHT
Nathan steps quickly into the antechamber. Madame Dream's anger is ignited when she sees him.

MADAME
Where have you been!

NATHAN
Takin' care of business.

He turns away nonchalantly. The Madame is outraged.

MADAME
HONEYCOMBE!.. Louisa and the new girl are missing. [Find them!]
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NATHAN
They're back.

MADAME
What?

He turns back slowly.

NATHAN
I just delivered 'em back.

The Madame is at a loss for words, but Nathan's self-satisfaction ignites her vitriole.

MADAME
While you were.. elsewhere .. the police visited.

NATHAN
Lucky I made myself scarce then.

Nathan matches her glare for glare.

MADAME
You ..(stops herself) The police have noted the girl's arrival. I told you to avoid the streets.

Nathan shuffles slightly.

NATHAN
It’s not my fault she arrived in broad daylight. Is that all .. Madame?
MADAME
Go home, Honeycombe. In that state you're bad for business.

NATHAN
You promised me work!

He steps forward confrontationally, but so does the Madame.

He leaves quickly through the curtain.

35. INT. LOUISA'S ROOM - NIGHT
Moonlight streams in on Louisa, who is sprawled messily across her bed, and Caroline, who has the covers pulled up around her chin. Night noises penetrate the room. Caroline's voice seems small as she asks.

CAROLINE
Louisa, are you going to be .. one of them?

LOUISA
No way! I'm gonna be a singing barmaid. They make a packet!

CAROLINE
But what if she.. forces you.

LOUISA
Don't be stupid. No one can force you. .. Unless you let them.

CAROLINE
You don't understand anything!
36. EXT. STREET - NIGHT

Nathan stands on the street outside the Federation Hotel. He pulls a coin from his pocket and looks at it.

Suddenly Jem exits the Federation. He is drunk, and leers close to Nathan.

JEM
I was coming to see you at work.

NATHAN
I told you, I don’t work there!

JEM
Wallace wants to see you, tomorrow morning. He’s interested in your employment situation.

NATHAN
Has ‘e got work?

JEM
(leers forward) You’ll have to go an’ find out.

NATHAN
Get outta my way.

Nathan pushes him away, but Jem returns and grabs him.

JEM
You’re just like your father. Wanna keep ‘em all to yourself. Turned your sister into a whore.
At the sound of the word 'sister' Nathan turns and runs straight for Jem. In a fit of pure rage, he smashes him with the most vicious blows, until men spill out of the pub to hold him back. Through gritted and bloody teeth, Jem whispers..

JEM (CONT’D)
I’ll fix you, Honeycombe.

37. INT. TENT - NIGHT
With a kerosene lamp in hand, Nathan stumbles in to his tent. Putting it down, he bends over the washbasin and throws water onto his face. Reflected back from a small mirror, his face is bruised and swollen.

He looks up, and he sees the torn photo standing on the simple wooden box-shelf. It shows him as a boy, surrounded by several sisters. His eldest sister reaches out to hold his hand, while a huge, dark-coated arm possesses her from the other side. Though only represented by this, his father’s presence still dominates them all.

Despite the fact that her face is careworn and wan, this sister’s likeness to Caroline is noticeable.

38. EXT. LANDSCAPE - DAWN
The soft hues of sunrise slowly reveal the awesome beauty of the timeless landscape: red dirt and stunted bushes lead to ghostly white wandoos which protectively surround ancient rocky escarpments.

But as we draw away from this peace, the silhouetted headframes, conveyors and sheds become a dark blemish on the pristine land.

The noise of machinery, whistles, and scurrying men bring us back to the bustling heart of Kalgoorlie, where gold is the lifeblood.
Going beyond the noise of its industrial heart to the residences we come close on a chicken in a coop, scratching the dirt in an endless search for sustenance.

39. INT. LOUISA'S ROOM - DAY
Louisa stands over Caroline.

    LOUISA
    Come on, Lazybones. Fire won't light itself.

Caroline stirs and groans.

40. EXT. BACK YARD - DAY
A box of groceries pushes through the fence followed by a small boy. TEDDY (8) knocks on the back door. It is opened by Kelly.

    TEDDY
    Here's your groceries.

He hands it to her.

    KELLY
    Thanks Teddy.

She turns to go.

    TEDDY
    Ya want any stockin's or som'in'?

    KELLY
    No thanks Teddy.

    TEDDY
    Boss says I gotta ask.
Teddy runs to the fence flap and disappears.

41. INT. MADAME'S OFFICE - DAY
The Madame is seated behind her desk. Louisa and Caroline enter, sullen. Caroline curtseys. Louisa looks askance.

MADAME
Where were you last night?

LOUISA
We went to the picture show,.. with Francine.

MADAME
I didn't tell you you could go out! You’re docked a week's wages.

LOUISA
That's not fair!

The Madame's glare silences her.

MADAME
You can go. And don't let me catch you out again without my leave.

Louisa leaves. Caroline is nervous.

MADAME(CONT’D)
And you.. I never expected such stupidity from you. Didn't your father teach you anything!?

CAROLINE
(defiant) He taught me everything .. Madame.
MADAME
Well he’s dead, isn’t he. I am your guardian now. I insist that you remain inside the yard at all times.

Caroline looks at her feet, unhappy.

MADAME (CONT’D)
Now. In your letter you said you were good at figures.

CAROLINE
Yes. (hesitates) And .. in your letter you said this was a ladies’ boarding house.

The Madame smothers her anger to look at Caroline shrewdly.

MADAME
It's true, I misled you. But think of it from my point of view. Poor Louisa needs help, and no respectable family will willingly let their daughter work here.

Caroline isn't sure how to react. The Madame takes control.

MADAME (CONT’D)
Good. Now copy these down (thrusts paper and pencil at her). .. Two and six for train fare, three shillings per week for board and lodging.. You can enter four weeks worth.. seven pence for ..

CAROLINE
What’s this?
MADAME
This is the amount you owe me.

CAROLINE
But.. you said..

MADAME
I am not a charity. When you are sufficiently skilled I will pay you a full wage. Until then, you will receive your food and lodging, but I expect you to repay the debt over time. Now, get back to work.

Caroline is flushed with anger.

42. INT. PARLOUR - DAY
Caroline enters the parlour and throws her dusting rag onto the floor. She hesitates when she sees the piano then comes over and puts her hands in position on the keys. She begins to play a fiery, angry tune, pouring her feelings into the music.

She jumps when the Madame storms in through the door.

MADAME
What are you doing!?

Caroline looks up, fearful.

MADAME (CONT’D)
You didn’t tell me you could play.

Caroline looks at her angrily.

MADAME (CONT’D)
Show me. (Caroline is frozen) .. Well, go on.
Unhappily, Caroline continues. The Madame listens for several minutes, then speaks.

MADAME (CONT’D)

Enough! I am going out. You are staying in to do your work. This room needs dusting.

She walks out.

43. INT. CORRIDOR / MADAME'S OFFICE - DAY

(INTERCUT)

Louisa enters through the back door. Looking down both corridors she prepares to call out. The Madame suddenly appears in her doorway.

LOUISA (SIMULTANEously)

CARoline..!(voice becoming small)

MADAME (SIMULT.)

Caroline is otherwise occupied. But since you are idle, you can clean my office. I'm going out. . . And Louisa, not a paper out of place when I return.

Madame Dream moves towards the front door. Louisa's shoulders slump as she turns to the office. She pulls a dusting rag out of her pinafore pocket.

44. INT. PRINCESS HOTEL, PRIVATE SITTING ROOM - DAY

Neil Wallace relaxes with a newspaper and coffee when Nathan Honeycombe stands at the door. Wallace looks up.

WALLACE

I'm glad you came.
NATHAN
I got work to do so make it brief.

WALLACE
Yes, I’m aware of your employment. Which makes you the perfect man for the job.

NATHAN
What job?

WALLACE
Your Madame is trading in young girls. The question is, are you involved?

Nathan is visibly outraged.

NATHAN
You filthy..! .. I’d rather..

WALLACE
I want you to find out what you can.

NATHAN
Why?

Wallace bursts from his seat and strides up to Nathan to speak directly into his face.

WALLACE
You’ll do it because I say!

Nathan pushes his shoulders away and laughs derisively.

NATHAN
I’m not doin’ it for love.
You're a private school pansy playing a man's game. (moves closer) No one can beat me harder than my ol' man did. And I didn't let him break me, see. You ain't got a chance.

He turns and walks towards the door.

WALLACE
You're in debt. I'll get that insect off your back.

Nathan turns slowly back into the room.

NATHAN
Why're you doin' this?

WALLACE
That's my business.

45. EXT. BACK LANE/BACK YARD - DAY
Nathan enters the back yard.

46. INT. CORRIDOR/MADAME'S OFFICE - DAY
Nathan looks into the Madame's office. Seeing no-one, he looks through the papers on the desk, until Louisa stands from behind the furniture, holding a dustpan and brush, surprising him.

NATHAN
She not 'ere then? So tell me,. Why's she got this new girl, eh?

LOUISA
How would I know?

NATHAN
Maybe you've 'eard something.
LOUISA  
Now listen you..  

Louisa turns, and tips the dustpan, knocking labelled boxes of letters off the shelf.  

LOUISA (CONT’D)  
Hell and damnation! Nathan! Come back!  

Nathan takes the opportunity to leave.  

47. INT. KITCHEN - DAY  
Nathan is helping himself to some food when Francine enters the kitchen in her dressing gown.  

NATHAN  
Ah,.. The lovely Francine.  

FRANCINE  
Don’t be funny.  

NATHAN  
So what do you know about the new girl?  

FRANCINE  
Nothin’. Why are you interested all of a sudden?  

NATHAN  
Where did she come from?  

FRANCINE  
I don’t know.
NATHAN
Didn’t you talk to her last night?

FRANCINE
(crinkles nose in distaste) Why would I?

NATHAN
(shrugs) I ‘eard some rumours she’s meant for a different sort of john.. From the up side o’ town. Jus’ wondering what’s goin’ on.

FRANCINE
Goin’ for the ‘oytie-toyties? With ‘er? I’ll rip her bloody...

Nathan grabs her arm before Francine can leave.

NATHAN
We won’t upset the apple cart until we know ‘er plans, will we?

FRANCINE
(suspicious) What are you up to?

NATHAN
None o’ your business. But when you find out anything, you tell me.

Piano playing is heard from the parlour. Surprised, both hurry to the parlour door.

48. INT. PARLOUR - DAY
Caroline is playing the same angry piece, thumping on the keys with energy. Nathan and Francine enter from the kitchen at the same time as Louisa enters from the corridor. They watch and listen, impressed, until Caroline stops and looks up at them.
LOUISA
That was brilliant! How’d you learn that?

Francine comes forward and leans over the piano.

FRANCINE
Don’t get above yourself. You’re just a housemaid, remember.

She turns and leaves quickly. Nathan leaves more slowly.

LOUISA
Can you give me lessons?

CAROLINE
Has she gone?

LOUISA
Yeah.

CAROLINE
I’m going out.

Louisa looks horrified.

LOUISA
Going out?

CAROLINE
Just for a little while. I’ll be back well before she comes back.
LOUISA
She’ll kill you! .. She’ll kill me.

CAROLINE
Look, next time she goes out, I’ll give you a lesson, okay?

Louisa looks very unhappy.

CAROLINE (CONT’D)
You agree?

Louisa nods, turns and leaves the room.

49. INT. DRESSMAKER’S SHOP - DAY
SFX Shop bell rings

The bell rings as Madame Dream pushes into the shop past the mess of costumes and accessories to find Isabella at her table. Pietta appears at the curtain.

ISABELLA
It’s early for you. Coffee?

The Madame nods, and thrusts a piece of paper at Isabella.

MADAME
Here are the measurements.. I had to guess.

Isabella takes them and nods.

MADAME (CONT’D)
Oh, and I may have found a pianist. What are they paying?
ISABELLA

They don’t have any money.

The Madame is disgusted.

50. EXT. STREET - DAY
Caroline emerges into the street from a back lane. She crosses quickly to the police station.

51. INT. POLICE STATION - DAY
Caroline enters and approaches the counter. A slovenly CONSTABLE, RYAN (38) sees her, but shuffles paper around his desk without purpose before he stands, stretches and approaches.

At another desk a CONSTABLE, JAMISON (22) is diligently writing in a ledger.

RYAN
Can I help you?

CAROLINE
Yes. I’d like to report a crime.

RYAN
Oh?

CAROLINE
Yes, ah .. Kidnapping.

RYAN
Serious. And who has been kidnapped?

CAROLINE
Me.
RYAN
(looks back at Jamison) Novel.

CAROLINE
Not.. not kidnapped exactly..

RYAN
So you weren’t kidnapped.

The Constable looks at her sternly.

CAROLINE
(Nervous) No.. well I took this job, and now..

RYAN
There’s a mighty big difference between taking a job and being kidnapped.

CAROLINE
Well I agreed to be a housemaid..

RYAN
And are you a housemaid?

CAROLINE
Yes, but she..

RYAN
And do they beat you?

CAROLINE
No.
RYAN
Starve you?

CAROLINE
No.

RYAN
Well what's your problem?

CAROLINE
She runs a .. well, a ..

RYAN
Listen girly, I've heard enough. Now you're clearly not a victim of kidnapping, so be off with ya.

At the door Caroline turns back to speak, but the Constable cuts in.

RYAN (CONT’D)
Wasting police time and resources is a serious offence.

Caroline leaves.

52. EXT. STREET / BACK LANE - DAY
As he crosses the road towards the police station, McDougall catches sight of Caroline hurrying away. He begins to run.

Hearing footsteps behind her, Caroline turns into the nearest lane. McDougall runs faster. She hides behind a woodpile.

MCDougall
Hey, missy!
A different GIRL turns around, and McDougall careers into her. Grabbing her shoulders to steady them both, he cranes past her, looking for Caroline. Pausing at the entrance to the back lane, he continues to run along the street.

Caroline emerges warily and runs in the opposite direction.

53. EXT. WAREHOUSE - DAY
Nathan paces erratically in the empty street as sounds from the two-up game leak from the building. He jiggles something in his coat pocket, turns away, then turns towards the entrance, agitated. When Jem appears and strides towards the entrance, he turns away.

54. INT. FEDERATION HOTEL - DAY
Nathan is sitting alone at the bar.

    WALLACE
    Not at the two-up game?

    NATHAN
    I've given up.

    WALLACE
    Or taken up another vice. 
    (indicates whisky glass) Another one?

Nathan hesitates, then nods.

    WALLACE (CONT'D)
    Found out anything?

    NATHAN
    Nup.
WALLACE
You haven't been trying.

In one explosive movement Nathan pushes the bar stool back ready to walk out.

NATHAN
Look. She’s young, she’s ‘ere, she plays the pianer..

WALLACE
Calm down. It’s just helpful to know what’s going on. Sit down.

The barman puts his second drink on the bar. Looking at it, Nathan sits.

WALLACE (CONT’D)
(Thoughtful) Does she play well?

55. INT. CORRIDOR / MADAME'S OFFICE - DAY
Madame Dream's sharp footsteps signal her return. In a panic Louisa stuffs papers randomly into the alphabetised boxes, until the Madame stands over her. Louisa stands guiltily.

MADAME
What are you doing!?

Louisa doesn't quite meet her eyes.

LOUISA
(mumbles) They fell.

MADAME
You useless girl! Can't I trust you to..
Kelly comes into the corridor.

KELLY
Madame,.. You got a visitor.

The Madame turns in anger.

MADAME
Tell them to wait!

KELLY
(whispers) It’s the cops.

56. INT. ANTECHAMBER / FRONT CORRIDOR - DAY
McDougall stands outside the front doors, while Janice stands in the corridor, keeping the door partially closed. Madame Dream sweeps through the curtain.

MADAME
You can go Janice. (pause)
Inspector McDougall, what can I do for you?

Janice retreats down the corridor. Francine's head withdraws into her room, though her door doesn't shut completely.

MCDougALL
Come on Magdelena. I saw that girl on the street. I think she's here.

MADAME
I would have thought if she is on the street, she clearly isn't here.
MCDougall

Why don't you let me in? We can settle this without any fuss.

Madame

Inspector we both know the law. If you have grounds you can apply for a warrant.

MCDougall

The police force tolerates your business, even has regulations to protect it for the good of you women. But there are limits...

Madame

(cuts him off) Yes, I know Inspector. And you are trying to cross them. I don't have to let you in unless you have a warrant. Produce one, or leave us alone.

MCDougall

I'll be back.

He leaves, angry.

57. EXT. BACK YARD - DAY

Breathing hard, Caroline falls forward into the yard. Once recovered, she retrieves her pinafore from behind the wood pile and enters the laundry where Louisa is working.

58. INT. LAUNDRY - DAY

Louisa, in the midst of washing, turns around when Caroline enters.

Louisa

You! 'Bout time. Madame's back.
Caroline finishes tying her pinafore, without saying anything.

LOUISA (CONT’D)
(frustrated) Well you can go and get the next basket from the front corridor then.

CAROLINE
(draws back) I'm not going there.

LOUISA
For God's sake! (points) Get those sheets started then.

Louisa marches out crossly. Caroline drags a sheet from the copper to the wringer and begins the laborious task of wringing it out.

59. INT. LAUNDRY - DAY
The Madame enters the laundry.

MADAME
What are you doing?

CAROLINE
The washing.

MADAME
I just had the police here, claiming they saw you on the street.

Caroline busies herself with the task at hand.
MADAME (CONT’D)

Well?

CAROLINE

What can I say, Madame? I’ve been here all the time.

The Madame glares, irresolute.

CAROLINE (CONT’D)

How could they know it was me?

Louisa returns with the basket of laundry and pushes in to the room. There is barely enough room for anyone to turn around.

MADAME

I’m just going Louisa. Will you get out of the way!

Louisa backs out, but smiles cheekily at Caroline when the Madame is gone.

60. INT. MADAME’S OFFICE / SITTING ROOM – DAY

Madame Dream is seated on her chaise longue when Wallace pushes through the door. The Madame looks up, alarmed.

MADAME

What the devil!

WALLACE

Rather more charming than him, I think.

He smiles sardonically.
WALLACE (CONT’D)
I’ve spoken with Sir Richard. He is undecided whether to charge you with soliciting.

The Madame gasps.

WALLACE (CONT’D)
However.. This girl.. If she is as refined as you describe, does she play?

MADAME
What?

WALLACE
He needs a pianist. Does she play?

MADAME
Yes.

WALLACE
Have her delivered to the Princess at 8 o’clock. He will hear her.

MADAME
We will [need to discuss..]

WALLACE
You won’t discuss anything. Sir Richard just wants to hear her.

MADAME
Are you taking her overnight?

WALLACE
Sir Richard has no intention of becoming involved with you in a sordid trade in young girls! But if you want to find her reasonable employment..
Wallace meets her straight, angry gaze.

WALLACE (CONT’D)
I understand your situation is .. somewhat compromised .. because of my professional involvement. Still, with a little trust, we may both get what we want. It’s your decision.. It’s the best way for him to see her.

MADAME
Eight o’clock it is.

The hint of a smile plays on Wallace’s lips as he strides out of the room.

61. INT. FRONT CORRIDOR - DAY
Wallace strides through the antechamber and out the front doors past Janice and Francine, who turn to watch as he passes.

JANICE
I recognise ‘im..

FRANCINE
Yeah, so do I.

62. INT. MADAME’S SITTING ROOM - DAY
Francine pushes through the door to stand over the Madame, who quickly stands herself.

FRANCINE
What’s ‘e doin’ ‘ere?

MADAME
I beg your pardon!
FRANCINE
I’ve seen ‘im before. He’s that lawyer. You gonna give her to ‘im?

MADAME
What are you talking about?

FRANCINE
Aren’t the likes of us good enough for ya?

MADAME
What?

FRANCINE
I heard you got plans for that prissy little slut. ‘E said you..

MADAME
Honeycombe?

FRANCINE
Er..

The Madame comes forward, and uses the full force of her authority to speak.

MADAME
If you breathe one word of this ridiculous story to anyone you’ll be out on the streets!

Francine backs away and leaves quickly.

63. INT. KITCHEN - DAY
Louisa and Caroline together sit at one end of the table, eating, while Janice, Kelly, and Francine help themselves to food and sit. Madeleine enters to join them.
JANICE
Madeleine,. You’d remember. Did you see that toff came in to see the Madame just then?

MADELEINE
Nuh..

JANICE
He’s the bloke who was involved in that punch-up.. You know, the one .. aaw.. ten or so years ago?

MADELEINE
How would I remember that?

JANICE
Yeah, he laid in ta Andrea..
You remember.. All that blood.

Louisa and Caroline have both stopped eating and are listening. Louisa’s eyes are round as tennis balls.

LOUISA
What happened?

JANICE
Well, she wouldn’t do what ‘e wanted, so he just ..

MADELEINE
(warning) Janice..

JANICE
He turned into a vampire, and bit her neck.., and when he came out o’ that
room, his fangs were drippin’ with blood. And he and the Madame just looked at each other... and laughed.

LOUISA
What happened to her?

JANICE
By the morning she had just disappeared. .. Some said she turned into a bat, and flew out the door. But I reckon she died, and turned into a ghost... And now whenever there’s a full moon, she walks the corridors, and bites anyone who isn’t in their beds.

Francine has moved to behind Louisa, and pinches her neck. Louisa screams and jumps in fright.

LOUISA
I hate you, Francine!

FRANCINE
So.. He’s back. I wonder who’ll be his next victim.. (leans in to Caroline)

MADELEINE
Don’t be stupid, Francine. She just fell and broke her leg... and she didn’t come back because she found a better job. She went to the Sisters of Mercy hospital, and they fixed her up.

FRANCINE
So what’s he doing back? Does he think we’ve forgotten, and he can try it again?

JANICE
Her name was Andrea.. Honeycombe.. wasn’t it?
MADELEINE
Nah, I don’t remember that. Anyway, the Madame sent him packing, told him never to come back.. So it can’t be him.

JANICE
He looked the same.

MADELEINE
Ten years on, you’re brain’s turned to sponge!

JANICE
I remember faces.

FRANCINE
Was her name really Honeycombe?

JANICE
Oh hell, I don’t know. Just thought it was a good story.

Janice gets back to eating, as do the others.

64. INT. MADAME’S OFFICE / CORRIDOR - DAY
Madame Dream is seated at her desk when Caroline passes the door. She calls to her.

MADAME
Caroline!

Caroline enters and curteys.

MADAME (CONT’D)
Tonight I want you to play in the parlour.
CAROLINE
In the parlour!

MADAME
Yes. You’ll play from nine.

CAROLINE
But I can’t play songs.

MADAME
Well, you can practise for an hour.
               Dismissed.

Caroline leaves quickly. The Madame rubs her forehead.

65. INT. PARLOUR - DAY (INTERCUT)
The parlour is dark and silent when Caroline enters. She gropes for a cord to the electric light without finding it. She shrinks from the touch of the velvet curtain and bumps against a side table with a lamp on it.

SFX Click

The parlour is suddenly illuminated with a sombre light.

She opens the piano. Carefully touching a key she begins to play a beautiful classical piece, staring at the velvet curtain while playing.

Having played the last chords, she creeps forward and disappears beyond the curtain.
66. INT. PHOTOGRAPHIC STUDIO - DAY (INTERCUT)
DANCE NUMBER #2

Lisette and three other women come into the studio. The youngest, JEANNE (17) is aghast at the glass ceiling, while ANNETTE (25) goes straight to the dressing area to rifle through the silks and furs. MIMI (22) stands with Lisette.

JEANNE
(French accent)
C'est magnifique, Lisette.. Maybe we can 'ave our soiree 'ere?

LISETTE
Maybe.. But for now we 'ave to move the furniture. .. Avec soin.

Mimi takes an industrial light by its post and wheels it to the wall. Jeanne and Annette remove the flat from behind a mayoral desk, leaving the heavy clerical furnishings in front of a bathroom frieze. The girls play around: their stretches on chairs, desks, with costumes,.. become a dance number as Mimi finds the gramophone and sets it playing. It merges with Caroline’s music. When the music is over, the space is clear for them to begin. Lisette claps her hands together.

LISETTE (CONT’D)
So.. what should we do?

67. INT. ANTECHAMBER / FRONT CORRIDOR - DAY

The dim light from the parlour shows a counter and stool. Beyond this a corridor runs the width of the house. Emboldened by its ordinariness, Caroline steps into the space. She tries a door handle. It is locked.

Further down the corridor a washing basket sits near a door which is ajar. She moves towards it.
68. INT. BEDROOM - DAY

Opening the door further, Caroline finds the electric light cord. A glaring bulb illuminates shabbiness: a double bed with sheets awry, a small cupboard, a rough crate as hanging space.

Carefully, Caroline opens the cupboard. An object clatters to the ground. Caroline starts. Her eyes are drawn to faded drawings on the wall.

She draws closer. They are of naked women. Still others show naked men. She looks with intense interest.

She notices the picture facing the bed. She moves to it. It is a scene from the Kamasutra: a man with a huge phallus is entering a willing woman. Caroline stares, horror and fascination mixed.

Nathan appears at the door. On seeing Caroline mixed emotions cross his face. He comes towards her silently. Taking a strand of her hair, he smells it. Caroline freezes in panic. His voice is hollow and hoarse when he finally speaks.

NATHAN

You’re so like my sister. Even smell like her.

Caroline turns in terror. Stifling her scream she pushes violently past him, and flees.

NATHAN (CONT’D)

Caroline!

Disturbed, Nathan turns to go, but picks up the fallen object, a wooden dildo. He looks at it for a moment before realization dawns and he drops it quickly.
NATHAN (CONT'D)
Filthy bastard!

He hurries out.

69. INT. POLICE STATION - DAY
Constable Jamison is eating a sandwich poring over the incidents register at his desk when McDougall enters.

MCDougall
(Scottish accent)
Has Marshall got that search warrant signed yet?

Jamison
Haven’t seen it. But I got a question.. That sheila who claimed she was kidnapped, is that an incident?

MCDougall
What ‘sheila'?

Jamison
She came in this morning.. ah .. Ryan saw her. And she said she was kidnapped. Loony! Standing there, right in front of us, saying she’d been kidnapped. Where do they get off?

MCDougall
What did she look like?

Jamison
Blond, older than a child but not a lady yet.

McDougall rolls his eyes.
MCDOUGALL
No. I mean did she look frightened, mis-treated?

JAMISON
Come to think of it, she did seem.. agitated.

MCDOUGALL
So where's the report.

JAMISON
Well, that's my point. No report. Ryan sent her away. So is it an incident or not?

MCDOUGALL
Heavens to Betsy! Where's Ryan?

70. EXT. TENT CITY, OUTSKIRTS - DUSK
It is sunset when a young Aboriginal woman waits on the edge of the tent city, close to a cool green glade. A young white man comes towards her and puts his arm around her possessively. Together they run down the small mound laughing.

71. INT. LOUISA'S ROOM - NIGHT
Caroline is in her work dress. She holds some music in her hand and paces in agitation. LOUISA enters.

LOUISA
Heard you've been invited into the parlour. Very posh.

The fear shows in Caroline's eyes.
LOUISA (CONT’D)
They won’t bite you. Barely anyone goes in there, anyway. Too busy elsewhere!

Louisa’s jest falls flat. Caroline moves to the door.

LOUISA (CONT’D)
You’re not going in that!

Caroline looks down at her dress.

CAROLINE
What’s wrong with it?

LOUISA
Caroline, it’s about having a good time. Them men just want a .. well, a little bit of homeliness. Pretty, you know...

Caroline looks at a loss. Louisa reaches to Caroline’s plain housemaid’s dress and unbuttons several buttons at the throat. She folds the cloth down into itself, creating a ‘V’ neck.

LOUISA (CONT’D)
There. Much prettier. Hmm, you just need some colour.

She reaches into her drawer and brings out some pink ribbon which has a small charm hanging on it. She ties it around Caroline’s neck.

LOUISA (CONT’D)
Only thing I’ve got of my mum.

CAROLINE
Where is she?
LOUISA
Oh.. She had to go to Paris, for dancing you know.

CAROLINE
Oh.

LOUISA
She’s making a packet so she can come back for me. .. There.

Louisa stands back to get a better view.

LOUISA (CONT’D)
You'll do.

CAROLINE
(unsure) Thanks.

Louisa smiles faintly in return.

LOUISA
Well, I'll just be here.

CAROLINE
Hmmm.

Caroline steels herself and exits.

72. INT. PARLOUR - NIGHT
Caroline opens the door from the kitchen and gingerly steps into the parlour, but no-one else is present. She relaxes a little, sits at the piano, and begins tentatively to play 'Greensleeves'.
Several bars later FLORENCE pushes through the velvet curtain with a man she calls CHARLIE. They both seem to have been drinking. Ignoring her, they plonk themselves heavily on the lounge.

Charlie brings out a hip flask, and they share it before Charlie lunges towards Florence’s ample bosom. Caroline picks up the pace and volume, to drown out the sound of their activities.

FLORENCE
Still sounds like a dirge! We want somethin’ lively!

Caroline grabs some music she finds on the piano and begins ‘The Camptown Races’. She winces at her own wrong notes, but Florence and Charlie are too pre-occupied with each other to notice.

A grubby miner pushes the curtain aside and peers in. He smiles at Caroline showing ghastly teeth. Caroline quickly looks down at the keys again.

ELLEN V.O.
Come on, Clive. Down the hall.

CLIVE is pulled out of sight and the curtain falls closed but is opened a second later. The Madame steps inside.

MADAME
Your job is to entertain. Sing!

A lanky man pushes through the curtain.

SCRANWNY
I’ll sort ‘er out, Missus.

MADAME
I wish you would!
The lean and leathery prospector strides past the Madame, pushing some coins into her hand.

**SCRAWNY**

Move over, girl. Scrawny's here to help.

Caroline only briefly looks aghast, before she is sharing her seat with Scrawny, and he is belting out a tune from a Gilbert and Sullivan operetta, accompanying himself quite proficiently. She joins in, tentative at first, but is soon enjoying herself.

They finish, quickly decide on a new tune, and begin that.

73. INT. PARLOUR - NIGHT

Caroline is playing, surrounded by a number of men and prostitutes, who are loudly if inexpertly singing accompaniment. Others fondle each other on the lounge. Nathan stands in the background, watching Caroline and the party. The tune comes to an end, and Scrawny pushes Caroline off the stool with jocular familiarity.

**SCRAWNY**

Enough of your showing off. My turn!

Various replies such as ‘not likely’, ‘not again!’ and ‘what about...’ go up amongst the crowd as Caroline stands and Scrawny takes over. She moves to the back to watch the scene. Jem pushes through the curtain. Seeing Caroline standing alone he moves towards her but an engaging-looking young man gets to her first.

**JOCK**

You play too well for this joint. Why don’t you pull up stumps and come to the city with me?

Caroline looks aghast.
CAROLINE

But I don’t know you!

JOCK

Don’t matter. (suggestive) I’d like to know you..

He puts his arm around her, but Caroline steps away, right in to Jem, who quickly puts his arm around her possessively.

JEM

That man troubling you, Sweetheart?

Jem looks to Nathan, turns her and pulls her onto the lounge, where he begins to fondle her.

CAROLINE

(loud) Let me go!

Nathan lunges across the room and punches at Jem, missing him. The guests part and scream. Jock pulls Caroline up and holds Jem’s arms while Nathan draws back ready to strike, but the Madame’s screech cuts across everything.

MADAME

Throw that and you’re out!

Nathan’s arm trembles with the effort of containing the blow as he lowers it. Caroline scuttles away from Jock and Jem, and Nathan faces the Madame.

NATHAN

I quit!

He walks out of the room.
The Madame looks insensed, but is quick to notice when Jem moves over to Caroline again.

MADAME
(loudly) She’s out of bounds.

Jem looks up angrily, and pushes past her roughly to leave through the curtain. The Madame withdraws.

Scrawny brings their attention back with a tune, and the party continues.

74. INT. FRONT CORRIDOR - NIGHT
As Nathan exits through the front corridor Francine sees him.

FRANCINE
Psst! (gestures)

NATHAN
Whadda you want?

FRANCINE
Heard a story today, ‘bout an Andrea Honeycombe. She related to you?

Nathan’s reaction is strong.

NATHAN
What did you hear?

FRANCINE
See me tomorra.

Nathan grabs her arm as she steps into the starting stall.
FRANCINE (CONT’D)
I gotta work now. See me tomarra!

He lets go and she closes the door on him. Nathan walks out.

75.  EXT. KALGOORLIE - DAWN
Early morning, and parishioners troop in to the church which was so recently a site for the two-up game. A small boy in knickerbockers scowls at the priest's greeting, and is hit on the head by his mother's hymn book while she apologises to the priest.

76.  INT. BACK LANE / BACK YARD - DAY
Teddy struggles to get a huge dress box through the fence.

77.  INT. CORRIDOR - DAY
Kelly holds the large box awkwardly while she navigates through the Madame’s office door. Francine appears from the parlour.

FRANCINE
What’s that?

KELLY
Looks like a fancy dress. .. And guess what? It’s frilly pink!

Francine and Kelly laugh hysterically.

FRANCINE
Let me have a look.

KELLY
Get out of it!
Kelly pulls it away abruptly and puts it on the Madame’s desk.

78. INT. PARLOUR - DAY

Caroline is picking up the few glasses and straightening the furniture when the Madame strides in.

MADAME

Caroline, you did well last night.

Caroline looks up in surprise.

MADAME (CONT’D)

Obviously your talent is wasted in the parlour. I’ve organised an audition for you.

CAROLINE

An audition!

MADAME

Yes. You’ll play for Sir Richard Glossup.

Caroline is shocked.

MADAME (CONT’D)

I’ve bought you a dress. It’ll come out of your wages, of course. It’s in your room. Let me know if it needs alteration.

The Madame strides to the door.

MADAME (CONT’D)

You can practise after lunch if you need to.
79. **INT. LOUISA’S ROOM - DAY**

Caroline opens the door cautiously and closes it firmly. On her bed is a large box. Opening it with reverence, she gasps when she sees the beautiful creation, with its petticoats and simple accessories.

She pulls it up and puts it to her body, then swirls around hugging it to her. She hurries to discard her old dress and merge into this one.

She grabs the small mirror on the cupboard and admires herself small sections at a time. She picks up her dad’s photo and kisses it.

**CAROLINE**

Thank you!! Thank you, thank you! Thank you for bringing me here!

80. **INT. LAUNDRY - DAY**

Caroline sighs deeply before she yanks another dirty sheet free from its basket. As she does so something falls to the floor. She retrieves it, and holds it up to the sunlight which streams through a crack in the imperfect wall. The gold nugget glitters.

She quickly pockets it, and shakes the next sheet out enthusiastically. She jumps guiltily when Francine appears at the door and enters.

**FRANCINE**

So, the little princess is getting her hands dirty with our sheets. You know what goes on in them beds.

Caroline is shocked.
FRANCINE (CONT’D)
Oh, but I forgot. You’re just sweet sixteen, never been..

Louisa interrupts.

LOUISA
Just you leave ‘er alone Francine. I’ve had enough of your bullying.

FRANCINE
Yeah, well.. Some of us ‘ave gotta work for a living. Not play make-believe ladies.

LOUISA
She’s not like that!

FRANCINE
You just see what happens..

LOUISA
Liar! Get out!

Louisa pushes the full basket she is holding at Francine, who trips and falls with the sheets to sit with her back against the wall.

FRANCINE
You know where your mother is? Whoring her way to hell!

Francine scurries out the door.

Caroline looks at Louisa, stunned.
LOUISA
Whadda you looking at?

Louisa turns away and sniffs loudly.

CAROLINE
Nothing, nothing. .. I’ll finish these.

Caroline bends to pick up the sheets. Louisa leaves quickly.

81. INT. KITCHEN - DAY
Francine, Janice and Madeleine are sitting down at the table, eating, while Caroline makes a plate of food up at the bench.

MADELEINE
Where’s Louisa?

CAROLINE
(embarrassed) Er.. She doesn’t feel well.

Caroline leaves with the plate. Madeleine looks at Francine.

FRANCINE
Why me!?

Nathan enters and looks around. Seeing Francine, he sits and helps himself to food.

MADELEINE
I thought you were fired?

NATHAN
And a good day to you too.
Caroline returns, and sits warily when she sees Nathan.

MADELEINE
So,.. Why’d you start a fight?

NATHAN
I didn’t start it. ’E was annoying Caroline!

JANICE
Is that true?

Caroline looks down at her plate.

CAROLINE
Yes.

JANICE
Well, she shouldn’t fire you for that!

NATHAN
I quit.

JANICE
Well, that’s a shame. I quite like havin’ a man around.. Livens up the ‘umble, ’ome scene.

NATHAN
I take that as a compliment.

JANICE
You better. You must get few enough with that ugly mug.
The women laugh. Francine clears her plate and leaves. Nathan stuffs the last piece of meat in his mouth and follows.

JANICE (CONT’D)
What’s goin’ on there?

MADELEINE
I don’t know.

They continue eating.

82. INT. CORRIDOR - DAY
Nathan follows Francine out of the back door.

83. EXT. BACK YARD - DAY
Francine soaks up the sun. Nathan joins her.

NATHAN
So what did you find out?

FRANCINE
Just that a girl called Andrea used to work here.. Oh.. A long time ago. You must’ve been in short pants then.

NATHAN
Well.. What ‘appened to ‘er?

FRANCINE
Janice reckons she was attacked. Blood everywhere.. And she left that night and never came back.

NATHAN
(disgusted) You must know more than that!
FRANCINE
Well I wasn’t working here then, was I!

NATHAN
What else did she say?

FRANCINE
Well, Madeleine seemed to think she only broke ‘er leg, and went to the Sisters of Mercy hospital. She reckons she got a plum job elsewhere and just never came back.

Nathan exhales as if he had been carrying a heavy burden.

FRANCINE (CONT’D)
(meaningfully) ‘Course, that’s not the reason most girls leave.

NATHAN
You mean she was up the duff?

FRANCINE
How old is Louisa?

Nathan looks at her sharply.

FRANCINE (CONT’D)
Anyway, the fellow who did it turned up yesterday. That lawyer bloke.. Wallace.

Nathan reacts strongly.

84. INT. MADAME’S OFFICE – DAY
The Madame is at her desk when Nathan appears at her door.
MADAME
You! I suppose you’ve come for your wages.

Nathan steps in.

NATHAN
No. I want my job back.

The Madame is surprised.

MADAME
I’m not sure I want you back, after all the trouble you cause.

NATHAN
Look, he’s a nasty piece of work.

MADAME
Spare me the litany! Alright. Be here at five to eight. You can escort Caroline to the Princess Hotel.

Nathan moves to speak but the Madame’s expression silences him.

NATHAN
(with difficulty) Yes Madame.

He turns and leaves.

85. INT. PARLOUR – DAY (INTERCUT)
Caroline plays a beautiful slow classical piece. She then bursts into a sophisticated dance tune. Both show high skill.
She returns to a hauntingly beautiful classical piece.

86. INT. PHOTOGRAPHIC STUDIO - DAY (INTERCUT)
(MUSIC: Caroline’s playing)

Lisette appears in front of Phillip in different outfits and poses. She gets very close to him and her flirting becomes personal. They kiss passionately and Phillip leaves the camera to join her on the floor. They make love.

87. INT. PARLOUR - DAY
(MUSIC: Caroline’s playing cont’d)

Caroline is playing when Nathan enters. She stops immediately. He slides onto the lounge.

NATHAN
Keep on.

Warily, Caroline resumes, but soon stops again.

CAROLINE
I would prefer to be alone.

Nathan remains still, looking intently at her with unfathomable eyes. Unnerved, Caroline begins to play again.

NATHAN
(hoarse) You play .. like an angel.

Caroline looks at him crossly.

CAROLINE
Would you mind. I can’t concentrate.
She plays again. Nathan slowly approaches her.

NATHAN
(hoarse) Get out, leave here. You’ll end up..

CAROLINE
I’ve got a very important audition.

NATHAN
Is that why she’s sending you ..?

CAROLINE
You’re always watching me. I wish you’d leave me alone!

NATHAN
You stupid girl! I’m trying to warn you.

CAROLINE
I’ve got an audition – possibly the most important in my life – and you tell me to leave?

NATHAN
Listen, I don’t know who’s playing what game. All I know is that it ain’t for your benefit!

CAROLINE
You can’t even save your own life. Leave off mine!

She rethinks.

CAROLINE (CONT’D)
(stops and turns) This may be my one chance to get out.
He puts his hand out to softly touch her face. She slaps it away and leaps up hurriedly to stand with her back to the door.

CAROLINE (CONT’D)
You vile man! Don’t ever touch me again.

NATHAN (SIMULT.)
(angry) You deserve what’s coming!

Caroline leaves.

88. INT. PHOTOGRAPHIC STUDIO - DUSK
Lisette kisses Phillip passionately, then rises.

LISETTE
I’ve got to go to work.

Phillip leans back on his arm, thoughtful.

89. EXT. PHOTOGRAPHIC STUDIO BUILDING - DUSK
As the sun sets we have a bird’s eye view of Lisette as she scampers back towards the red light streets.

90. INT. LOUISA’S ROOM - NIGHT
Caroline looks again at the nugget which she wraps tightly in paper. She turns guiltily when Louisa enters the room and pushes it into her petticoat pocket.

LOUISA
What’re you doing?

CAROLINE
I’ve got an audition.
LOUISA
(notices the box) What’s that!?

CAROLINE
(awkwardly) I've got to get
dressed. Do you mind?

LOUISA
I’ve seen you dress before!

Louisa watches as Caroline opens the box. Louisa
gasps.

LOUISA (CONT’D)
Gawd sakes, it's beautiful!

Caroline begins stroking its soft folds. Louisa
puts her hand out to do the same.

CAROLINE
DON'T! Are your hands clean?

Louisa automatically scrunches them on her calico
pinafore, then looks accusingly at Caroline.

LOUISA
Who just finished the washing up!

Caroline gathers up the petticoats.

CAROLINE
Er,. . would you mind helping me?

Louisa rolls her eyes. They are interrupted when
Madeleine enters.
MADELEINE
Madame told me to put some make-up on your face.

CAROLINE / LOUISA
(SIMULTANEOUS)
Make-up!

91. INT. CORRIDOR - NIGHT
The Madame pushes Louisa aside as she steps out from the parlour to look at Caroline. She hands her a cloak.

MADAME
Ah.. very nice. Now remember girl. Men don't require conversation. A smile conveys.. everything.

Nathan steps in behind the Madame. She turns.

MADAME(CONT’D)
(to Nathan) Ask for Sir Richard’s rooms. And wait. You may need to bring her home.

Caroline turns to go with Nathan at her heel. The Madame turns back to the parlour, and notices Francine watching from the parlour doorway. She glares and Francine withdraws.

92. EXT. STREET - NIGHT
Caroline and Nathan walk in an awkward silence. When Nathan takes her elbow to steer her across the road she avoids it. He exhales angrily. They walk on in sullen silence.

93. INT. PRINCESS HOTEL FOYER / SITTING ROOM - NIGHT
Wallace is sitting in a comfortable chair when Nathan knocks and opens the door. Caroline steps forward nervously. Nathan steps in possessively.
NATHAN
You! I’ve been looking for you!

Wallace steps forward to put his arm around Nathan’s shoulders and lead him out into the foyer.

WALLACE
You were dragging your heels, so I thought of a quicker way to get to talk to her.

NATHAN
She thinks she’s got an audition.

WALLACE
Of a sort.

Nathan grabs his lapels.

NATHAN
What happened to my sister?

WALLACE
What do you mean?

NATHAN
Tell me, or I’ll thump you.

Wallace stuffs a note into Nathan’s pocket. They both look to the sitting room door to see Caroline watching them. Wallace’s posture and tone changes for her benefit.
WALLACE
Listen man, why don’t you come to my office tomorrow, and we’ll discuss this?

NATHAN
I wanna know now!

WALLACE
Ten o’clock?

Nathan swings at Wallace as hotel staff come running at the raised voice. They grab Nathan as he punches. The blow glances off Wallace’s cheek. Nathan is grabbed and thrown onto the street.

94. EXT. STREET - NIGHT
Nathan calls in past the doorman..

NATHAN
Caroline!.. I’ll be here!

.. as the doorman pushes him away.

95. INT. PRINCESS HOTEL, BAR - NIGHT
Wallace leans over to grab the bottle of champagne the BARMAN has put onto the bar.

WALLACE
Bring an ice bucket and two glasses. .. Oh, and I don’t want to be disturbed.

The barman nods and Wallace exits.

96. INT. PRINCESS HOTEL SITTING ROOM - NIGHT
Wallace re-enters the room with the bottle of champagne which he presses to his cheek.
CAROLINE
Are you alright?

WALLACE
Yes, perfectly fine. Though he is rather a big brute.

CAROLINE
He scares me.

WALLACE
Yes, well I wouldn’t trust him as far as I could throw him. But to more pleasant things. Champagne?

CAROLINE
I don’t drink.

WALLACE
Oh, that can’t be true. Did you know, all the best performers have a small drink before they go on stage. It helps them relax.

CAROLINE
Oh... When am I to play?

WALLACE
All in good time.

He raises his glass at her.

97. INT. FRONT CORRIDOR / ANTECHAMBER - NIGHT
It is a busy Saturday night. When the Madame moves down the corridor to settle a dispute between Madeleine and a PUNTER, Francine slips out through the velvet curtain.
98. INT. LOUISA'S ROOM - NIGHT

Caroline's photo frame is open and Louisa is tracing the inscription in handwriting on the back of the photo. It reads 'Johannes Frank, Dec 1899' and 'With love to my daughter'. Francine bursts in and Louisa starts guiltily and hides the photo behind her back.

FRANCINE

What's she doin' with that new bitch?

LOUISA

How should I know?

FRANCINE

She's never sent girls out before. What's she doing!?

LOUISA

I don't know.

Francine leans behind her. Louisa holds the photo out of harm's way, but Francine snatches it.

LOUISA (CONT'D)

Don't hurt it!

Francine holds the photo with two hands, preparing to rip it.

FRANCINE

Tell me.

LOUISA

She's gone to play the pianer, for Sir Richard Glossup.

Francine looks disgusted.
FRANCINE
The planner!?

99. INT. PRINCESS HOTEL, BACK CORRIDOR – NIGHT

WALLACE
The stairs are this way.

Wallace guides a drunken Caroline towards the back door.

100. EXT. WALLACE'S BACK LANE - NIGHT
Wallace guides Caroline from the dark lane up some stairs lit by a bare bulb to a second floor flat. She is unsteady on her feet.

101. INT. WALLACE'S KITCHEN - NIGHT
Wallace opens the door and pushes Caroline forward. He turns on the light, closes and locks the door firmly.

CAROLINE
(weakly) You said we were going upstairs.

WALLACE
This is upstairs, isn’t it? Though I’m not sure you can play in that state. Here, let's loosen that clothing.

He comes towards her to unbutton her dress, but she jerks away.

CAROLINE
My audition!
WALLACE
You need to lie down.

He guides her into the sitting room.

102. INT. WALLACE'S SITTING ROOM - NIGHT (INTERCUT)
Caroline moves to sit on a chair but Wallace steers her to the lounge. When he pushes her to lie down, she resists and raises her body.

CAROLINE
Why have you brought me here?

WALLACE
How old are you?

CAROLINE
Sixteen.

WALLACE
(lustful) Sixteen. And how did you get caught up in this racket?

CAROLINE
I don't understand you.

Wallace leans forward and grabs her wrist to pull her towards him. She resists.

WALLACE
You are adorable.. But what to do with you.. (pause) Would you like a kiss?

With a quick tug, he brings her to her knees in front of him. He kisses her tenderly around the face. She just bears it.
WALLACE (CONT’D)
I can be tender, you know.

He peers down her bodice with avarice.

CAROLINE
This isn’t an audition.

WALLACE
Now that’s where you’re wrong.

CAROLINE
If you were any sort of gentleman
you'd take me home now!

WALLACE
Would I? What do you know of
gentlemen, I wonder? I think you
need some tuition.

Fear and horror wash over Caroline as Wallace
backs her towards the sideboard. He slides his
hands over her thighs and up towards her breasts.
He grabs her face and kisses her, pushing his
tongue into her mouth. Caroline's scream is
smothered. They struggle, but she succeeds in
turning away. He lets her face go but continues to
hold her tightly against him.

WALLACE (CONT’D)
It doesn't have to be like this
you know. Some women enjoy it.

He pulls her forcefully towards the couch, but
loses his grip and Caroline makes a dash for the
open window. She doesn't hesitate but throws
herself out of it, landing spread-eagled on the
galvanised iron roof of the verandah below.

Wallace rushes to the window.
Without looking back Caroline scurries towards the ridge of the gable, and disappears over it onto another part of the roof.

WALLACE (CONT’D)

Damn!

Wallace hits the window frame hard, then withdraws. Inside the room he forcefully closes the sash window, resting his head against it in unease.

103. INT. MADAME'S OFFICE / CORRIDOR - NIGHT
The Madame looks at the clock then stands at her office door. She glares when Janice falls out of the parlour door, laughing, and is grabbed by the large arms of a man.

MADAME

Have you seen Honeycombe?

JANICE

No.

The Madame returns to her office and resumes her task, counting money. Francine appears in her doorway.

FRANCINE

(drunk, accentuated cockney)

Why is she getting all the favours?

MADAME

To which 'she' do you refer?

FRANCINE

You’ve set 'er up with Sir Richard Glossup!
MADAME
That is none of your business!

Francine sways slightly.

FRANCINE
I been wiv you for four an' a 'alf years. An' she waltzes in and gets treated like 'er shit don't stink. (hiccup)

MADAME
You're drunk. You know the rules. You're off for the rest of the night.

FRANCINE
You can't do that to me!

MADAME
You'll be out on your ear if I see any more of this behaviour.

Francine draws her hand back to slap at the Madame's face, but the Madame grabs her arm and pushes her out of the door easily.

FRANCINE
I've 'ad just about enough of yous!

The Madame's face is stone.

FRANCINE (CONT’D)
Don't think you'll sleep safe in your bed..

Francine staggers down the corridor.
The Madame stands and closes the door firmly. She leans against it for a brief moment before she stands straight and resumes work mode.

104. INT. PRINCESS HOTEL, FOYER - NIGHT
Only night lights remain on. Nathan, drunk, enters and hammers on the door of the sitting room.

NATHAN
Let me in! Wallace!

A maid comes running.

MAID
No-one’s in there, Sir. It’s locked up for the night.

Nathan staggers back, looks at her blankly. As understanding dawns he hurries out the front door.

105. EXT. ROOFTOPS - NIGHT
Moving over the roof in a kind of crab crawl, Caroline sees an open window. Climbing towards it she crosses the pitch and gasps. She is on glass.

The room below her is like a theatre set, with flats, props and lights. Several of the side windows are open, to allow the cool night air in. With great care Caroline makes her way along the ridge of the roof and down towards these. In a precarious move, she slides head first through an opening.

106. INT. PHOTOGRAPHIC STUDIO - NIGHT
Caroline is momentarily caught hanging from the window lever into the studio. With her skirts around her ears, she is finally able to grasp the lever and right herself. Hanging only her own height from the floor she lets go, and collapses in a mess of skirts onto the studio floor.
She waits in the muted light, terrified that the sound will have awakened a tenant, but silence prevails. Tears well, but Caroline wipes them away fiercely.

As her eyes become accustomed to the dull interior – lit by the moonlight – she sees the door, and moves towards it silently.

As she passes she watches the faces that watch her. Framed portraits of stern mayoral candidates seem to glare, along with Victorian matrons with collars and bonnets which obscure any inclination to softness. When she draws close to the sideboard, she notices the set of postcards.

A gawdy harlot smiles lazily, posed invitingly across a bed. She bares a breast carelessly, and one stocking is gathered around her ankle.

Caroline picks up the postcard to have a closer look. The face is over-painted, giving a hollow, grotesque look to the woman as if she were behind a mask.

Caroline is startled then by a door opening somewhere across the corridor. She ducks behind the changing screen as the door is flung open. Light floods into the room, and she catches the view of her own face in the mirror. Her lipstick is smudged, her cheeks hot and flushed. In horror and shame she recognises echoes of the harlot's make-up on her own face.

The intruder leaves, and Caroline grabs a cloth lying next to a wash bowl and scrubs her face and eyes and mouth as silent tears wrack her body.

107. EXT. SOLICITOR’S OFFICE - NIGHT

Nathan hammers on Wallace’s office door. Inside is dark and lifeless, but he hammers and hammers, then falls down in a crumpled mess, sobbing with his face against the wall.
NATHAN
Andrea.. Andrea.

108. EXT. HOUSE YARD - DAWN
A bird on a perch sings brightly, then we draw back to see it is caged.

109. INT. PHOTOGRAPHIC STUDIO - DAY
The main doors open, and Phillip Weymouth enters the space. He is whistling and his footsteps reverberate on the wooden floors. Caroline, lying under shawls on the chaise longue in the dressing area, starts awake. His footsteps cross the room and disappear. In a panic she gets up.

She peers through the screen as a door opens and Phillip crosses the room again, now eating buttery toast and carrying a mug of tea. He exits.

Waiting a few minutes, Caroline cautiously follows him out.

110. INT. PHOTOGRAPHIC STUDIO OFFICE - DAY
At the bottom of the stairs, Caroline sneaks warily past Phillip’s office door and exits.

111. EXT. STREET - DAY
Caroline hurries down the street until she sees a COUPLE on the street ahead of her. She ducks down a side lane and hurries away.

112. EXT. TENT CITY - DAY
Caroline finds herself faced with a sea of tents. She wanders towards them.

113. INT. TENT - DAY
Buzzing flies wake Nathan, who looks terrible. A bottle falls off his stretcher when he raises his body awkwardly. After splashing his face with
water his eyes fall again on the photo of his sister. He sits back onto the bed.

114. EXT. TENT CITY - DAY

Caroline walks amongst makeshift dwellings. The dust blows around her feet and into her face, but she barely reacts. The distorted soundscape of wind punctuated by flapping cloth, an occasional call between men, a dog in the distance and laughter around a communal fireplace fails to penetrate her silence. Instead these sounds accentuate her loneliness. Bereft of purpose in a sea of canvas and scrap, she wanders.

She approaches a rough dwelling where, still steaming, a billy sits on a wheelbarrow loaded with prospecting implements. With a small spark of energy Caroline approaches and lifts it to her lips, gulping the remains of the tea within. She chokes, dropping the billy as she spits the tea leaves out on the ground. The sound alerts the occupant JACK DAWKINS (56), who bursts out of the tent.

JACK

What’re you doing? That’s my tea!

Caroline looks at him, then her body doubles over into his arms and she vomits violently. He holds her up, then brings her awkwardly in to the tent.

115. INT. TENT - DAY

JACK eases Caroline onto his camp stretcher, speaking fast and nervously as he loosens her clothing.

JACK

Look. This isn't the place to be wandering. When did you last eat?

His hand slows as his eyes see her soft pale skin. Her eyes are closed. Stealthily he proceeds, then
more eagerly as he bares her breasts. He stops then, staring, almost overcome with his desire.

JACK (CONT’D)
I've got some food I could give you .. if you do a little something for me.

He puts his hand gently on her leg, sliding it upward. They both freeze as Caroline's eyes open and she looks into his face with wide frightened eyes.

JACK (CONT’D)
It'll be alright. I'll be gentle. And then I'll give you some tucker. That's what you need.. some tucker.

His hand proceeds up her thigh more urgently now, until he abandons his words to concentrate on bringing her underwear down and unbuttoning his own trousers.

JACK (CONT’D)
(whispered mantra) Forgive me Stella forgive me, God forgive me.. forgive me forgive..

As he mounts her, penetrates her, climaxes and collapses on top of her we hold on Caroline's face. At times twisted in pain her only show of emotion is the single tear which rolls down her cheek as he comes to rest. She turns away.

Caroline lies deathly still as Jack dresses himself and prepares some food. Blow flies buzz around the meat.

JACK (CONT’D)
I haven't got much.. You can have some of this.
He thrusts a hock of meat under her nose. She continues to lie impassive.

JACK (CONT’D)
Here you go. Get some of that inta ya.

He ties up the cloth which holds his own food for the day, and indicates the plate he has left for her - with a small chunk of bread and the leftover meat bone. He turns to go, then turns back.

JACK (CONT’D)
I don't have much.. but if you want to come back tomorra.. Well, we could see what we can do..

His words trail off. He comes over awkwardly, moves to kiss her but withdraws at the last minute. He pats her leg instead.

JACK (CONT’D)
Aah well.. I'll be seeing ya.

He exits the tent. Caroline closes her eyes.

116. INT. FRONT CORRIDOR - DAY
Louisa stands in her nightdress and knocks urgently on a work room door.

LOUISA
Madeleine.. Madeleine! Let me in.

Francine opens the adjacent door, crossly.
FRANCINE
Shut up! Or I'll tell the ol' witch you were in 'ere.

Pulling a face Louisa slips quickly into Madeleine's room. Thinking again, Francine leaves her room to listen.

117. INT. MADELEINE'S ROOM - DAY
Madeleine flops on the bed again as Louisa talks at her.

LOUISA
She's missing! Madeleine, they've done something to 'er!

MADELEINE
What are you talking about?

LOUISA
Caroline. She didn't come home.

Madeleine grabs Louisa's mouth, and speaks close to her ear.

MADELEINE
Listen. You won't do any good if you start blabbin' about it. Let it go.

Louisa, with terrified eyes, looks at her, shocked. She hurries out of the room.

118. INT. TENT - DAY
Caroline sits on a chair, her back partially to us, her underwear around her ankles as she rubs between her legs with a cloth. She plunges the cloth into the bowl, watching the swirls of red enter the water.
She dries herself, dresses, and stands. She exits the tent without touching the food.

119. INT. CORRIDOR / LOUISA’S ROOM - DAY
Madame Dream, still in her night robe, knocks on Louisa’s door.

MADAME
Louisa, Caroline..

She opens the door, and finds that neither girl is there. Caroline’s bed hasn’t been slept in. She turns and finds Louisa in the corridor.

MADAME (CONT’D)
Ah,.. Louisa. I wanted to mention.. Caroline had the option of staying out last night. As you must already know, she took it.

LOUISA
So, .. nothing’s wrong?

MADAME
Nothing at all. .. But Louisa, when she comes back, please come and tell me. I’d like to know how she likes her new employer.

LOUISA
Of course, Madame.

Louisa remains standing in the way, looking at her with a clear strong gaze as the Madame tries to pass.

MADAME
Will you get out of the way!
Louisa moves slowly and the Madame strides to her office.

120. INT. CORRIDOR - DAY
The Madame stops Janice in her robe in the corridor as she is going through to the back yard loo.

MADAME
Where's Honeycombe?

JANICE
I ain't seen him.

MADAME
Well, go and find him!

JANICE
You mean, go out?

MADAME
Yes!

JANICE
But I could be fined.

MADAME
I don't care!

Janice turns back to her room.

121. INT. MADAME'S SITTING ROOM - DAY
KELLY knocks on the Madame's bedroom door anxiously.

MADAME V.O.
Who's here!?
Dunno. But 'e won't go away.

The Madame enters, still tying up her robe, to see Wallace in her sitting room.

MADAME
It's you!

WALLACE
I want you to know what really happened before that little vixen spreads too many lies.

MADAME
(coldly) She attended an audition! Did she get to play?

WALLACE
She ran out on me.

MADAME
Oh... (considers) I didn't give you leave to deflower her. Still, I consider it a deal done. You owe me 50 pounds.

WALLACE
I'm not paying for something I didn't get!

MADAME
Oh, you'll pay alright. If only for the damage you did last time.

Their eyes lock, then Wallace turns away.
WALLACE
She's not with you?

MADAME
She didn’t return here. .. Well, ..
I suggest we both use all our
resources to find her.

WALLACE
I want her first!

MADAME
Pay me, and I will personally deliver
her.

Wallace looks ropable, but slaps the money into
the Madame’s hand.

WALLACE
To the old homestead, Summerhurst.

A noise behind the door alerts them to a listener,
Wallace, enraged, quickly leaves.

122. INT/EXT. FRONT CORRIDOR/BROTHEL - DAY
As Wallace pushes through the front doors,
Francine hurries to catch up to him.

FRANCINE
I bet I can find 'er. What'll you
give me if I do?

Wallace confronts her threateningly, grabbing her
wrist.

WALLACE
If you find her, you'll come to me
first.. for your own good.
He swings around aggressively and leaves.

123. EXT. BACK LANE / BACK YARD - DAY
Breathing hard Caroline falls through into the back yard. Staring at the house, she hurries into the laundry to wait.

124. EXT/INT. BACK YARD/LAUNDRY - DAY
The back door squeaks, and Caroline peeks through a crack in the wall at Louisa, who tips a bowl of water over the small vegetable garden bed.

   CAROLINE
   Pssst .. Louisa!

Louisa turns, and with a glance to the house comes into the laundry.

   LOUISA
   Caroline! Oh I'm glad to see you.

Tears well in Caroline's eyes, and she hugs Louisa, who is taken aback.

   LOUISA (CONT’D)
   You alright?

Caroline quickly draws her arm across her eyes and sniffs loudly.

   CAROLINE
   Yes, mostly.

   LOUISA
   What happened?
CAROLINE
(smiles through tears) Nothing .. Um..
Have they missed me?

LOUISA
The Madame told me you have a new
employer. Are you a singing barmaid?

CAROLINE
Yes, that’s right. I won’t be coming
back. Can you sneak my things out?

LOUISA
You don’t wanna say goodbye?

CAROLINE
Only to you.

LOUISA
It'll look a bit suspicious, won't
it, if I bring your stuff out? How will
I explain it?

CAROLINE
(pleading) Look, you can have my music.

LOUISA
(brighter) Really?

CAROLINE
Will you just bring my things!

LOUISA
Okay.

CAROLINE
And don’t tell anyone.
Louisa returns to the house.

125. INT. LOUISA’S ROOM – DAY
Louisa throws Caroline’s things into her bag. She takes the photo frame and considers, but then returns it to the dresser.

She pulls the dress box out from under the bed, looks at it and frowns. Her frown lightens as she pushes it back under and goes out the door.

126. INT. ANTECHAMBER / FRONT CORRIDOR – DAY
Louisa peers cautiously down the corridor and then tiptoes towards the washing basket which is at the far end. She takes it and walks quietly back towards the antechamber, but Francine steps in front of her.

    FRANCINE
    What’re you doin’?

    LOUISA
    Getting the washing basket.

    FRANCINE
    You usually get it when it’s full.

    LOUISA
    I got sheets too ya know.

Louisa pushes past Francine and leaves quickly. Francine watches her go.

127. INT. CORRIDOR – DAY
Louisa moves down the corridor carrying a full washing basket covered in a pillowslip, neatly tucked in. She stops when she sees Francine watching her from the parlour door, but then pokes
her tongue out in a pretence of naturalness as she pushes open the rear door and exits.

128. EXT/INT. LAUNDRY - DAY
Caroline is becoming more and more anxious when the back door finally opens and Louisa appears with a washing basket covered by a pillowslip. She plonks it down in front of Caroline.

LOUISA
Francine's snooping again.

CAROLINE
Not about me?

LOUISA
(lies) No.. no.

Caroline, barely listening, rifles through her things.

CAROLINE
Where is it? My dad's picture?

LOUISA
You can't take that. It will give me away for sure.

CAROLINE
(tears threaten) But it's the one thing I really want.

LOUISA
You can't have it! (softens) I'll look after it for you. .. Send it to you later.
CAROLINE
Okay. But I want it back.

LOUISA
I'll look after it for you really well.

Caroline turns to unbutton her dress, but soon turns back.

CAROLINE
Will you help!

Louisa begins unbuttoning. Caroline gratefully throws off the dress and puts on her plain frock. She grabs the pillowslip, rips it, and ties it over her hair. Louisa holds the dress up to her body in rapture. Caroline looks at her.

CAROLINE (CONT’D)
Don’t. It’ll get you into trouble.

Louisa's steady gaze is unnerving.

CAROLINE (CONT’D)
Promise me you will never, EVER wear it.

LOUISA
‘Course I won’t! Where would I wear a thing like this?

Louisa puts it in the basket, downcast.

LOUISA (CONT’D)
(small voice)
Can I come?
CAROLINE
Oh Louisa. Let me get settled..

LOUISA
It’s been nice having like .. a sister.

Caroline gives her a quick, awkward hug. Louisa watches as she ducks through the fence.

129. EXT/INT. TENT CITY / TENT - DAY
Nathan is sprawled awkwardly on his cot when Janice throws the tent flap open. His snoring is replaced with choking as she abruptly pours a tea cup of water onto his face. He wakes in a start.

NATHAN
Wha... what’re you doing ‘ere!

He sits up awkwardly. She continues to stand over him.

JANICE
Madam wants ya, ya lazy good-for-nuthin’. They can’t find the new girl.

NATHAN
So what!

JANICE
She wants ya ta come!

NATHAN
I ain’t her slave.. Now leave me alone!
Janice stares at him. As she turns away she glances over the unkempt space, with its dirt flaw and filthy ragged furnishings.

JANICE
(to herself) Ya no better than a dog!

She leaves. Nathan reaches for the empty beer bottle on the floor, struggles to rise and pick it up, but throws it down again as he strides out of the tent with an awkward gait.

130. EXT. BACK LANE / STREET - DAY
No sooner has Caroline rounded the corner than she is grabbed by Madame Dream on one side, and Francine on the other. They hold a handkerchief to her nose. A struggling Caroline is dragged around the corner and into the brothel’s main doors.

131. INT. FRONT CORRIDOR / BEDROOM - DAY
Madame Dream and Francine pull Caroline down the corridor. Caroline speaks awkwardly as the drug takes effect.

CAROLINE
You can't do this. You said you were my guardian! You’re supposed to protect me.

They reach the end bedroom. The Madame opens the door and Francine shoves Caroline inside. The Madame shuts the door and locks it. Caroline withdraws, wimpering.

She slides down the door and sits crumpled against it.

The Madame strides back down the corridor with Francine following her.
FRANCINE
What's my reward?

The Madame is shocked.

MADAME
What!?

FRANCINE
You 'eard me. I wan' a reward.

The Madame pushes past her and leaves through the curtain. Francine turns back, thinks, then slowly creeps to the bedroom door. Behind it, Caroline whimpers.

132. INT. FEDERATION HOTEL - DAY
Nathan, looking sickly, is sitting at the bar when Wallace approaches him.

WALLACE
Ah, Nathan Honeycombe. Bit early to be drinking, isn’t it? ..

NATHAN
(dull tone) What happened to my sister?

WALLACE
I swear to you, I’ve never met your sister.

NATHAN
They said it was you.

WALLACE
Who?
NATHAN
The girls at the brothel.

WALLACE
Well, how many men go through that place? I don’t doubt someone who looked like me has visited.

Nathan bends over his beer, and Wallace realises he is crying.

WALLACE (CONT’D)
Maybe we can’t help your sister, but we can help Caroline. Do you know where she is now?

NATHAN
(becomes alert) I left her with you!

WALLACE
I know. I wanted to help her,.. to get her out. She misconstrued my actions, and now.. Look, I need to find her again.

Nathan looks at him with suspicion.

WALLACE (CONT’D)
We need the information she can give us to stop this business. To help her.. And others like her.

NATHAN
I thought..
WALLACE
Leave it alone, Honeycombe. Let others who are better qualified do it.

NATHAN
Why not go to the police?

WALLACE
We don’t want to alert suspicion. The Madame would just deny it, blame me. We need her story.

NATHAN
What if I don't trust you?

WALLACE
You’re a fool.

Nathan is taken aback. Wallace puts coins on the bar and leaves.

133. INT. FRONT CORRIDOR - DAY
Kelly answers an insistent knock. McDougall and Crosswater enter.

KELLY
It’s early! Whadda yous want?

MCDougall
I’ve got a warrant to search your premises.

Wallace and Crosswater walk past Kelly and out through the curtain towards the Madame’s office.

134. INT. MADAME’S SITTING ROOM - DAY
The Madame is lying with cucumber on her eyes.
McDougall knocks and Madame Dream quickly sits and slips the cucumber slices in a nearby jug of water before he and Crosswater enter.

**MADAME**
What’s this about?

**WALLACE**
You required a warrant.

McDougall slaps it on the table in front of her. The Madame glances at it, then takes control.

**MADAME**
Yes well .. We're officially closed, so let’s get on with this.

McDougall grabs the water jug and begins to pour a glass.

**MCDougALL**
Cucumber. That's interesting..

He drinks the water and then eats the cucumber. The Madame watches.

**MADAME**
You know you’re wasting your time. Whoever this girl is, she isn’t one of mine.

**MCDougALL**
Hhumph! We'll take a look anyway.

The Madame stands slowly. She looks at Crosswater.
MADAME

It may be a good idea to knock before you enter the rooms. This is the girls' rest time. You may find them in a state of 'deshabilles'.

Crosswater's expression changes.

MADAME (CONT'D)

Come along then.

135. INT. FRONT CORRIDOR / BEDROOMS (INTERCUT) - DAY

The Madame walks the full length of the corridor, knocking on each door and throwing each open.

McDougall follows behind, looking in, while Crosswater holds his hat to his chest and brings it close to his face when something offends him.

In various rooms girls grumble and complain. 'Close that door!', 'What's going on?''Hey!' Others are snoring.

At the end of the corridor Madame Dream stops.

MADAME

That's it. You've seen all my rooms.

MCDougall

You've got a young housemaid haven't you? Louisa? Where does she sleep?

MADAME

Out of harm's way.. at the back of the house. But she has (nothing to do..)

MCDougall

I want to see her room.
McDougall and Crosswater stride through the velvet curtain while Madame Dream hurries behind.

MADAME
Surely that's not necessary. She's only a housemaid!

136. INT. BEDROOM (INTERCUT) - DAY
As the doors open and close and the cries go up Caroline slowly wakes. Awkwardly, she straightens her body and rubs her head. When she recognises voices in the corridor outside she turns weakly and begins to bang on the door and cry out.

At first weak, her cries get louder until she bangs furiously on the door and yells a ferocious Amazonian howl. Still no-one comes.

137. INT. CORRIDOR / LOUISA'S ROOM - DAY
McDougall flings the door open, and he, Crosswater and the Madame stand staring. Louisa stands back quickly from shoving the dress box further under the bed.

One bed is perfectly made, while the other is in disarray. McDougall opens the wardrobe and cupboard but only Louisa's things remain. He exhales angrily, then grabs the photo frame, still facing the unused bed.

MCDougall
A bit young to have a beau. Is this yours young lady?

LOUISA
It’s .. my dad.

McDougall is unconvinced.

MADAME
As I said.. She is a figment of someone’s imagination.
McDougall is furious.

**MCDougall**

You haven’t heard the last of this, Magdelena!

He leaves the room crossly, with Crosswater trailing behind. The Madame looks to Louisa.

**Madame**

I’ll talk to you about this later, Louisa. For now, you’d better stay in here.

The Madame leaves. Louisa sits on the bed. The key turns in the lock and Louisa looks up, horrified.

138. **INT. BEDROOM / FRONT CORRIDOR - DAY**

Caroline rests against the door, cradling her reddened hands.

**Francine**

Pssst.

Caroline sits alert, and leans in to the door.

**Caroline**

Louisa. Is that you? Louisa?

Francine stares at the door in turmoil. She turns to leave, then draws closer silently, listening.

**Caroline (cont’d)**

Madeleine?.. I've got a gold nugget. I’ll give it to you. Are you there?

Francine disguises her voice by speaking quietly.
FRANCINE
Where is it?

Caroline huddles towards the door.

CAROLINE
Who...? (realises) Francine.

FRANCINE
Where's the nugget?

CAROLINE
Have you got the key?

Silence.

CAROLINE (CONT'D)
If you open the door I can show you.
I'll give it to you.

FRANCINE
You're bluffing.

CAROLINE
Listen Francine. I promise. I'll
give you the nugget. But you have to
get the key. .. Or get Louisa.

Silence.

CAROLINE (CONT'D)
If you help me out, I'll leave and never
come back.

Silence. Tears well in Caroline's eyes.
CAROLINE (CONT’D)

Listen Francine. If I don't get out she'll send me back to Wallace. .. I'll let him.. (swallows) I'll make love to him. I'll make him mine.. forever.

Silence.

CAROLINE (CONT’D)

.. But if I'm not here, you can go to him. It'll be you lying in his bed.

Francine leaves silently.

CAROLINE (CONT’D)

(more desperate) I won't be here to receive her favours. I'll be far, far away. I'll.. Francine! (sobs)

The key clunks in its lock. The door slowly opens. Francine faces Caroline, whose face is streaked with tears.

CAROLINE (CONT’D)

Thankyou!

She holds out the slip of paper with the nugget in it. Francine grabs it and looks at it with avarice. She rifles through the small bag of personal items which has been discarded in the corridor, then looks ferociously at Caroline.

FRANCINE

Where’s the dress! I want the dress.

CAROLINE

(hesitates).. Louisa’s got it.
Francine grabs Caroline and pulls her to the front doors. There, Caroline searches Francine's face, but finds no sympathy. Francine pushes her out.

FRANCINE
Good riddance! And stay away.

139. EXT. BROTHEL - DAY
Caroline runs down the street and into a laneway.

140. EXT. RAILWAY STATION - DAY
Caroline cautiously steps up to the station window and peers inside. It is dark and empty.

She reads the timetable posted on a board. She reads the fares and turns away to face the same view as faced her on her arrival. She bites her lip as she thinks.

141. INT. LOUISA’S ROOM - DAY
Francine bursts in to Louisa’s room and begins to search. She quickly notices the dress box under the bed. She brings it onto the bed and opens it. She smiles.

Louisa appears at the door.

LOUISA
What are you doing in here? That’s mine!

Louisa grabs for the box but Francine pushes her in the face, so Louisa ends up sprawled on the bed.

The Madame bursts into the room.

MADAME
What is going on! Give me that!
She wrenches the box from Francine and storms out.

MADAME (CONT’D)
You’re fired!

Francine follows her out in a rage.

142. INT. CORRIDOR – DAY
Francine runs forwards, grabs the Madame to spin her around, and draws back her arm to slap her just as Nathan enters by the back door. In a split second he grabs her arm, and has Francine pinned against the wall.

The Madame reels and recovers.

MADAME
(to Francine) You’re fired! You’ve got ten minutes to get out. (to Nathan) Hire a cart and driver.

143. INT. FRONT CORRIDOR – DAY
Nathan enters through the main doors as the Madame appears at the curtain.

NATHAN
Cart’s ‘ere.

MADAME
She’s in here.

She proceeds down the corridor to the room Caroline recently occupied, but Nathan remains stock still.

NATHAN
Who?
MADAME
Caroline Frank.

NATHAN
What’re you doin’ with ‘er?

MADAME
None of your business!

Nathan stands in the corridor. The Madame looks back.

MADAME(CONT’D)
Come on.

NATHAN
Tell me what you’re doin’ with ‘er.

The Madame turns, surprised.

MADAME
What’s it to you?

NATHAN
I lost my sister to a place like this.

MADAME
(in disgust) You useless, spineless, snivelling (excuse of a man!)

Nathan grabs her. Frightened, the Madame looks at him.

NATHAN
Open the door!
She unlocks the door, and opens it carefully. Looking inside, they both see it is empty. The Madame is visibly shaken.

Nathan leaves quickly.

144. EXT. BROTHEL - DAY
On the street Nathan strides away past the waiting cart driver.

    CART DRIVER
    Well is she comin’?

Nathan ignores him.

A hundred yards beyond, he turns back. Wresting with his conscience, he walks away again.

145. INT. LOUISA’S ROOM - DAY
The Madame enters Louisa’s room, where Louisa is curled up on the bed. She has been crying. When she sees the Madame she sits up.

    MADAME
    You know Louisa, I think it best that you leave us.

Louisa gasps.

    MADAME(CONT’D)
    Francine is trouble. I don’t think I can keep you safe anymore.

    LOUISA
    (worried) But please, Madame.. I can handle her.
MADAME
Hush Louisa. Now, Caroline has taken a nice position as a pianist. She would like you to come and join her, as her maid. Would you like that?

Louisa’s eyes can hardly get bigger.

LOUISA
Really!?

MADAME
It’s a fine house, with a gentleman. And Caroline, of course.

LOUISA
When do I start?

MADAME
The cart is waiting to take you. You just pop this dress on, and you can go.

LOUISA
Really?

MADAME
Yes, silly girl. Now do it quickly.

The Madame stands and leaves. Louisa bounces off the bed and throws open the dress box.

146. INT. CORRIDOR - DAY

Louisa emerges from her room in the dress, which she holds off the ground. She has attempted to pin her hair up too. Caroline’s photo is sticking out of the small purse hanging off her wrist. She knocks on the Madame’s office door, but the Madame sweeps in from the parlour and brings her quickly through to the front of the house.
MADAME
This way.

147. EXT. BROTHEL / STREET - DAY
Louisa climbs with difficulty onto the seat next to the driver. She turns to wave goodbye, but the Madame has already returned inside.

CART DRIVER
What a pretty dress.

Louisa smiles happily as the cart rolls away.

148. EXT. HANNAN STREET / FEDERATION HOTEL - DAY
Nathan leans against the post outside the Federation Hotel when he sees Louisa and the cart passing by. He reacts in alarm, but when the MAN he is with puts coins into his hand, he turns towards the pub door instead. Over the street noise we hear his companion say..

MAN
Come on, Nath..

NATHAN
Just one.

They enter.

149. EXT. POLICE STATION - DAY
Nathan cowers outside the police station, irresolute. He turns to the door, and then turns away when a stranger marches in. He fiddles with a twig, indecisive.

When he looks up, he sees Caroline emerge from the Emporium and hurry along the street.
Nathan throws the twig down and runs after her. In sight of the railway station he catches hold of her shoulder and swings her round to face him.

NATHAN
You! Where’re you goin’ now!

CAROLINE
Please, let me go! .. I can’t bear that life. I can’t stay here!

NATHAN
What about Louisa!

CAROLINE
What do you mean?

NATHAN
She’s sending ‘er in your place.

CAROLINE
(gasps) But.. What are you doing here? You’ve got to stop them!

NATHAN
I’ve come to tell you, haven’t I?

CAROLINE
(bitterly) It’s your job to protect us!

NATHAN
(in disgust) You’ll let ‘er go to save your own skin.

CAROLINE
You’re a useless coward!
Their eyes meet briefly in mutual accusation and shame before Caroline walks away. Nathan calls after her.

NATHAN
Meet you in hell..!

151. EXT. RAILWAY STATION - DAY
A train has arrived. Caroline walks quickly through other passengers and buys a ticket.

As she waits to board, she watches a new arrival, a young woman about her own age, who looks anxiously around at the groups of others who belong to someone.

For a brief moment, Caroline is reminded of her own frightening experience of being alone - in a strange industrial world; in the bedroom at the brothel when Nathan touched her hair; in the unwanted embrace with Wallace.

Caroline fidgets, then suddenly she breaks through the crowds and runs down the street.

152. EXT. TENT CITY - DAY

CAROLINE
Nathan! Nathan!

She screams after him as he ducks into a tent.

153. INT. TENT - DAY
She bursts in to the tent. Nathan sits on the bed.

CAROLINE
Nathan. Where did they take her?
Nathan remains motionless.

CAROLINE (CONT’D)
What’s wrong with you? We’ve got to go!

NATHAN
You said it yourself. What use am I? None, .. To you.

CAROLINE
But Nathan.. I can’t do it alone.

NATHAN
Get out!

Caroline looks at him disbelieving.

CAROLINE
You took money from him, didn’t you!

He stands aggressively.

NATHAN
I said get out!

Caroline looks at him in shock, turns and leaves quickly.

Nathan reaches under his bed for a bottle. He finds nothing. He stands and looks for one on the box-shelf. He finds nothing, and in rage sweeps everything onto the floor. The box-shelf falls, and everything scatters. But the photo of his sister lands upright at his feet. He looks at it.

Slowly he picks it up, and looks long at her.

With new resolve he leaves.
154. EXT. OLD HOMESTEAD - DAY
Louisa steps warily down from the bullock cart and the driver turns away. She walks timidly towards the verandah, where a curtain falls back over the window.

A moment later Wallace storms out of the front door towards her. He grabs her in rage.

WALLACE
You! She’s sent me you!

He pulls her roughly inside.

155. INT. OLD HOMESTEAD - DAY
Still holding Louisa, Wallace pulls at the curtain tie and binds her hands to the bedframe. He grabs another one and ties it viciously over her mouth.

WALLACE
I’ll be back!

He leaves the house.

156. EXT. WALLACE’S FLAT - DAY
Nathan thumps hard on the door, until a neighbour appears on the adjacent landing.

NEIGHBOUR
(crossly) He’s not there!

Nathan scowls and turns away.

157. EXT. POLICE STATION - DAY
With only the briefest pause, Nathan strides towards the front door.
158. INT. POLICE STATION - DAY
Nathan enters and goes straight to the counter.

NATHAN
Where’s McDougall?

159. EXT. HANNAN STREET / SOLICITOR’S OFFICE - DAY
Francine heads towards Wallace’s office, when she sees Caroline on the streets coming from the opposite direction. She ducks around the side of the building next to Wallace’s office.
Caroline hammers on Wallace’s door.

CAROLINE
Wallace! Wallace!

No-one responds. She peaks through the lace curtains and sees the office is empty.

She turns to leave, is grabbed around the throat, and pulled in to the shadows. Francine quickly stuffs rags into her mouth and ties her hands, disguising the ties behind the handles of her own bag. She speaks close into Caroline’s ear.

FRANCINE
If you want to see your little friend alive, you’ll come with me. No trouble mind.

She removes the rags from Caroline’s mouth, and proceeds onto the footpath holding the cord to Caroline’s hands tightly.

160. INT. FRONT CORRIDOR - DAY
The thundering on the door ceases when Janice throws it open crossly. Wallace pushes past her and through the velvet curtain.
JANICE
(Yells after him) We’re closed!

161. INT. MADAME’S OFFICE / SITTING ROOM (INTERCUT) - DAY
Madame Dream is filing her nails when Wallace storms in.

WALLACE
Where’s Caroline? Your note said you had her.

MADAME
Keep your voice down! Do you want the whole street to know about it!

She leads him into the sitting room.

MADAME (CONT’D)
I sent you Louisa instead. She’s Untouched. You’ll still get your pleasure.

WALLACE
It’s my reputation I care about!

162. INT. CORRIDOR / MADAME’S OFFICE / MADAME’S SITTING ROOM - DAY
Francine opens the door and pushes Caroline through, steering her into the Madame’s office. With force, she yanks Caroline towards the sitting room door and pushes her through that door.

FRANCINE
Here she is! What’ll you give me for her?

The Madame and Wallace stare.
MADAME
How did you get out!?

FRANCINE
Well, what’s she worth to yas?

In an instant Wallace reaches for Francine while the Madame goes for Caroline. The struggle is short before the two women are subdued. Francine spits like a viper.

FRANCINE (CONT’D)
(to Caroline) You pathetic little..
And you! (to the Madame) You wait till it I..

Wallace grabs a cushion and pushes it violently onto Francine’s face. She sinks to the floor.

MADAME
What are you doing!?

Wallace grabs Caroline and hurries for the door. The Madame follows.

MADAME (CONT’D)
You can’t leave me with the body!

At this moment McDougall and Crosswater burst in with Nathan. Within seconds they tousle with Wallace. The Madame screams, but she is easily subdued.

Caroline runs to Francine, and falls onto her knees by her side.

CAROLINE
Francine! Francine.
Francine’s eyes open.

FRANCINE
(to Caroline) You’re not the only one with brains.

Wallace is calling out obscenities.

WALLACE
She’s just a whore. You can’t believe what she says. None of them. I’m a lawyer!

The Madame raises her cuffed arm and slaps his face.

MADAME
He was trying to abduct her. We were trying to stop him.

Francine appears leaning against the door frame.

FRANCINE
She (points to the Madame) was selling her, and he (points to Wallace) tried to kill me.

Caroline steps forward to confront Wallace.

CAROLINE
Where’s Louisa?

163. EXT. OLD HOMESTEAD - DAY
Caroline leaps off the cart before it is stationary, and runs into the house before the policemen even alight.

She brings Louisa out.
164. INT. POLICE STATION - DAY
Caroline and Louisa exit the interview room with McDougall.

MCDougall
Here’s a little something of yours from Francine. (gives her the nugget)

CAROLINE
Thankyou! .. What will happen to Nathan?

MCDougall
I think he’s paid his dues, don’t you? .. Now please tell me you’re not going back there.

CAROLINE
I’ve still got a train ticket. (to Louisa) Would you like a trip to Perth?

LOUISA
Do they have singing barmaids?

MCDougall
Now stay out of trouble, you hear me, Missy?

LOUISA
I’m a sensible girl, Mr McDougall.

MCDougall
Hhhhhmm.

The girls leave the station.
165. EXT. POLICE STATION - DAY
Caroline and Louisa into the sunlight. Nathan, waiting in the shadows, approaches diffidently.

NATHAN
I just wanted to say.. I.. I’m sorry.

CAROLINE
You came through in the end. You saved our lives.

NATHAN
But I didn’t save her, I couldn’t save her..

He sinks to the ground, sobbing in the middle of the yard. Louisa throws her arms around him, and Caroline squats near, talking quietly. Eventually Nathan regains his composure, stands, and walks towards the gates. Louisa catches up and takes his hand.

166. EXT. STREETS - DAY
Nathan and Louisa walk together for a short way before Nathan turns in to a laneway. Catching up, Caroline joins Louisa and together they continue towards the station.

CAROLINE
You look good in that dress.

LOUISA
Hmm, you can be my maid for a change.

CAROLINE
I don’t think so!
Lisette runs at a pelting speed after them. They have a quick conversation, which ends with Louisa throwing her hat into the air.

All three return towards the main street.

167. EXT. PHOTOGRAPHIC STUDIO - DUSK
The sun sets over the higgledy-piggledy town as we move over the rooftops and darkening townscape into the brightness and excitement of the soiree dance performance, including Lisette and the French girls, Caroline playing piano and Louisa selling snacks.

168. INT. PHOTOGRAPHIC STUDIO - CREDIT SEQUENCE
The lights go up, and we are faced with a dazzling cabaret scene. Lisette and the French women perform the can-can in risque costumes. Caroline, dressed in a more sedate way, plays the piano with gusto. Louisa gives a bag of peanuts to Phillip, who stands by the entrance. She moves through the crowd selling snacks to the swelling audience. She slips a packet to Nathan and winks.

THE END

Credits Roll
Case Study: Using the Framework to Analyse Calico Dreams

Preface to the analysis of voice

In this section I analyse *Calico Dreams* to illuminate its voice. Within the scope of this research, this process has also allowed me to test the framework as a tool of analysis. The section serves to illustrate how the framework can be used to discern voice, and how voice may be described through such analysis. Because the research question arose through the issue of a national inflection in voice, I show how some elements, which are present in the drama and uncovered through use of the framework, may associate the voice in *Calico Dreams* with Australianness. This Australian inflection, I argue, underpins many of the choices made in the writing of *Calico Dreams*, particularly through its characters and storyworld and the many elements from everyday life which are present. These act as signifiers to an Australian perspective or worldview in the writing through the interplay of the historical period and location in which the story is set, and the values and attitudes which seem to be taken for granted and underpin the drama.

In any instance of screenwriting, certain attitudes position the writer in relation to the fiction and suggest the worldview inscribed in the voice. This worldview is important because it delimits the writer’s orientation to the material and social world, and many assumptions of behaviour, values and beliefs arise from this orientation. The treatment of characters in sympathetic, ambivalent or antipathetic ways forms a key aspect of worldview, and is therefore an important aspect of voice. This is so because sympathetic treatment suggests an ‘us’ stance in the writer towards the fictional world, while an antipathetic attitude will result in a distanced ‘them’ stance. In this case I am arguing that the voice is sympathetic in its treatment of the Australian characters and world. This evidences an Australian inflection in the voice on two counts. Firstly, the ‘us’ stance suggests loyalty in the writer to this cultural worldview. Secondly, the lack of any contending other worldview in the drama allows this Australian worldview to remain unchallenged. (It should be noted that writers can write *against* their own cultural perspective, and deliberately write from a cultural worldview which is not their own. However, in the overwhelming number of cases in which a writer does not do this, I argue that the worldview is
inscribed unconsciously, and matches that of the writer’s own worldview (even when this is complicated by competing influences).

In the analysis which follows I reproduce excerpts from the screenplay to illustrate voice. I retain the screenplay font and formatting to easily distinguish between these and the exegetical text. I reference excerpts from the script with the scene number (Sc X), and speech or paragraph number (sp X / para X) counting from the top of the scene. The page numbers for each scene relate to the screenplay as placed in this document. I highlight colour-coded elements which appear in the screenplay text and which relate to ‘life as lived’ aspects of the Australian worldview, which I argue, add to the sense of authenticity of the world. These are elements which give readers the sense that the writer’s voice is Australian, because the voice displays familiarity with the world and people (a close, ‘us’ perspective).

Since screenwriting is dense, many elements from the framework can be present in each short excerpt from the screenplay. However it is necessary in this analysis to limit the discussion to the most fruitful areas related to the voice. Therefore some areas may not be fully discussed.

Thinking analytically about a screenplay provides the proof of voice, but the description of voice may be more useful when succinct. I end the Part by describing the voice briefly. I also suggest the areas in which the Australian inflection in the voice is most obvious.

I argue that voice, in this instance, can be defined as working within a hybrid of the genres of historical realism, melodrama and art cinema, to tell an ensemble story about a young woman who comes of age when she resists becoming a prostitute. The voice shows a woman’s perspective which is grounded in an Australian storyworld and underlined through its Australian worldview. As discussed, I describe the voice as having a female and an Australian inflection related to this worldview, which is defined by a sense of ‘us’ emanating from the point of view within the writing. This is based on several key aspects of the screenwriting. These are that the screen story is told from the perspective of the women living together in a brothel in Western Australia. The multicultural society portrayed is one in which individuals are
immersed in community, and reflects a collectivist worldview. Cultural theorist Graeme Turner (1993) contends that Australians generally show a particular “lack of faith in the concept of individualism” (p. 105), and Meaghan Morris claims that this collective view is preferred by Australians (2016, p. 96). In claiming a worldview, it is important to note undercurrents of dissent or contradiction within the story, which raise questions regarding the storyteller’s attitudes towards the fictional world and its elements. By and large, this dissention or complication is absent in *Calico Dreams*, allowing me to claim a female and Australian worldview which appears to be unchallenged within its context.

The question of a national inflection

Before embarking on the analysis proper I will briefly describe national inflection, a concept which merges with that of screenwriter’s voice because of the part identity plays in the creation of voice. In turn, identity creates the worldview spoken of above. I consider each voice to have a national *accent* or inflection which underpins the worldview, and which amounts to a set of ideas and understandings which are informed by the ethnic-cultural-national identity of the writer. While the concept of a national inflection may be contestable in a global world, Edensor insists that national identity is part of personal identity (2002, p. vi). Benedict Anderson goes further, arguing that national belonging takes place in the *imagination* of each citizen (Anderson, 2007). This suggests that the discussion of the concept of an inflection in a wider discussion of voice in screenwriting is appropriate, since voice is at once concerned with the writer’s identity, with the reader’s identity which informs their interpretations of story elements, and also with imaginaries in both identity and place, through fictional storytelling which is embedded within a material world. In describing the voice in what follows I also describe some of the main features of the screenplay which are related to this national inflection. I finish by describing the voice.

Analysis of *Calico Dreams*

*Calico Dreams* is an original feature film screenplay, and is 96 pages long. As described in the synopses, the story concerns a naive young girl who is being forced into a life of prostitution by the madam in the brothel in which she is employed as a housemaid. The story is set in an actual historical period in Kalgoorlie, Western
Australia, and according to the AWG assessor, there has been some attempt to recreate the period with authenticity (in Appendix D, Connell, 2014, p. 443). The protagonist, Caroline Frank (16 years) and the antagonist, Madame Dream (48 years) are female, and the cast includes a large number of women. The madam is referred to as ‘Madame’ Dream (French pronunciation) by Caroline, who from the outset was led by the Madame to believe her employer ran a boarding house for respectable young women. (For ease, I have retained this spelling throughout, though other characters will use an Australian pronunciation which equates with the spelling ‘madam’). Choosing a female protagonist, and taking a female perspective in the story, has allowed me to reflect aspects of my own worldview in *Calico Dreams* through my own closer connection with my female characters arising because I too, am a woman, and the characters and situations are my inventions. Though subtle, this worldview defines the voice as female over the course of the drama through the attention paid to a female experience, as depicted in instances in the writing.

One of the things I enjoy in Australian cinema is the way that diverse female voices (both fictional and ‘writerly’) have been able to be heard, through films ranging from *The Squatter’s Daughter* (1910) to *The Sapphires* (Blair, 2012). My purpose in writing is to contribute stories which add to what I think of as an Australian tradition of strong competent female protagonists (Dermody & Jacka, 1988; O’Regan, 1996; Pike & Cooper, 1980; Routt, n.d.). My observation of the depiction of men and women in Australian films does suggest a lack of congruence between the desires and needs of men and women, which causes tension in their interactions. Morris describes many depictions of Australian society as “essentially segregated,” a society in which “men and women have separate worlds, and an encounter between them is fraught with difficulty” (1980, p. 142). To a certain extent this can be said of *Calico Dreams*. Family life is not depicted at all, and the intimate male-female relationships which are glimpsed - if not dysfunctional - are not shown in a purely positive light. While male characters such as Nathan Honeycombe and Hamish McDougall are drawn with some sympathy, no character is shown to be in a sustained and loving intimate heterosexual relationship. These aspects of the story may support a reader’s inference that the writer is female and the voice is Australian.

*Calico Dreams* is partly an ‘issues’ film, in which the theme is prostitution. This theme
is shown visually through ‘permeable barriers’ (such as curtains, an iron fence, and dust) which symbolise the body through their association with virginity, vulnerability and also transgression. This theme underlies every aspect of the drama, aided by the story as set in a working brothel. The theme is central to the subject matter, and is symbolised visually in many scenes. While prostitution is not unique to Australia, the theme has an Australian inflection through its expression within an Australian storyworld. For example, the story’s basis in history gives rise to specific ways in which the women characters’ lives are circumscribed through legislation, social tolerance, and everyday circumstances. These depictions are based on historical research (Anonymous, 1910; Casey & Mayman, 1964; Durack, 1959; Fuller, Griffths, Martin, & Borg, 1975; Galvin, 2011; Greenwood, 2002; Grenville, 2010; Griffths, 1975; Havillard, 1986; Heyer, 1954; Hocking, 2012; Johnson, 1923; King, 1988; Kingsbury, 1945; Macchia, 2011; McKewon, 2005; McLaren, 2000; Milentis & Bridge, 2004; Palmer, 1981; Pascoe & Thomson, 2010; Price, 1987; Saunders, 2011; Studdy-Clift, 1996; Taylor, 1918; Turner, 1993; Unattributed, 1910a, 1910b, 1929, 1933, 1963; Vivienne, 1993; Walker, 1912; Webb, 1993) and derive generally from the ways things were in Kalgoorlie in that period. Thus the Australian inflection may be evidenced in areas such as: ideas in any form (including social organisation, practices, behaviours and etiquette); objects (for example, locations, spaces, props or set dressings); social infrastructure depicted in the story (for example, policing, transport, currency and so on, and the associated modus operandi, values, objects and practices depicted), or any everyday phenomenon.

Setting up the world

Screenwriting manuals emphasise the importance of setting up a screen story so that readers can quickly understand which story they are being told. This involves showing the world, the main character/s and all other pertinent information quickly, and in dramatic ways. Calico Dreams specifies the type of story and its setting through the subtitles “Kalgoorlie, Western Australia 1906” (Sc 1, para 1) which suggest both the realistic historical genre and where the story is set. It then immediately depicts a particularly segregated and masculine world. We are introduced to a major secondary character, Nathan Honeycombe, who is shown to be a gambler and is by no means depicted as a traditional hero (though Nathan is portrayed as a “noble failure” (Aronson, 2000, p. 30), which is a form of Australian
Nathan embodies the theme of imprisonment through his addictions, which theme is also integral to the story through Caroline’s situation in the brothel. Historically, confinement to their dwellings was forced on the prostitutes in Kalgoorlie through city by-laws, though many flaunted these and were fined accordingly (King, 1988; Milentis & Bridge, 2004).

With regard to discerning voice, two of the first impressions a reader will gain of any story are the tone and mood, which quickly tell the reader what type of story and world they are entering. Both tone and mood define the type of experience a reader can expect from a screen story, based on its level of realism and on the affective experience it offers. Within the text below, I have underlined tone and mood indicators, and colour-coded significant elements which suggest the specificity of an Australian storyworld through the language, people, natural or built environments, and public administration, organisation and social infrastructure.

1. EXT. CHURCH - DAY
Subtitle: Kalgoorlie, Western Australia 1906

The cross, welded neatly above the huge galvanised iron water tank which has recently been put to use as a church seems to mock its new purpose. Still, stragglers – mostly working men - approach, then duck 'round the back. A small handwritten banner proclaims “Labour meeting 10am.”

2. EXT. CHURCH BACKYARD - DAY

A melee of men in all styles and manner of dress close around the two-up circle as the call goes up. A well-dressed man of business, NEIL WALLACE (38) squats close to a rough-looking hand, JEM HANCOCK (34).

BERT V.O.

Come on men, place your bets.
This could be your lucky day!

The coins spin and roll to come into sharp focus against the dirt, one showing its red cross. A sea of cries, both sorrowful
and joyful rise up.

NATHAN HONEYCOMBE (28) kneeling at the forefront of the game in a coat which has seen better days, curses.

NATHAN

(Heavy cockney)

Damn an’ blast it!

He glances at Wallace's watch and stands, but Jem confronts him. Leaning in to Nathan’s ear, his comments - only partially audible in the din - are unwelcome. Wallace can't help but overhear. He becomes interested.

JEM

Honeycombe, heard you got a new job at Dream's. You can pay me back now you're flush.

NATHAN

Someone's pulling your leg.

Nathan pushes Jem away, but GAVIN (40) has heard too.

GAVIN

Dream's?!.. The brothel? Illegal isn't it - a bloke in there? Bet there's some perks though.

Gavin smirks. Nathan looks Gavin firmly in the face.
Not my type. Now I gotta be somewhere.

Nathan would push his way out, but Jem blocks him.

JEM

That’s not what I heard. What about your sister?

Livid, Nathan grabs his collar. Their faces almost touch as Nathan’s words spit like venom.

NATHAN

You leave her out of it.

The Keeper's voice rings out above the crowd. Sounds from the game pursue Nathan derisively. Neil Wallace watches closely as Nathan leaves.

(Scs 1 & 2, pp. 121-122)

Irony is evident in the tone of the voice, through the idea that the cross “mocks” the water tank, and that a “small handwritten banner ‘proclaims’” a labour meeting (Sc 1 para 1). The second scene confirms the reason for this when it becomes clear that rather than attending a meeting, the men are gambling. If this set up seems light-hearted, this is contradicted as the mood worsens. Nathan’s curse (Sc 2 sp 2) signals a more serious mood, which by the end of the scene is decidedly ugly. This is traced firstly through the double curse – “Damn an’ blast it!” (Sc 2 sp 2), then when Jem’s comments are “unwelcome” (Sc 2 para. 4), is confirmed when Nathan pushes Jem (Sc 2 para 5), and becomes concrete in Jem’s behaviour in blocking Nathan’s retreat (Sc 2 para 6). Nathan becomes "livid", so that his words “spit out like venom” (Sc 2 para 7), and when he leaves, the sounds of the game pursue him “derisively” (Sc 2 para 8). The tone remains realistic while the mood has become increasingly threatening. As elements of voice, the realistic style and setting reinforce the sense of an authentic
Australian storyworld, while the mood foreshadows that Caroline, whom we meet next, will be threatened.

Defining the world through everyday life

As our first experience of the story, these two scenes perform an important function in defining the world. The spoken language is written to suggest the Australian location through idiomatic expressions (in italics below) and practices such as the two up game, which is strongly associated with Australian cultural identity through the Australian ANZAC mythology. This is reinforced when the reader is alerted to Nathan’s “cockney” accent (Sc 2 sp 2), implying that this accent is different from those around it. The written language is informal, as colloquialisms and slang are used in instances such as: “stragglers ... duck ‘round the back” (Sc 1 para 1). At the two-up game, Jem uses language such as "now you're flush" (Sc 2 sp 3 - meaning Nathan has money), and Jem’s comments to Nathan are only “partially audible in the din” (Sc 2 para 4 - meaning loud noise). This use of informal language brings the sense of the voice into a relationship of ‘us’ with the characters, particularly because it is used both in the scene text and in the spoken dialogue. The suggestion is a close association between the writer’s and the characters’ modes of expression, implying a strong familiarity with an Australian world, from which readers may make an inference (Phelan, 2005; Lisa Zunshine, 2006) regarding the voice’s national inflection. The language as written can be identified as English (Australian/UK) through the spelling of the word ‘labour’ (Sc 1 para 1).

The screenplay was not written to prove its Australianness. However, if I had sought to be more specific to Kalgoorlie, it would have been possible to mention that men of diverse nationalities (the majority being British) arrived on bicycles, walking or even riding camels, rather than using other forms of transport. A working man may have had the T’Othersider or other local newspaper under his arm. These elements do not appear because they are irrelevant to the plot and emotional storyline. Nevertheless, they are objects which belong to the storyworld and may be inserted through art direction during the screenplay’s production. When noted in the text or seen on the screen these items, which are true to the historical period, lend the world particular authenticity and show the dusty streets to be an Australian (as opposed to American, as was presumed in Cashflow) frontier. Such items can indicate to a reader that
formal research has been undertaken. In doing this, they can add to the reader’s sense of competent writing, as well as authenticity in the voice. In viewing the film, an audience member cannot know whether these items were placed within the frame in the screenplay, by the art director who was charged with creating an authentic historical world, or by the director, who suggested the objects be in the frame, and yet in all cases, their presence will signify an Australian worldview (and the voice of the film).

While the mood of scenes 1 and 2 become progressively angry and aggressive, the following scene introduces the theme of sexual threat. We see the main character, Caroline, for the first time, and are invited to experience the world from her perspective. Here the threat is strongly implied through the visual and aural cues. The sense of threat is developed as part of the dramatic design the screenwriter has imposed on the story.

3. EXT. RAILWAY STATION – DAY

Steam is released from the engine in a deafening hiss as CAROLINE FRANK (16) steps down from the railway carriage and turns wide-eyed to face her future. Like a pox on the land, the litter of industry confronts her: gigantic headframes standing straight and phallic; gaping hell-holes which swallow all; slag heaps dwarf the men who swarm like ants with picks and shovels and wheelbarrows amongst the tents no longer white, but swollen red with dust. This is Kalgoorlie. She gingerly steps down onto the street.

(Sc 3, p.123)

Imagistic prose as an aspect of voice

Many of the choices which define the voice here relate to the language, images and sounds chosen, but these are clearly embellished with greater meaning and effect for the reader through the mode of expression, imagistic prose (Boon, 2008). This is achieved in the language through poetic and literary devices. Though without dialogue, the scene portrays the types of threats Caroline will face, foreshadowing elements of the plot. As stated, the theme of sexual awakening is represented
symbolically throughout the screenplay through permeable barriers—in this case the veil of steam—which is accompanied by an unpleasant sound cue. Caroline is powerless against the threats she faces, which are focused through sexual and body references imposed in the description. These establish the theme of the whole. Performance cues are also written into the text through description.

While language use, images and sound can be thought of as singular, their effect overall is achieved through the dramatic design the screenwriter imposes through their relation to the whole. Dramatic design relates to so many ‘small’ cues active in screenwriting in any one moment that it is often left out of discussions of screenwriting in preference for topics which are more easily articulated. A related matter is that these choices are often credited to the art director, the cinematographer and the director (when the film is viewed), because their meaning becomes more evident when seen in the context of the film, as opposed to being read on the page. I make the point here that the voice attends not only to design at the level of formal craft areas, but takes account of every small cue of language, image and sound which appear in the drama. In this the writer must use their imaginative capacities and mental and emotional intelligence to scrutinise many possible options and choose the most appropriate in order that the dramatic design is expressed in ways which fully support the meaning the writer seeks to convey. When the meaning is well-supported, readers are assisted in visualising the action (see Maras, 2009, pp. 69-78). Voice acts as a ‘controlling consciousness’ to guide all aspects of the written screenplay, and many aspects of the production. This voice, which encompasses cues to realisation, unifies the screenplay as an artistic whole which has been guided by a single vision at the scripting stage (And here, of course, I am speaking of original screen stories written by a single writer or by co-writers). Directors and crew members interpret the text based on the ideas and design which is first expressed through the screenwriter’s voice.

Caroline as a reticent hero

When we first meet the main character, Caroline, she is described as “wide-eyed,” indicating a close shot. From that point, the descriptive text focuses on the industrial site before her, as the theme of sexual threat is developed. The “litter of industry” is a pox on the land, headframes are “phallic,” the mineshafts “gaping holes,” the men
are “dwarfed,” and the tents are “swollen red” as if stained with blood. As in the example sentences given in Part IV, the setting serves to reflect the insignificance of the character amidst the power and size of the surroundings. Caroline is largely ignored within the frame as the other images speak more loudly.

As the writer I felt that the threatening mood of *Calico Dreams* needed to be established early in the screenplay to convince readers of the importance of what is at stake for Caroline: her body-integrity. This was a choice made in order to enhance the drama and create tension, and was seen as important because of the more casual attitude to sex amongst many modern Western societies. Creating this sense of threat, as discussed previously in ‘Creating Voice through Craft,’ was made more difficult because of my commitment to save my female characters from violence. It proved tricky during the writing, to maintain this threat while working within the (realistic) tedium and normalcy of house duties in Caroline’s life at the brothel. As a side note, this issue has larger repercussions in relation to the issue of gender imbalance in screen stories (Francke, 1994; Jacey, 2010; Liddy, 2014; Seger, 2003; Smith, Choueiti, & Pieper, n.d.). Female characters are thought by some film executives (and audiences) to be less interesting because of the servile tasks which are associated with women through their nurturing role in society. In most cases, female characters need to step out of more traditional female roles in order to be deemed interesting enough to appear in screen stories. This leads in many cases to a discrepancy between how women experience their lives, and the portrayal of female lives on the screen.

To a certain extent, the ‘realism’ of Caroline as a character and of the tone set by the genre, added to the difficulties of writing a story where my central protagonist was a timid and relatively passive young girl. Significantly, this scene is the first time we see Caroline, so the impression left by this scene will carry greater weight as readers cumulatively assemble information about her. She is positioned as relatively weak to engender sympathy. It should be noted though, that the assessor felt that this choice presented the risk that audience members would not cheer for Caroline, or would not identify with her as the main character.
On a mythic level, heroes (as a term which is used interchangeably with ‘protagonist’) are made through the actions they perform. Caroline does not perform any heroic actions in this scene, nor does she actually do much on her own account until the disturbance in scene 28. Here the nature of Caroline’s personality and position in life interacts with my own identity and preferences as an Australian screenwriter. I tend to prefer self-effacing and reluctant heroes who arise from amongst ordinary life. Vogler (2007) and Aronson (2000) both note the reluctance of Australian heroes. While Aronson describes Australian heroes as “noble failures” (2000, p. 30), Vogler goes so far as to describe Australia as a “herophobic” culture (Vogler, 2007, p. xx). I argue that Australia is not hero-phobic, but understands the term ‘hero’ differently from a dominant American understanding. The consequences in this case, are manifested through structural choices as well.

Parallel narrative structural pattern a feature of voice
Making the choice of a timid main character meant accepting consequences such as need to develop a complex of storylines (Nathan’s and the Madame’s, as well as Caroline’s) in order to strengthen the dramatic structure and give the screenplay momentum. Doing this allowed me to compensate for Caroline’s passivity, but did also mean that the writing process was complicated. This presented extra challenges, and illustrates the interrelationships between structure and character choices which form the voice. In this case, I describe Calico Dreams as having a parallel narrative structure, though Batty and Walback (2008) describe it as “parallel” storytelling which “features the journey of more than one hero” (p. 146), while Aronson (2000) considers it multiple protagonist/antagonist structure, in which the protagonists and antagonists "take it in turns to fulfil the structural tasks carried out in the normal three-act structure by one character alone" (p.122)

As a passive hero, Caroline begins as a victim of history, rather than its agent (O’Regan 1996; Turner, 1993) – a characteristic which Tom O’Regan (1996) recognises as common to many Australian films (p. 198). Because Caroline began as a naïf, her story needed to allow time for her character to be developed. The scene below represents the second major beat in Caroline’s story, which is her (late) discovery that her place of employment is not a ladies’ boarding house, but a working brothel.
28. EXT. BACK LANE/STREET/BROTHEL - NIGHT

Caroline follows behind while Louisa explains their mission. She is in no way prepared for what she finally sees.

LOUISA

We gotta try 'n sneak in without being seen. That's the main doors. We gotta get through there without being seen... an' we'll be home and hosed.

They arrive on the street.

The scene is as dazzling as a Christmas display, with flashing lights proclaiming "Madame Dream's House of Love". Grubby miners and slick young 'men-about-town' mingle eagerly in the street, jostling, joking, and peering down the stalls when a gate opens.

Caroline stares. Janice, Marguerite and other girls are sitting on chairs, barely clad, and doing suggestive movements or engaging in banter. When a man enters a stall, the gate closes behind him. Caroline reacts in horror when she sees Madeleine emerge from behind a curtain to take up her seat.

With their focus fixed on the house, a man approaches from behind and speaks into Caroline's ear. She screams, falls forward into the street, and flees.

(Sc 28 pp. 150-151)

In the above scene I have highlighted elements of the built environment and the public administration and social infrastructure which are related to the historical circumstances in Kalgoorlie in 1906. I have also underlined the structural beat, which is played out over two stages. During the invention of the world I had imagined the brothel to be bounded by back lanes on two sides, and by a street corner on a third
side. The fourth side is the street frontage (where the action here takes place). Action takes place in all these spatial environments over the course of the screenplay. This scene also depicts a major beat, the disturbance, also called inciting incident/catalyst (Batty & Waldeback, 2008, p. 31), which occurs in two parts. Firstly, Caroline stares in shock as she takes in the scene. Then when a stranger speaks into her ear, she flees.

The disturbance is the beat in which the protagonist becomes aware of a major problem in their lives— a problem which causes them to act. The problem crystallises the character’s goal (and the screenplay’s dramatic question) and supplies the impetus for the protagonist to begin the story’s journey. The question posed here is “will Caroline escape prostitution?” Underlying this is a second question related to the story type, that is, will Caroline ‘come of age’ through facing this problem? This disturbance impacts strongly on Caroline, who is so shocked at the revelation that her place of employment is a brothel that she reacts by fleeing immediately.

In *Calico Dreams*, the lateness of Caroline’s story disturbance, roughly twenty minutes into the film, is caused by and supports the parallel storytelling, and is integral to the structural design in this draft of the screenplay. It is also central to the ensemble nature of the story. Placing Caroline’s disturbance at scene 28 is purposeful, because related to the time taken to set up the three major characters and their situations (Caroline, Nathan and Madame Dream respectively). Their stories interrelate, and each affects the other. In the case of Caroline and Nathan, both characters are flawed, and their interactions lead to healing for both. For Caroline, finally learning to stand up for herself signals her coming of age. In the pages leading up to this, Caroline’s character, naiveté and background have been shown, and various antagonisms have been set up to create uncertainty around her position. This scene (28) is the first time Caroline reacts to what has been growing tension.

For Nathan, becoming involved in Caroline’s plight gives him the opportunity to redeem himself in his own eyes by ‘saving’ her. We have learnt that he is a gambler who has run out of luck. He is employed illegally, a fact his creditors—fellow gamblers—have become aware of. Jem in particular, sees advantage for himself in this, and becomes involved with the lawyer, Neil Wallace in order to leverage some benefit. In an earlier scene, Nathan has failed to meet Caroline at the station, a task
which his employer, Madame Dream required him to complete. We have yet to see the consequences of this for Nathan, though we have seen Nathan threaten Caroline because of it.

The Madame too, has had her ambitions for Caroline thwarted when her offer to partner Sir Richard Glossup in a high class brothel was roundly refused. Instead, she has approached lawyer Neil Wallace, with whom she is previously acquainted. Wallace brutally beat a prostitute at her establishment in the past, and it is a mark of her desperation that she should visit Wallace to propose an alliance of sorts. However, the balance of power between them is uncertain, and drives the tension in the last half of the screenplay. Against this backdrop, Caroline is indeed, a pawn in the game of several powerful players, though ignorant of this. Hence, much ground has been covered and yet the disturbance related to Caroline’s own story has not occurred.

Dramatic beats are placed to modulate dramatic effect for the greatest emotional gratification of readers. As the writer, I must work to attain commitment in my readers towards wanting to know what happens. The parallel narrative structure has allowed me to describe a story in which characters act on each other and tension is created and maintained, even while my main protagonist has taken little or no action in ‘dramatic’ and ‘physical’ terms prior to this.

Caroline is the main protagonist in Calico Dreams because she is the character who undergoes substantial transformation through the story. Nathan too, is redeemed, but only through his involvement with Caroline’s plight. It is her story which enables his to play out. The Madame is a major character in her own story, and an antagonist to Caroline and Nathan, but she is not changed by her experiences. Using parallel narrative structure, the scenes before the disturbance were used to create the web of intrigue Caroline unknowingly steps into.

On another point, genre itself is a major choice which is an index to voice, and which also impacts and constrains some choices within the voice. Calico Dreams is partly described as melodrama because the narrative is “concerned with emotional states and impact” (Bordwell, 1985; cited in Moran & Vieth, 2006, p. 191) of the characters.
on each other, more than on or in the world.

Voice relies on the moral sensibilities of the writer

A further important point I would like to make with regard to structural design is that guidance towards the ordering of beats and scenes comes from within the human body. A screenplay’s tone and mood must be carefully modulated between relaxation and pleasurable feelings, and tension which causes stress. Writers judge the level of these based on a combination of embodied reactions, intuition and mental effort to assemble the screenplay elements and place them in the right order and at the right degree of intensity to keep momentum, tension and catharsis in balance. When this is successful, the audience becomes engaged and remains so for the length of the drama. This suggests that the voice of a screenplay can be described in terms of the decisions regarding tension and release, the balance between light moments and more serious moments, and the affect the writer achieves through this. A screenplay develops significantly over subsequent drafts. Therefore, while early drafts are often concerned with placing the correct elements in the right order to establish a strong framework for the story through dramatic design, later drafts are more concerned with ‘finessing’ the design to achieve the most compelling emotional flow and movement between scenes. It is at this point that the screenwriter attends most carefully to the levels of tension, intensity and cathartic release, to perfect the emotional experience they imagine their readers (viewers) will gain.

Ordinary and ugliness of the world a characteristic of this Australian voice

*Calico Dreams* displays what has been recognised as an Australian preoccupation with ordinariness and ugliness (O’Regan 1996, p. 233). Supported by this is a worldview which focuses on the experience of the ‘common man’ (Turner, 1993, p. 108), or in this case, women. In *Calico Dreams* this ordinariness and ugliness is clearly displayed in the locations in which the story takes place. In the scene above, the screenplay draws a specifically Australian portrait of how clients and prostitutes met through gated ‘starting stalls’ at the front of the brothel (C. Galvin, personal communication, 3 Dec 2011). To a rural Australian, these stalls bear a striking resemblance to sheep runs, through which livestock are driven to be treated against parasites, be castrated, or have their tails or testicles removed. This positions both
the prostitutes and clients as disturbingly interchangeable with animals. In the scene
which follows, the interior of the brothel is shown to be dingy, grubby and a site of
ordinary ugliness:

65. INT. PARLOUR - DAY (INTERCUT)
The parlour is dark and silent when Caroline enters. She gropes for a cord to the electric light without finding it. She shrinks from the touch of the velvet curtain and bumps against a side table with a lamp on it.

SFX Click

The parlour is suddenly illuminated with a sombre light.

She opens the piano. Carefully touching a key she begins to play a beautiful classical piece, staring at the velvet curtain while playing.

Having played the last chords, she creeps forward and disappears beyond the curtain.

66. INT. PHOTOGRAPHIC STUDIO - DAY (INTERCUT)

DANCE NUMBER #2

Lisette and three other women come into the studio. The youngest, JEANNE (17) is aghast at the glass ceiling, while ANNETTE (25) goes straight to the dressing area to rifle through the silks and furs. MIMI (22) stands with Lisette.

MIMI

[French accent]
C'est magnifique, Lisette. .. Maybe we can have our soiree here?
Mimi takes an *industrial light* by its post and wheels it to the wall. Jeanne and Annette remove the flat from behind a mayoral desk, leaving the heavy clerical furnishings in front of a bathroom frieze.

The girls play around: their stretches on chairs, desks, with costumes,.. become a *dance number* as Mimi finds the *gramophone* and sets it playing. It merges with Caroline’s music. When the music is over, the space is clear for them to begin. Lisette claps her hands together.

**LISETTE**

Maybe.. But for now we have to move the furniture. .. Avec soin.

**LISETTE** (CONT’D)

So.. what should we do?
the ground. Caroline starts. Her eyes are drawn to faded drawings on the wall.

She draws closer. They are of naked women. Still others show naked men. She looks with intense interest.

She notices the picture facing the bed. She moves to it. It is a scene from the Kamasutra: a man with a huge phallus is entering a willing woman. Caroline stares, horror and fascination mixed.

Nathan appears at the door. On seeing Caroline mixed emotions cross his face. He comes towards her silently. Taking a strand of her hair, he smells it. Caroline freezes in panic. His voice is hollow and hoarse when he finally speaks.

NATHAN

You’re so like my sister. Even smell like her.

Caroline turns in terror. Stifling her scream she pushes violently past him, and flees.

NATHAN (CONT’D)

Caroline!

Disturbed, Nathan turns to go, but picks up the fallen object, a wooden dildo. He looks at it for a moment before realization dawns and he drops it quickly.

NATHAN (CONT’D)

Filthy bastard!
He hurries out.

(Scs 65-68, pp. 184-187)

Authenticity in the voice through description of the world

Tom O’Regan (1996) proposes that Australian films often display ordinariness and ugliness (p. 243) as part of a ‘warts and all’ Australian social realism. In the sequence just presented there are many cues to the ordinariness and ugliness of the world, from the “dim light” (Sc 67 para 1) and washing basket (Sc 67 para 2), to the sheets which are “awry,” the “rough crate” and the “faded drawings” (Sc 68 para 2). These also relate to the sordid representation of the brothel.

Other voice choices related to the authenticity of the world are historically-based, for example, the reticulated electricity - public administration and social infrastructure (Kingsbury, 1945; Unattributed, 1910b); the piano - customs and practices of the people (Pascoe & Thomson, 2010, p. 132); and the glass ceiling of the photographic studio – natural and built environment (Pascoe & Thomson, 2010, p. 9. The practice of can-can dancing is documented in news reports of the time, and is associated with the presence of French prostitutes (King, 1988; Milentis & Bridge, 2004; Webb, 1993).

Screenwriters do not always pursue historical research on the world of their story before imagining and writing it. In this case, some effort has been expended in order that the world may be depicted in a realistic way so that it will come across as authentic to readers. This aids in the reader’s suspension of disbelief, and can encourage the reader to bond with the writer who has impressed him with her craft competency and creative/imaginative depiction of the past.

Theme of transgression developed through mood, pace and staging

As with the disturbance (previously discussed), this sequence leads in to an important emotional beat in Caroline’s story in which she learns what the sex act actually entails. While describing a beat is a function related to the structure of the
screenplay, in this case the beat is also related to Caroline’s characterisation of as an inexperienced (naive) girl, and to the development of the theme of ‘purity’ versus ‘soiled.’ As a young Victorian woman she has been kept in ignorance and now, for the first time, she experiences the complex sexual feelings and emotions excited through graphic pictures of naked adult bodies. She is fascinated, horrified and terrified all at once.

The mood of these scenes: the furtive alertness on Caroline’s part (she “creeps” Sc 65 para 4); the dingy rooms and lighting, described as “dark and silent” (Sc 65 para 1), suggest muted colours and lighting to give the impression of an underworld. She travels through labyrinthine corridors. When she is at the bedroom and finally turns on a light it “glares” (sc 68 para 1), but what is illuminated is “shabby,” “rough” and ill-kept (“awry”) (Sc 68 para 1). She gains information which shocks her, and yet she experiences the excitement (and fear) of her own emerging sexuality. The ordinariness and ugliness reflects the relatively ‘bleak’ Australian view of male – female relationships (O'Regan, 1996, p. 21), mentioned previously (Dermody & Jacka, 1988; Fiske, Hodge & Turner, 1987; Morris, 1980, 1988, 1989; O'Regan, 1996).

The staging of the beat over a sequence of scenes of which this discovery is the climax, deliberately removes Caroline from the everyday world happening around her. Caroline has snuck into a part of the brothel which she has been forbidden to enter. Thus the staging and sets (dinginess, creeping, ‘permeable barriers’ such as the velvet curtain) create an air of mystery and also of transgression. The mysteriousness will only be enhanced in its realisation because visually, these rooms are interior with no access to daylight. We have not previously seen this part of the brothel. The dramatic design allows for Caroline’s development as a person to be tracked as she undergoes a symbolic and transformative journey which in reality, encompasses only a few metres in the brothel space.

The decision to stage the beat over several scenes achieves certain goals: it builds suspense and tension, and also adds to the air of mystery, while slowing the pace of the story. Withholding the ‘pay-off’ in the sequence which represents a journey towards knowledge, shows a certain confidence in the writer’s voice, which may
again be considered competent because of the use of such strategies.

As noted, Caroline is at first shown to be unheroic, through the way she is intimidated by many of the new surroundings she encounters in Kalgoorlie. In this scene she “shrinks” from a touch (Sc 65, para 1), is “careful” with the piano (Sc 65 para 3) and “stares” at the velvet curtain behind which she has been forbidden to go (Sc 65 para 3). She finally gains the courage to “creep forward” (Sc 65 para 4). The use of verbs, her actions and their descriptions add to the tone and mood, and also indicate what sort of person Caroline is. Her actions show unease and discomfort, and are contrasted with the actions of the French dancers who enter the photographic studio (Sc 66), “rifle through” silks and furs (Sc 66 para 3), and move furniture to suit themselves (Sc 66 paras 2 & 3). Here, the use of contrast between the actions and behaviours of two sets of characters highlights the dramatic design in the writing (Koivumaki, 2011), and enhances the emotional impact of the scenes. These are choices of voice.

One further ramification of Caroline’s situation in Kalgoorlie is her relative isolation from mentors and friends. This has consequences which aid in the development of the dramatic world (her threatenedness). However, lacking a close friend to confide in means that Caroline’s emotional world cannot easily be conveyed through conversation. Other characters tend to dominate her, and Caroline’s voice is heard less often. This is compensated for by her piano playing, which allows Caroline’s emotional range to be shown. The music she plays in scene 65 will indicate her vacillation while deciding whether to take the risk of venturing into areas of the brothel which have been forbidden to her. In other scenes in the screenplay, other states of mind are illuminated: anger, determination, longing and frustration. This strategy was used effectively in The Piano (Campion, 1993) as a way to illustrate the mute main character, Ada’s complex inner world (Michael Nyman [composer], cited in Campion, 1993, p. 150).

As a strategy, her ability to play beautiful music is adopted to create sympathy for her amongst viewers (though this is less effective for readers). It also adds to the sense that there is more to know of Caroline. Though young and timid, she is a protagonist who has multiple facets to her personality. This level of thought towards
character exposition and development is a characteristic of this voice, and is part of
the basis for the argument, made earlier, that the screenwriter has taken a
sympathetic stance towards the characters. In general, these small personal details
reflect a voice in which characters and character development are privileged over
fast-paced action. This is achieved at all levels of story, from the choices of genre,
character, storyworld, structure and themes, to the careful development of tone and
mood through the content: language, images and sounds. The competence in the
voice is evidenced through the ways that each element supports others, creating a
coheseive system of the screenplay. This is the basis upon which I have argued at
various points within this exegesis that the voice unifies a screenplay as an artistic
and aesthetic whole. It is this level of consistency in matching choices across all areas
to tell a more powerful story, which evidence the control which voice exercises over
the creative process. This control becomes more powerful as greater competence is
gained through longevity of practice.

Authenticity through speech

Amongst the characters, a large number of different ethnic and national backgrounds
are present. Lisette and her dancers represent the many French prostitutes who
travelled to the Western Australian goldfields. People of other ethnic backgrounds
who are present in the screenplay reflect the historical and factual roots of the story.
Representations of multiculturalism are noted by O'Regan as a feature of many
Australian films (O'Regan, 1996, p. 21). A multicultural cast presents the writer with
choices regarding the representation of accents within the dialogue. I have chosen to
represent speech characteristics through verisimilitude in the written language
(Boon, 2008, p. 266) using lexicon, grammar and spelling. In scene 5, three characters
speak with three different accents. Veronica is Australian:

VERONICA
You, French slut! This is our beat.
Ya got no rights 'ere. Push off.

LISETTE
(French accent)
You gonna make me? (to man) 'Ey
The policeman Hamish McDougall is Scots:

MCDougall

(Scots accent)

Ach,.. Lisette, ya turnin' inta a nuisance. .. (to Veronica) And you lasses go home. Or else!

(Sc 5, pp. 125)

This representation of a multicultural world supports the impression of authenticity regarding Australia being as it was at that time, because it reflects the population mix as it would have been, thus reaffirming the Australian national inflection.

Use of sets and props to elaborate character and develop themes

Characterisation can be expanded through the use of props and plants in screenwriting. Props (‘properties’) are small objects occurring in the world which take on significance through their use/presence. These often come to take on symbolic meaning specific to the story. A plant is an instance when an object/person, word/phrase or idea is used, which is later repeated for dramatic purpose. This element becomes a motif which links scenes through the associated ideas, and adds emphasis for dramatic or comic effect. One such prop in *Calico Dreams* is the washing basket. The washing basket embodies the themes of intimacy and ‘soiled’ objects, and it represents the contrast between cleanliness (‘purity’) and the sordid nature of the prostitution which is carried out in the brothel. Washing baskets also reference an ‘everyday’ life lived by common people (Turner, 1993, p. 108).

The washing basket is used in many ways in *Calico Dreams*. The presence of the washing basket in the corridor (Sc 67 para 2) emphasises Caroline’s transgression, and connects her act (going into spaces she is not permitted to enter) with ‘dirty secrets’ which she mustn’t know (and ‘dirty’ acts). As an Australian inflection, washing baskets symbolise a dislike of the ‘tall poppy’; everyone is made equal when reduced to their underwear. Thematically, the washing basket relates to bodies and intimacy which are both public and private.
As mentioned, the themes around prostitution are explored in the visual style through symbols of ‘cleanliness’ and washing in the *mise-en-scène*, and the repetition of permeable barriers/veiled spaces in the production design and locations I chose, where my intention was to allude to virginity. In previous scenes the loose sheet of galvanised iron in the backyard is entrance and exit in an otherwise impermeable fence. In scene 65, the thick velvet curtain is the barrier between the living areas and the bedrooms where the ‘business’ is carried on, and where Caroline is forbidden to go. In the scene to follow (114), the permeable barrier is the dust which swirls around Caroline as she wanders in distress. The confusion of dust and wind also signals the confusion and distress of her mind, as she reels from her recent experience (an attempted rape) and its implications.

Use of sound / poetic to create an impression of apperception, art cinema

The experience of writing can be intense, and involves the screenwriter not simply with words, but with a total experience. Ideas come from the mind, in which there are no restrictions on size, shape and complexity. But while most scenes have specific images embedded within the text which express intended coverage, this scene suggests images through the description of a soundscape, which reflects the ‘unseeingness’ of Caroline’s state of mind. In the following, the elements of the genre art cinema are apparent through the suggestion of an auteurist approach to visual design (Moran & Vieth, 2006, p. 32) shown in the scene’s description:

114. EXT. TENT CITY - DAY

Caroline walks amongst *makeshift dwellings*. The *dust* blows around her feet and into her face, but she barely reacts. The distorted soundscape of wind punctuated by flapping cloth, an *occasional call between men, a dog in the distance and laughter around a communal fireplace* fails to penetrate her silence. Instead these sounds accentuate her loneliness. Bereft of purpose in a sea of *canvas and scrap* she wanders.
She approaches a **rough dwelling where**, still steaming, a **billy** sits on a **wheelbarrow** loaded with **prospecting implements**. With a small spark of energy Caroline approaches and lifts it to her lips, gulping the remains of the **tea** within. She chokes, dropping the billy as she spits the tea leaves out on the ground. The sound alerts the occupant **JACK DAWKINS** (56), who bursts out of the **tent**.

**JACK**

What're you doing? That's my tea!

Caroline looks at him, then her body doubles over and she vomits violently. He holds her up, then brings her awkwardly into the tent.

(Sc 114, pp. 221-222)

In this scene an impressionistic visual style is implied in the writing. The “**distorted soundscape**” (Sc 114 para 1) includes: “an occasional call between men, a dog in the distance and laughter around a communal fireplace” (Sc 114 para 1). I describe the style as impressionistic because what is described is not specific to what is occurring, but gives a general impression of what may be happening around Caroline. The dramatic emphasis falls on the “**general conditions besetting the characters**” (Moran & Vieth, 2006, p. 31). This suggests an art cinema visual and narrative style, in which an “**authorial expressivity**” (2006, p. 32) is invited by the images and sounds, while the coverage in images is not fully described.

The scene shows Caroline walking amongst the miner’s tents – a no man’s land of canvas, dust and meagre living (Sc 114 para 1). She pays no attention to the dust which blows in to her eyes (Sc 114 para 1), suggesting a blankness of vision. The dust acts as a symbolic veil separating her from the environment she is in, as well as from full consciousness. She is ill (from alcohol consumption) and in shock. She wanders without purpose, but the use of the word “**bereft**” is suggestive of a state of loss. Caroline’s loss at this point in the script is in her belief that if she remains ‘good’ she will be treated well. She has just experienced an attempted rape organised, she believes, by her employer. She no longer feels she can return to the brothel, and yet
her only alternative is to starve on the streets. Her state of apperception is noted in the statement that sounds “fail to penetrate her silence” (Sc 114 para 1).

One of the characteristics of art cinema generically, is the reliance on “psychological causation” (Moran & Vieth, 2006, pp. 31-32) of events, where the character lacks “defined desires and goals” (p. 32). Moran and Vieth note that art cinema “disrupts the tighter, cause-effect linkage of a Hollywood-like cinema, in favour of a looser, more sketchy relationship between narrative events” (2006, p. 31), which is the case here, where the scene suggests an abandonment of purpose in Caroline’s actions.

In the scene, sound effects are cued which are intended to suggest the images which will accompany Caroline’s purposeless wandering. A state of mind and scene coverage are written into the text through images of: “flapping cloth” of a tent; “men” calling out to each other; “a dog”; and a “communal fireplace” around which men are laughing (Sc 114 para 1). These are the things that Caroline is not seeing, and yet they offer the director material from which to design a montage which happens around Caroline as she walks. This montage mirrors the action (Caroline’s sense of loss as she walks) in images, while the “distorted soundscape” (Sc 114 para 1) emphasises the apperception Caroline experiences, and therefore adds a specific mood. This strategy exploits the capacity of readers to mind-read meaning (Zunshine, 2006, p. 4) through mood, visual and aural cues, as was described in Part IV.

In this scene it is sound which enables me, the screenwriter, to incorporate the apperception of Caroline’s state of mind while she is shown to wander in a material world. This supports and extends Batty and Waldeback’s statement that sound is the “unconscious” of the cinema (2008, p. 157), and ties sound cues to the conscious experience of the character as well – though an ‘altered reality’ form of consciousness. While not all screenwriters think aurally as well as visually, it is a characteristic of the voice in *Calico Dreams* that it accentuates moments, mood, and the drama through sound cues (seen in Scenes 1, 2, 3, 65, 66 and again here).

This scene shows an Australian world with some specificity, a specificity which will be enhanced through its realisation on location amongst Australian landscapes, soil, vegetation, and open skies (natural and built environments). The excerpt also
includes depictions of **Australian people – their habits and practices** - including language. Here the term ‘billy’ (Sc 114 para 2) meaning a pot in which to boil water over a fire, is an Australian term. The makeshift nature of the dwellings, the sense of communal living and the low status of Jack and his compatriots who live this lifestyle, suggest the historical circumstances of the times. The experience of community which originated a specific Australian mythology (Turner, 1993, pp. 96-98), and collectivism (Morris, 2016, p. 96) which some scholars argue arose from this, originated only a decade before this story is set (in the 1890s - Turner, 1993, p. 111). The world could be described as ordinary and ugly by some commentators.

The habit of drinking tea, tents as rough dwellings, communal fireplaces and dogs, wind and dust, and prospecting implements are **art and design elements** which also speak to a lifestyle which was intrinsic to the goldfields in Kalgoorlie. While these may be general to other goldrushes of the era in other nations, it is the many small cues of soil, vegetation, climate (‘aridity’), labels on the crates and tins used to construct the dwellings and crude furniture, and so on which will identify the scene as Australian when realised through art and design elements used in the production. Through competent art direction, these elements will all support the Australian inflection which is implied in the written screenplay, which become part of the voice of the film.

**Voice as a filtering, controlling consciousness**

In discussing language, images and sound here I have demonstrated that the voice uses elements from everyday life to build the Australian world through settings, art direction and design. However, the voice can only describe this world insofar as the dramatic design of plot and emotional storylines allows. Extraneous elements which do not serve the drama and overall style have no place in the screenplay because the discipline of screenwriting requires brevity (though they can accompany it as separate notes).

This demonstrates the way that the voice must act as a filter, and for this reason I have referred to it as a ‘controlling consciousness’ at points in this thesis. As has been reiterated, this filtering function operates through the mechanism of choice. Choice is the reason that some elements which would elaborate the world and confirm its
national inflection more specifically may not appear in the text, though in the writer’s mind they are present in the scene or the world. The dramatic design is the screenwriter’s primary concern, and extraneous elements can confuse or misdirect the reader’s understanding of the action. More than other forms of fictional writing, it is the expression of the design in concrete forms which implies competence in screenwriting form. Such expression, given at the level of structure and formal craft and also at the level of props and small cues in the text, directs the reader in interpreting meaning through the intentional nature of each cue described in the text.

Summary - Describing Voice of Calico Dreams

The analysis above is based on the application of the conceptual framework for screenwriter’s voice to Calico Dreams. The case study illustrates the analysis of voice based on the structural design, storyworld, characterisation, themes and genre, and through the choices of language, images and sounds, and of tone, mood and specific instances of content. These suggest competence in the medium shown through dramatic design, use of language, through imagistic prose and through familiarity with the medium using the power of vision and sound cues.

The dramatic design created tone and mood (threat), and positioned the characters as weak, strong, empowered or dis-empowered. Dramatic design revealed the development of dramatic structure through successive beats. The themes were also developed through beats, and were expressed using content, plants and props to deepen the reader’s understanding of the world, characters and situations. Characteristics of the voice included the use of sounds; imagistic prose; and poetic devices through language which was often informal, and showed some irony within a generally serious tone. The pace was varied, including slower scenes of mystery, transgression and apperception. The Australianness of the storyworld and its elements add significant meaning as the screen story unfolds, and this in turn adds a sense of authenticity (and thus credibility) to the screenwriter’s voice.

The screenplay’s Australian origins were shown to be inscribed through the language; the depiction of people, their habits and practices; through the natural and built environment and art and design elements; and through the public administration and
social infrastructure shown or implied. The world is drawn with some specificity, giving the screenplay a “sense of place” (see Appendix D, Connell, 2014, p. 443) which, according to the Australian Writers Guild assessor, will become stronger through subsequent drafts (see Appendix D, Connell, 2014, p. 443). These elements served to imply an Australian inflection in the voice which was not contradicted by other extraneous elements related to other cultural-national groups. Though French and other nationalities are represented amongst the characters, these do not disrupt this sense of an Australian storyworld because of the balance and focus maintained with other Australian elements. In a globalised world, it is often the specific mix of different ethnicities in one location which confirms the location, rather than its cultural-national ‘purity’.

For the sake of those parts of this thesis which dwelt on other aspects of screenwriting which exhibit voice, I will suggest these descriptors of the voice behind Calico Dreams. I would use phrases such as ‘has a female perspective,’ based on the large number of female characters; that the main protagonist and antagonist are women; and that the screenplay is set in a brothel and its subject matter is prostitution. I consider the focus on the interior world of the female characters a significant detail in suggesting this. I may describe the writing style as poetic, visual; competent. The characters may be described as having depth or being complex, well-rounded, realistic or recognisable. The voice may be considered compassionate, moralistic or sympathetic when assessed based on its treatment of the characters. The genre may be described as a period film or an historical drama. The story may be described overall as a portrait of prostitution in the Kalgoorlie gold rush at the turn of the twentieth century.

The above offers a range of options related to how a voice may be described. Each reader will of course, describe the voice differently based on their own reception of the text. Such a reception can be informed by the reader’s prior knowledge of screenwriting, of Australia, of Australian films, and of any number of other subject matters with which the screen story intersects. In the final analysis it will be the reader’s personal understanding of the screen story which governs their sense and description of the voice. In this regard, the argument that a screenplay is a dialogic text through which “individual differences and contradictions are enriched by the
social heteroglossia” (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 284) is extended beyond the text, and even beyond its immediate reception, to the backgrounds and histories of its readers. This perhaps explains some of the ongoing fascination of readers with fictional stories which engage them personally in different ways.

Though an array of descriptions of voice may result from inviting readers to describe their responses to any screenplay, the value of this can be great. Humanity has since time immemorial, come together, nurtured and learnt from each other through story. Even in its plainest form, describing voice can be useful to screenwriters and filmmakers who seek to deepen their understanding of the craft of storytelling for film. If stories deepen our collective understanding of what it is to be human, then an awareness and understanding of voice can illuminate the experience of being human even further, through the way voice opens us to a deeper interrogation of our own responses to story, and where these come from. Beyond this, describing voice can benefit anyone who seeks to understand more of the craft behind the films they view and love.
Part VI - Conclusions

This thesis represents a substantial contribution to knowledge in several ways. Its critical analysis of previous (scant) theories of voice in screenwriting, most particularly that of Dancyger, Rush and Baughman, demonstrate the gap which has existed in knowledge regarding screenwriter’s voice. This theory of voice in screenwriting is important to the field of screenwriting. I argue that it is also tangentially important to film studies and film criticism, because it clarifies the relations between these by disentangling the screenwriter’s role from that of film practitioners. In this, it corrects many of the misunderstandings inherited through scholarship. In such scholarship and criticism, the role of the director has tended to be conflated with that of the technicians who help to create a film, but most specifically, the screenwriter. The value of the screenplay has also been diminished in film discourses in the face of its child, the film. This research has been undertaken from the perspective of one who is familiar with both screenwriting and filmmaking as practices, within an industrial as well as a theoretical context. Its relevance to the field, therefore, is well-founded.

The research can be valued too, because of the relatively recent development of a discourse of screenwriting, through which screenwriting is understood on its own terms rather than being ‘spoken for’ by other disciplines. This theory of voice can be placed centrally to such a discourse because it touches on so many of the relations which exist around the practice of screenwriting, and the understanding of screenwriting within the nexus of film production. The research speaks then, to screenwriters as individual practitioners; to screenwriting as an industrial form of writing which entails specific relations to industry, business and financing of films; to filmmakers, whose ability to read and understand nuanced screenwriting is central to their own craft; and to film critics, who, through the framework for screenwriter’s voice, are offered a tool which can enhance their role as assessors of films. The framework is as useful to students and fans whose interest in screenwriting and films is only new, as it is to practitioners whose involvement with the film industry is substantial and professional. It is also valuable to the large number of executives who are involved in developing, managing, buying and selling film projects. The concept of a national inflection in voice is also highly relevant to related areas to do with arts
and cultural policy and administration.

The thesis presented demonstrates an understanding of the field of screenwriting as both a craft and practice, and as a set of industrial relations and theoretical perspectives. The first rationale argued for the research as new knowledge by pointing out the bias inherent in a film studies approach to voice, in which the film is the text in which voice is claimed to reside. This section demonstrated that dramatic and narrative voice as theorised by Dancyger, Rush and Baughman was not a replacement for a concept of voice which embraces voice from the perspective of screenwriting and screenwriters. It therefore supported the notion that the research represents substantial new knowledge.

Implied in the research outcomes – particularly in the formulation and description of a framework to represent screenwriter’s voice including its national inflection – is a methodology through which screenplays can be interrogated for voice, and for national-cultural inflection within the voice. Though related to the argument for personal voice, this is an area which deserves deeper interrogation than has been possible here.

The newness of the knowledge presented here raised the issue of its general validity and applicability to screenwriters and many others. This was answered through the questionnaire on screenwriter’s voice which was undertaken during the research in order to test the relevance of the theory of voice being developed. Though not a rationale in itself, it provided confirmation of the appropriateness of the direction of the research, and of the methodology. Thus, the questionnaire represents a demonstration of the significance of the research for practitioners, to some of whom the research speaks.

Overall, the research has offered ways to understand and locate voice in a screenplay through the concept of an identifiable screenwriter’s voice. Part I ‘Origins of the Research’ introduced and described how the project came about through the recognition of an American voice in a screenplay written two decades ago. It
introduced the research question which arose through this incident. It argued for the creative and practical nature of the research methodology, which combined approaches from creative writing, qualitative research methods, visual and multimediial methods, and auto-ethnographic methods, including diarizing, reflective and imaginative writing, and visual design work. The introduction also argued for the relevance of the research to individual practice, to scholarship, and to industry and arts policy.

Part II ‘Introduction to the field,’ established that the concept of voice is applicable to screenwriting by canvassing attitudes to voice amongst screenwriters in Australia and elsewhere. I then introduced Dancyger, Rush and Baughman’s concepts of narrative and dramatic voice, arguing that these ideas are inadequate as a way to understand voice in screenwriting. This provided the rationale for this research. This section then argued for the significance of the research, based on its centrality to an emerging discourse of screenwriting. This argument was founded on the importance of a discussion on voice at this time, as screenwriting is being reframed within intersecting discourses both in the academy, and in the wider (increasingly globalised) world of film industries internationally.

Part III addressed the circumstances surrounding screenwriter’s voice, both in theory and in its wider industrial context. This part defined voice as the pervasive authorial presence of the screenwriter in the text, and expanded on this definition through foundational statements which clarified the specific understanding of voice in screenwriting in the thesis. The principle which underpins this argument for voice is that wherever there is writing, there is voice, and wherever there is voice, there is national inflection. This was argued on the basis of the mind as the source of voice, which reflects the personhood, including national identity, of the writer. It was argued that it is the choices a screenwriter makes which form the voice in a text, since these create the overall stylistic continuities of any text which unify it as an artistic and aesthetic whole. An approach to the description of voice was also offered, which emphasised that all observations of voice are valid, though perhaps only for the observer. Discerning voice was described as a process of indexing tendencies.
The practice, described in Part IV, confirmed that voice can be discovered through the exposition of factors influencing the writer as they make choices in the flow of practice. This section described some of the factors which were operative in the writing of *Calico Dreams*. The framework for screenwriter’s voice was then presented, and each craft area was described to suggest the areas most fruitful for understanding and characterising these aspects of voice.

Part V built on this when it presented the screenplay, *Calico Dreams*, and then analysed its voice in the ‘Case Study’. The analysis showed that the voice in *Calico Dreams* can be substantiated on many levels by reference to the screenplay’s textual elements. The applicability of the framework areas was demonstrated, leading to a description of the voice as female and Australian, amongst its other characteristics.

Interrogation, observation and self-reflection on the practice of screenwriting has been the basis of this research practice / practice research. The practice has revealed new knowledge through the exposition of screenwriting practice, and through the results of that practice – a theory of screenwriter’s voice and a framework diagram which depicts the elements of a voice and suggests the relationships amongst these. This is argued to be new knowledge, since no other theory of screenwriter’s voice has been found to exist, which interrogates the concept of voice in screenwriting to any depth or breadth.

**Findings**

The research has shown that screenwriter’s voice is the controlling consciousness of the screenwriter as it is present in the text, and this voice is inscribed in the text through the choices the screenwriter makes. These choices can be more easily discerned using the areas suggested within the framework for screenwriter’s voice, which is a tool to guide the interrogation of a screenplay text. Such interrogation can illuminate voice within the text through the choices made. The framework can be used to uncover personal voice. To a limited extent, a national inflection which is related to the writer’s own personal worldview and national context, can also be discerned using the framework as a guide.
Several principles support this argument for voice, and reveal further aspects of voice in screenwriting. Firstly, the screenplay is seen here as a coherent, stand-alone artwork and the screenwriter/s is considered the screenplay’s author/s. Moreover, the research belongs to a discourse of screenwriting, which understands screenwriting from within the craft and business of screenwriting itself. In this case, the perspective which informs this topic is most specifically a practitioner’s perspective, and the research has been undertaken through a creative practice methodology. The practice of writing an original dramatic screenplay was central to the research, however, I propose that voice need not to be limited to original works, nor to drama itself. This statement suggests an area for further research.

The research argues that perceiving voice is always consequential upon a reader’s responses to the text, and that reading voice remains a process of indexing tendencies and registering impressions. All observations of voice are personal and valid, though not universal. This is the case in any judgement made of the aesthetic value of any text, under any circumstances. The principle behind any argument for voice is that the choices which screenwriters make while writing, inscribe a personhood into the text, which is based on the writer’s own unique life experiences, personality and identity. Thus, any voice is an expression of a particular writer’s personhood. This thesis substantiates the ways that voice ties a work to the determinate intelligence, moral and aesthetic sensibilities of the screenwriter. Encompassed within this is the understanding that any instance of voice draws on a subset of the writer’s qualities, traits, beliefs and experiences. Voice then, is not commensurate with the whole writer, and yet speaks to the complexity of human identity.

Voice generally can be evidenced by the stylistic continuities which a reader discovers in a work, which unify it as an aesthetic and artistic whole. That individual screenwriters can have a strong sense of their own voice and can articulate this is evidenced in the Report on the screenwriter’s questionnaire (Appendix F). It follows that the personal style and philosophy of a writer can become noticeable as readers become familiar with several works by the same writer, and this evidences what may be thought of as a “range” which can define any particular voice.
Voice is understood to be specific only to the text which expresses it, and in the case of multiple writers, can be described as the ‘voice of the screenplay.’ A further proposition which can be made based on this work is that voice may also be able to be discerned, defined and described for any film, in which case it would be termed the ‘voice of the film,’ in recognition of the input of multiple practitioners to the filmmaking process. This again, suggests an area for further research.

This research understands the relationships between craft components, ideas and signification within a screenplay text to be entirely entangled, meaning that voice and national inflection—though different concepts—complement each other and cannot be disentangled, though focus can fall on one concept or the other. In general, voice encompasses national inflection, while national inflection can be thought of as a subset of voice.

The thesis addresses the research question by defining and describing voice, and illuminating the processes by which voice is inscribed and can be discerned in a screenplay. In doing this, it speaks to the rationale described in ‘Origins of the Research.’ But the deeper aim underlying this, is to build a greater understanding of the labour which screenwriting entails, and the extent to which the screenwriter writes their particular worldview into the text through their unique screenwriter’s voice. A discourse of screenwriting that recognises voice as a phenomenon which is central to the value of any screenplay, can enrich the understandings surrounding the text and its film, and can advocate for screenwriting scholarship as rich and rigorous research.
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Summary
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INTRODUCTION

TED GRIFFITHS, the Bank Manager in the wild west town of Bristly Hills, has no respect. He has no respect for the security of his clients’ savings, no respect for the sanctity of womanhood, and certainly no respect for MR X, the hood he plans to hire to find the bankrobber JIMMY CASHFLOW.

MR X senses this, and refuses the job. So CAGNEY takes it.

Cagney also has no respect. No respect for Ted, her client: no respect for MADAME DREAM, the proprietress of the brothel where she works; and no respect for... Well, but that’s different. Cagney truly loves Jimmy even if as a bankrobber he is, .. well, .. unsuccessful, and as a beau he is mostly absent..

In a sleepy little hollow in the big wild west, one thing is on everyone’s mind... CASHFLOW.
SYNOPSIS
In this wild west spoof CAGNEY FRAZER, a gentleman’s escort, is engaged by TED GRIFFITHS, the Manager of the Bristly Hills Bank, to find the bank robber JIMMY CASHFLOW.

CAGNEY needs the money to buy her freedom from the brothel and MADAME DREAM, who will do everything in her power to force Cagney to become a prostitute. And for Cagney the task is not difficult, since Jimmy is her lover.

Ted wants to hire Jimmy to rob his bank to cover up his own embezzlement. However, when Jimmy is chased from the brothel Cagney is forced to meet Ted empty-handed, and then return to face a livid Dream. In retaliation, Dream organizes an appointment with their most vicious client. Cagney’s friend MADELEINE goes in her place, sending Cagney instead to find Jimmy.

While out Cagney, posing as Clarabelle Rockford - heiress, charms Ted into considering a loan request. Madeleine returns from her appointment having been badly beaten by RICHARD GLOSSUP, and Cagney resolves not to leave the brothel without her friend.

Madame Dream is asking $1000 each for their freedom, so Cagney collects the loot from Jimmy’s previous robbery, knowing it is counterfeit. She leaves most of it in Ted’s safe, and presents Dream with the $2000. Madame Dream however, has no intention of letting them go, and orders Cagney’s punishment. Jimmy interrupts, asking to see Cagney in order to retrieve the loot, which could be traceable to himself or Cagney.

Cagney persuades Jimmy to take her out to see Ted. Ted refuses to return the money, and Cagney discovers there is to be an internal audit of the bank. Ted promises to meet her with the money this evening. Meanwhile however, Ted is alerted to Cagney’s deception, and plans to take his revenge.

They meet, and Ted is violent and abusive until Jimmy comes to Cagney’s rescue. He is distraught however, at seeing her with Ted, and decides to rob the bank. Cagney also, escapes with Ted’s keys, and independently goes to the bank to retrieve the counterfeit. They meet in Ted’s office, argue and reconcile, then jointly rob the bank. Ted arrives, and is spotted by the teller DEREK, who fetches the SHERIFF. Cagney and Jimmy escape, and the Sheriff finds Ted at the scene of the crime. Jimmy and Cagney pay Madame Dream what she asks in counterfeit, and leave safely with Madeleine, to set up the “Cagney and Cashflow Movie Company”, where Cagney can pursue her career in acting, and Jimmy need never rob a real bank again.
**Principle Characters**

As an escort at "Madame Dream’s House of Love" **CAGNEY FRAZER** often has to improvise to avoid the designs of her lecherous clients. It is lucky she is a consummate actress! She longs for the day when she will be free to head westwards to stardom!

Everyday in gaol **JIMMY CASHFLOW**, draws strength from two worn and well-loved icons. - A faded photo of Cagney; and a snippet of beard hair from his erstwhile hero, Billy the Kid.

None of the local belles are quite good enough for **TED GRIFFITHS**. So he consoloes himself with the working girls from the brothel, self-righteously confident in being an up-standing and respectable citizen (and Bank Manager) of the Bristly Hills Bank.

Nathan Honeycombe has had a bee in his bonnet since, in the cockney slums of London, he first heard the name Karl Marx. He has carried his conviction to the wild west, and not being able to write, voices it. He signs his name **MR X**.

**MADELEINE**, a few years older than Cagney, is the straight-talking prostitute who brought her to the brothel when Cagney was desperate for a place to hide. She still looks out for Cagney, feeling a little responsible, and genuinely hoping to see Cagney escape and fulfill her dreams.

Magdelena De Vos became **MADAME DREAM** when she grew too old to win hearts in the dance hall. She consequently lives out her life in bitter resentment of the younger, prettier working girls whom she ruthlessly exploits.

Ted took **DEREK** on as teller because of his timid, unassuming air. However, money and power have changed Derek. And Ted little imagined how frightening this youth could be, who has native cunning, a brilliant mind and Ted as his role model!
CAGNEY appears from behind the fitting booth curtains wearing a gaudy dance hall outfit. JIMMY looks away in disapproval. Then she appears as a southern belle, in a wig of blond ringlets, ribbon and lace. He offers her his arm. The two step off the sidewalk. A shop assistant trails behind, labouring under the weight of their purchases.

JIMMY stands to help force his new pair of boots on, revealing on the dresser behind a small shrine to Billy the Kid, incorporating a “Wanted” poster adorned with flowers and a black mourning band. JIMMY takes the gun belt draped above this, and is revealed in the mirror to be dressed in a smart formal outfit with a cowboy’s neckcloth.

JIMMY is in the same outfit when he and CAGNEY link arms outside a small country church. CAGNEY is wearing a pretty cream wedding dress. They ascend the stairs and enter. A small man enters frame and begins nailing a poster to the board outside. It shows a sketch of JIMMY with the words: “WANTED FOR BANKROBBERY”.

As JIMMY and CAGNEY step up to the altar guns appear on all sides.
Outside the church CAGNEY kicks the shin of a DEPUTY who is holding her back while JIMMY is taken away.
1. INT - BRISTLY HILLS BANK SAFE/
    TED’S OFFICE       DAY

Mr TED GRIFFITHS, Manager of the Bristly Hills Bank, is in the open safe. He takes a note from each money pile and adds them to the large safety deposit box which is labelled “Ted Griffiths Retirement Fund”. He stuffs a couple of hundred dollar bills into his pocket, singing...

TED
Money makes the world go around...
.. And keeps Ted Griffiths a happy man.
Oh, how I love being a bank manager!

He closes the large safe door, and locks it. He picks up the phone and dials the number written on a big scrap of paper on the centre of his desk...

2. INT - BROTHEL HALL/
(intercut)      TED’S OFFICE      DAY

MR X picks up the phone, but it is snatched out of his hand by MADAME DREAM. Her withering look is turned to sweetness as she speaks..

MADAME
Madame Dream’s House of Love. Can we make your dreams come ... true?

TED
Say that again, you ol’ wench. When are you going to have a go with me, eh?

MADAME
(without the charm!)
Okay, who do you want this time?

TED
Give me a redhead... That little girl...Delilah.. She the youngest you’ve got?.. Doesn’t matter, she’ll do. I like a bit of class..

MADAME
I think you know all our girls by now. Now was that full,... or ...

TED
You got any specials this week?? .. Anyway, she told me she didn’t do the full job.. Your authority.
MADAME

..Ah.. the little..!! That is absolute bullshit. I’d have her on her back as soon as..!

The MADAME remembers herself..

MADAME

(Laughs delicately..) Ha... Yes,,.. Many gentlemen would like to bed her, Mr Griffiths. But I’m afraid she is unavailable at present. Though of course that could change at any time. Perhaps you could be the lucky gentleman to ..ah... persuade her...
(Silence..)Far be it from me to resent the sensibilities she expresses..
However...

TED

Well, well... I’m glad I had this talk with you Dreamboat. Maybe I can talk some sense into her..

MADAME

Yes, well... I’ll leave it to you, shall I? ... I hate to think of all the revenue I’m losing... (sigh) I’ll get her for you..

The MADAME leaves the phone, and climbs the stairs.
TED, in his office, can’t believe his luck...

3. INT - STUDIO, DREAM SEQUENCE ____________ DAY

CAGNEY is standing on a dais in a full length, sequined dress, with glittering Hollywood backdrops and a crowd of adoring fans in front of her. She is throwing them kisses and they are throwing flowers...

4. INT- BROTHEL LANDING/CAGNEY’S ROOM _______________ DAY

CAGNEY is suddenly woken by a glass of water being throw over her face. The MADAME storms out, pausing as she goes to say..

MADAME
That little runt Ted Griffiths is on the phone for you. I want you to do as he wants this time. I’ve had enough of your preciousness. Face it girl, you won’t have it forever. It’s time you started paying your way.

With that the MADAME leaves. CAGNEY looks despairingly past the selection of wigs and trinkets on her dressing table to the photo of a handsome young cowboy, Jimmy Cashflow.

5. INT - BROTHEL HALL _____DAY

CAGNEY steps into the foyer, and picks up the phone. MR X smirks in a corner, until a look from CAGNEY sends him away.

CAGNEY
Hello..

6. INT - SALOON BAR _____DAY

CAGNEY is hardly recognizable in a bright ginger wig and an outfit to suit her profession. She steps timidly into the ill-lit bar room of the “Ree-Alto”, squinting after the sunlight outside. She spots TED and stands taller, then swaggers over to play her part...

7. EXT - RAILWAY SIDING _____DAY

JIMMY jumps lightly off the baggage car as the train moves slowly in to the siding. He dusts down his full cowboy outfit, and readjusts his hat. We recognize him from Cagney’s photo.

8. INT - SALOON BAR _____DAY

CAGNEY is redoing her smudged lipstick at a small corner table. The contents of her purse are strewn over the bench seat. TED GRIFFITHS falls drunkenly next to her. She stares momentarily at the large corner of white shirt hanging out of his fly and starts repacking her purse hurriedly...

CAGNEY
Well, thanks for the drinks, Teddybear. I’ll see you next week..

She smiles, and moves to stand. TED grabs her wrist violently.

CAGNEY
(innocently)

Won't I?

TED

Listen Baby, I'd like to see your little pussy. I'll pay you real well...

CAGNEY pulls away.

CAGNEY

I gotta go!

She stands, but TED is at her side surprisingly quickly, holding her arm so tightly that tears appear in her eyes..

TED

I got a room upstairs, Delilah. I want you to come up there with me now. And don't cause a scene,.. or some bad reports about you might just get back to that madam of yours... and then you'd be forced to come crawling back to me anyhow, see?

9. INT - SALOON BAR/STAIRCASE    _____DAY

CAGNEY is led by the arm up a dingey staircase. The barman JOE watches impassively as they pass.

10. INT - UPPER LANDING          _____DAY

TED takes her along the corridor to one of the end rooms, and pushes open the door.

11. INT - DINGEY ROOM             _____DAY

TED pushes CAGNEY onto the bed.

TED

Now Dollface, what's it gonna be? Are you gonna come quietly..?

TED laughs at his own joke, then takes some notes from his wallet, and flashes them in front of her face. .. CAGNEY seems to acquiesce.

CAGNEY

Oh Ted, I've been waiting for this..

TED
That’s it Baby. I knew you’d see reason.. And old Glueface need never know.. you ain’t just an escort.

CAGNEY

Teddybear, my throat’s dry from all the excitement. Can we have some champagne brought up?

TED has relaxed again, and seems docile as a kitten.

TED

Sure my little Candybar. I’m gonna lick you all over...

TED licks her up the cheek, and then saunters over to the door. Opening it, he calls out..

TED

Hey Joe.. Bring us up a bottle o..

A porcelain lamp smashes down on TED’s head. He turns to CAGNEY..

TED

Sugarpie,... what did you do that for..

He falls onto her, and brings her down to the ground under him. He’s out cold.

CAGNEY looks up, wide-eyed to the ceiling.. A sob escapes her lips. She brings her arms around his width, attempting to turn him over and off her. Her hand finds his wallet.

12.   EXT - BRISTLY HILLS BANK       DAY

JIMMY stands in front of the bank door. He gazes up and down the street before he sidles in, spurs jangling.

13.   INT - BRISTLY HILLS BANK   DAY

JIMMY walks into the empty foyer. He pulls out his gun and says...

JIMMY

This is a stick-up.

His voice echoes around the empty room.

Two tellers are seated at their desks. DEREK, pimply and with thick glasses, is talking incessantly as he works, bending unusually close to the screw he is tightening on a simple mechanical device. GLORIA nods occasionally at inappropriate
times and very absent-mindedly. She never looks up from the task at hand. filing her nails.
JIMMY says more loudly...

JIMMY
This is a stick-up.

There is no response until DEREK happens to look up, and stands.

DEREK
Do you want something sir?

JIMMY
Yeah, I do. I want to withdraw a certain amount from your bank.

DEREK
Oh yes. And do you have an account sir?

JIMMY
I don't need an account, boy.

JIMMY holds up his gun. DEREK can’t quite see what it is.

DEREK
Well if you don’t have an account, I’m afraid....

DEREK finally notices the gun for what it is. He begins to shake, and has to hold the counter to steady himself while his knees knock violently together. He just manages to press a button under the counter which causes a box camera mounted close to the ceiling to explode its flash powder. JIMMY doesn’t notice. Instead he growls..

JIMMY
I want some money!

JIMMY bangs his fist on the counter. The gun goes off, blowing Jimmy's hat off his head. The bullet ricochets round the foyer before it lands in JIMMY’s leg.

JIMMY
Jeez!

DEREK is startled out of his shakes. JIMMY sinks down in front of the counter, groaning. DEREK leans forward.

DEREK
Are.. are you alright, sir?
When he doesn’t receive a reply he turns enthusiastically to GLORIA, pointing to the camera.

DEREK
Gloria, Gloria.. Did you see that
Gloria!? It’s going to revolutionize
bank security!!

GLORIA looks up from her work, showing home-made earplugs firmly implanted under her hair. The wires lead to an original gramophone, spinning on the desk behind her..

14.   EXT - BROTHEL YARD    DAY

     CAGNEY is almost running when she rounds the corner of the building and careers into JIMMY, who falls backwards onto the steps. CAGNEY lands in his arms. JIMMY is in agony...

     CAGNEY
    Who are... JIMMY!! Jimmy, you’re
back! Oh Jimmy, take me away from
here. I don’t care where we go. I just
can’t bear it any more...

CAGNEY covers him with kisses until she becomes aware of JIMMY’s gasps of pain...

     CAGNEY
     Jimmy?... It can’t have hurt that
much! Jimmy,... you’re bleeding! Here,
come inside...

CAGNEY helps JIMMY up...

15.   INT - TED’S OFFICE    DAY

     TED storms in through the rear door. The piece of paper with Madame Dream’s phone number on it is still in the centre of the desk.
TED sweeps it off angrily. A number of other papers fly off as well, revealing still others. TED sits in a huff. There is a timid knock on his door. DEREK waits outside ...

     TED
Whadda you want?

Behind the closed door DEREK answers, but can’t be heard. TED opens the door furiously and pulls DEREK inside by the collar.
Now tell me what you want, you little twerp..

DEREK

Well um.. you see,.. Mr Griffiths..there was a robbery..

TED throws DEREK away..

TED

There was a robbery! Why didn’t you tell me!! How much did they get??

DEREK

Um,.. Nothing sir... But I got...

TED

They robbed the bank and got nothing! Well well well, you’ve done well lad. Hah. Well done..

TED sits at his desk, mighty pleased with himself.

TED

So, what shall we say in the report? It was due to the extraordinary heroism of the..

DEREK

Oh, thank you sir...

TED

Not you boy!! Now get out of here. I’ve got work to do... ..Manager, Mr Ted..

DEREK

But, .. but... I took ...

DEREK holds out the photo he’s been clutching.. TED waves him away...

TED

What do I want that for. Now GET OUT!

DEREK carefully leaves. We can see him ear-ballng GLORIA through the glass. TED turns to writing his report.

TED

Ex-straw-din- ... How do you spell that?
He grabs a piece of paper from the pile on his desk to use as scrap paper, and tries different spellings, mumbling as he does this.

TED
Egs.. straw - No, that can’t be right.
Stror.. din .. erry..

TED puts that piece aside, and grabs another with more space for scribbling on it. This one is a memorandum from head office. TED continues to try spellings until the words 'INTERNAL AUDIT', which are written clearly across the page, encroach upon his attention. He looks at the desk calendar in front of him and says hoarsely...

TED
Three days..!

He picks up the phone and gets a line out to Gloria's desk. We see DEREK, now at his desk, pointing it out to her several times before he answers it himself..

TED
Bring me that photo... QUICK!

DEREK scurries to Ted's door, photo in hand. TED yanks the door open, and grabs it.

TED
What took you so long!

He slams the door in DEREK's face. He picks up the phone and begins to dial, staring at the photo of Jimmy.

TED
What took you soo... long since I’ve seen you. Have you had a nice day? ... Business fine?.. Yes. Mine ... ah.. (laughs coyly).. Well, .. I could use a little help. Let’s meet... somewhere.. ah.. private..? Madame Dream’s?

16. INT - BROTHEL KITCHEN ______ NIGHT

JIMMY has his leg in the kitchen sink, trying to extract the bullet with a large pair of medical tweezers. CAGNEY enters, wearing her dressing gown. Seeing he hasn't noticed her, she sneaks up behind JIMMY, and bites his neck affectionately. JIMMY screams out loud. She has caused him to slip with the tweezers which are now embedded in the wound.

CAGNEY
Jimmy!.. It’s only a graze..

JIMMY swallows his pain.

CAGNEY
Come on. Let me have a look.

CAGNEY pulls him round, to get a better view of his leg. She grabs the tweezers and yanks them out...

CAGNEY
Jimmy, what are you doing to yourself? Are you crazy!? ...Ugh!

She is horrified when she sees the messy flesh wound with the bullet in its centre.

CAGNEY
What's that Jimmy? A bullet!??

JIMMY nods, speechless. CAGNEY now yanks the bullet out before JIMMY can protest. Blood spurts out of the wound in gentle pulses. CAGNEY is about to vomit.

CAGNEY
I gotta go.

She rushes out of the room, leaving JIMMY gasping for breath in agony. He falls onto the chair behind him. A few moments later, CAGNEY returns, her mouth open and face pale. She pushes a glass of whisky into JIMMY's hand, and goes straight to the sink to wash her mouth out with water. JIMMY gulps down the whisky. Recovered, CAGNEY grabs the padding and bandage lying on the table, and deftly bandages the wound. She does it so fast, that she fails to notice that she is bandaging JIMMY's leg to the chair leg.

CAGNEY
Okay, where's the money? We can be on the eleven thirty to Mexico. What do you say?

She looks up at JIMMY, her face shining with hope.

CAGNEY
It's you an' me kid, an' the world's our oyster...

JIMMY looks down, tears in his eyes.
JIMMY
I gotta tell you Loretta. Billy an’ me,.. we ride alone.

CAGNEY
What!? You’re gonna leave me behind!?

CAGNEY stands and slaps him.

CAGNEY
After all I’ve done for you, you shitface! Well,.. Go then. The sooner you’re out of my life the better!

CAGNEY turns away from JIMMY so that he can’t see her tears. JIMMY doesn’t move. CAGNEY bitterly continues..

CAGNEY
I’ll find a way to get to Hollywood without you. Don’t you think I won’t. I don’t need your money to become a star. Now get out!!

JIMMY’s suppressed tears burst out ...

JIMMY
I can’t!

CAGNEY turns in anger...

CAGNEY
Why not?

JIMMY indicates the chair leg. CAGNEY sees he is bandaged to it. She begins to laugh hysterically. JIMMY starts to howl. They embrace and howl together. JIMMY interrupts by saying..

JIMMY
I’m gonna marry you, Cagney!

She becomes serious..

CAGNEY
..So,.. where’s the money? You had me worried then.. I really thought you were going to leave me here...

JIMMY
I’m gonna marry you.. And I’m gonna get a job..
CAGNEY is shocked.

CAGNEY
But you said you wouldn’t be one of the exploited workers..

JIMMY
..With a retirement fund, holiday pay..

CAGNEY
Jimmy, what’s up with you? You hate work.

JIMMY stops, unconvinced himself.. CAGNEY twigs.

CAGNEY
You didn’t get anything, did you? You robbed a bank, got yourself shot, without even getting any money.. Not a red cent..

She is incredulous, then angry..

CAGNEY
You just better do as you say, Jimmy, and go and get a job.. ‘Cos I’m not risking my arse to support you.

JIMMY immediately stands and hobbles towards the back door, dragging the chair with him.

CAGNEY
Where are you going!?

JIMMY
To the store, to get a paper.

CAGNEY
But you just got here! .. Come on Sweetie. Tomorrow is soon enough.

She kisses him, and begins unbandageing his leg. They both laugh softly.

CAGNEY
I can’t believe you’re back. You know, everything is gonna be alright from now on.. I know it.
They smile.

17. INT - BROTHEL KITCHEN/PARLOUR NIGHT

Suddenly, MADELEINE bursts through the door. CAGNEY starts in fright..

CAGNEY
(relieved) Oh, it’s you...

MADELEINE
Hey Cag, I was getting worried about you. Did Ted ..? Hey, you must be Jimmy Cashflow. The man himself. Robbed any good (banks lately?)

CAGNEY
Not now, Mad. I think we’d better have a talk.. But first, can you do me a little favour? I need to get Jimmy upstairs, without.. you know..

MADELEINE looks stunned, but agrees.

MADELEINE
Yeah.. Sure Honey.. You’re sure [it’s worth the risk?]

CAGNEY cuts her off by pushing MADELEINE out the door.. CAGNEY watches through the door until MADELEINE signals the all clear. CAGNEY takes JIMMY by the hand, and they rush across the parlour and up the stairs. MADELEINE returns to the kitchen to await CAGNEY’s return.

18. INT - BROTHEL KITCHEN NIGHT

CAGNEY bursts through the door, startling MADELEINE.

MADELEINE
So,.. Lover Boy’s returned. But what the hell do you think you’re doing, Cagney? MADELEINE Cont’d He can’t stay here. Dream’ll freak. She’s down on you enough as it is..

CAGNEY
I know! But what am I to do? He’s shot. It’s only for one night. I’ll tell him to go... tomorrow.

MADELEINE
Cag, I know I got you in here..

CAGNEY
No Mad! You helped me out when I needed a friend.

MADELEINE thinks..

MADELEINE
You want her to kick you out, don’t you!? Hell Cag, if it were that easy..! ..The only way is to buy yourself out. Can’t you just try...?

CAGNEY stiffens. MADELEINE pursues her argument..

MADELEINE
With Jimmy here, it’s the perfect opportunity.. Just get him to pay..

CAGNEY
I can’t do that, Mad. I won’t.

MADELEINE
But what’s the difference? You sleep with him anyway.

CAGNEY
He doesn’t have any money!.. And.. he doesn’t know.

MADELEINE covers her surprise..

MADELEINE
Well hell, he’s no saint!

CAGNEY
Mad..

MADELEINE
Okay,.. But.. well.. Jimmy ain’t no prince, and he sure as hell ain’t got no white charger to carry you away on. I’m worried for you, Honey.

They hear someone in the parlour. Both women hush warily.

CAGNEY
It’s just for tonight. I haven’t seen him for three years... I can rely on you...?

MADELEINE
Hey.. I never had this conversation. I never saw the man.

MADELEINE stands to leave. Then turns...

MADELEINE
You know the difference between you and the rest of us...? You still think men are worth it. God bless the child...

MADELEINE sighs and exits. CAGNEY sits alone.

19. INT - CAGNEY’S ROOM NIGHT

CAGNEY quietly opens the door and slips inside. JIMMY is already fast asleep on her single bed, fully clothed. CAGNEY speaks to herself, needing to say the words even if JIMMY isn’t listening.

CAGNEY
You bastard, Jimmy Cashflow. You walk into my life again, after three years being in gaol, .. bringing nothing with you but trouble... Well, I’m desperate. I need a friend... So you better come up with the goods, Babe, or you an’ me both may as well get lynched tomorrow. ... But I don’t want that Jimmy..

She softly kisses his brow and falls onto the bed beside him. He turns in his sleep, embracing her in his arms.

20. INT - BROTHEL HALL/PARLOUR DAY

CAGNEY, in her shabby satin dressing gown, is sitting on the window sill drinking cocoa when TED opens the front door and comes forward. CAGNEY recognizes his profile. She immediately ducks and crawls behind the sofa. TED enters the parlour and sits heavily.
The door opens again. This time it's MR X. He comes straight through to where TED is and speaks in a hoarse cockney whisper.

MR X
What's your business, Griffin?

TED
Er... That's Griffiths. (Laughs nervously) Griffin is a celtic dragon..

MR X
Don't you pull rank on me, Puffin. you think I'm inferior 'cos I'm an employee..

TED
No, no, Mr X. I treat you as an absolute equal. I respect you (tremendously...)

MR X
I don't need scum like you to pa'ronize me. I got a decent job now. ‘Caretakin’ the young ladies. So get on wiv it. What d'ya want?

TED leans over and whispers in Mr X's ear.

TED
I’ve got to find a bankrobber..

MR X
Don't blow in my ear, you li'l tart! If I'd 'ave known you was like that...

MR X gets up to go.

TED
No, no Mr X... You're the best... Who else...?

MR X demands from the doorway..

TED holds out the photo he’s been clutching.
TED
PLEASE... I need to find this man...
I’ve got a job (for him)...

MR X hits the photo to the ground without looking at it. CAGNEY recognizes JIMMY.

MR X
A job? I see. An’ you’re goin’ to pay him union wages I s’pose, wiv a nice pension for when ‘e retires? I know your sort Mr Ned Gibbon. Don’t care a brass razoo for a workin’ man’s lot...

TED
I’ll give him free superannuation,.. an.. and a christmas bonus..

MR X
I see. An’ will there be any danger involved? What about ‘is wife and kids? I know wha’ it’s like, believe you me, to ‘ave your dad only a dull memory and a faded photograph on the mantelpiece...

MR X leans melodramatically against Madame Dream’s mantelpiece.

MR X cont’d
You can coun’ me out Mr Goofball. Don’t bovver ta call again. I’ve got a respectable job now. I ’ope I nevver see you again!

MR X turns and walks out the door. TED gesticulates in desperation.

TED
Shit!!

CAGNEY thinks quickly. She gets up, eyes closed and hair over her face...
Before he knows what has happened TED has been dragged down on the floor with her.

CAGNEY
Ooops.. I"m looking for my eyeglasses..
Can you imagine.. I've lost them.
And my eyes are stinging so I can't even open them. Would you help me look..?
CAGNEY steers TED on hands and knees to the point where his head is between the lounge and the standard lamp. She then pushes the lamp against his neck, pinning him against the lounge.

CAGNEY
You want a man. I'm the one to find him. I want fifty thousand dollars - cash in hand, and I'll bring you the man, as soon as you want.

TED
But you're a gir...

CAGNEY
Hey.. which would you rather - brains or brawn? If I say I can get him, I can get him. Now, you wait for my call. You bring the money. I’ll bring the man. You got it?

TED
Right, right.

CAGNEY releases the lampshade a little.

TED
Shouldn’t we shake?

CAGNEY grabs a vase and knocks TED out.

CAGNEY
Sorry pal, ..had to do it..

CAGNEY gets up, rings the bell on the coffee table, and leaves the room.

21. INT - CAGNEY’S BEDROOM DAY

CAGNEY enters her bedroom. JIMMY is looking distastefully at the bedpan.

JIMMY
Do you have an outhouse I could use?

CAGNEY
Jimmy! Guess what! I’ve found a job for you!
CAGNEY is beaming.

JIMMY
A job?.. This early in the morning?

CAGNEY
Come on Jimmy. You’ll love it.

JIMMY
What do I have to do?

CAGNEY
Aah.. nothin’ much.. Just aah..

CAGNEY can’t contain her excitement any longer..

CAGNEY
We are gonna be paid fifty thousand dollars for you to rob a bank!!

JIMMY has to grab CAGNEY to stop her squealing and bouncing up and down on the bed.

JIMMY
Honey, honey, honey, now calm down there. You just repeat what you said then...

CAGNEY
I just got a bank manager to agree to pay us fifty thousand dollars to rob his bank!!

JIMMY
Hang on. You’re telling me that you want me to be an outlaw??

CAGNEY
Jimmy,.. It’s perfect. He wants his bank robbed. You’re a bank robber...

JIMMY
Hang on now. Last night I got to thinking...

CAGNEY
But...

JIMMY
My future with you is more important than robbing banks.

CAGNEY
Just one more job, Jimmy..

JIMMY
I wanna marry you Cagney. An’ grow old together, an’ watch our kids grow up. I been lucky so far .. But if I get caught a second time..

CAGNEY
But.. He wants you to rob his bank..

JIMMY
I’m gonna go out today, an’ get my first real job. Just till ...

JIMMY stops. CAGNEY looks at him.

CAGNEY
Jimmy, you don’t understand..

JIMMY
It’s the only way we have a chance..
Now, do I have to use this thing?

JIMMY picks up the bedpan again.. CAGNEY is distracted..

CAGNEY
I’ll get you some paper...

She goes out the door, still distracted.

22.   INT - BROTHEL PARLOUR   DAY

MADELEINE and a young girl, LOUISA, are in the parlour picking up pieces of vase. CAGNEY walks through to the kitchen, and is followed by MADELEINE..

23.    INT - BROTHEL KITCHEN   DAY

CAGNEY and MADELEINE enter..

MADELEINE
Funny thing happened this morning..
CAGNEY

Oh?

MADELEINE

That Ted Griffiths was found out cold on the floor in the parlour..

CAGNEY

Really?

MADELEINE

Yeah. You wouldn’t know anything about that, would you?

CAGNEY

What?.. Me..?

MADELEINE

Could be bad for business... I’d get my story straight if I was you. It wasn’t your loverboy now, was it? Protecting your honour?? You are in dangerous territory, girl...

CAGNEY’s resentment spills over..

CAGNEY

Jimmy,.. protecting my honour..! Only ever caused me trouble, with his bankrobbing an’.. Now he won’t even rob a bank that’s begging..!

CAGNEY hits the table. MADELEINE comes forward with an awkward gesture meant to comfort.

MADELEINE

Well all I can say is.. once a bankrobber... Not that I’m recommending it as a profession... But if he’s got it in him, he’s gonna have to live it. A leopard can’t ever change his spots.

MADELEINE moves away.

MADELEINE

But get your story straight for the Bitch.

CAGNEY looks at her gratefully.

CAGNEY
Madeleine,.. thanks.

MADELEINE leaves for the parlour. CAGNEY leaves for the outhouse to get Jimmy’s paper.

24. INT - BROTHEL LANDING/CAGNEY’S ROOM ___ DAY

JIMMY steps cautiously out onto the landing, before CAGNEY’s head appears at the top of the stairs. When she sees him she runs and pushes him back in the door.

CAGNEY
Jimmy! What the hell do you think you’re doing!?

JIMMY
I just need to go to the john. Can’t I just go?

CAGNEY
NO Jimmy! I mean, if you’re seen you’ll be expected to pay! You can’t just stay in my room for free!

JIMMY
Well, no.. I guess not. But you could pretend I was family.. just visiting.

CAGNEY throws her arms up in frustration.

CAGNEY
Jimmy,.. what do you think this is!? It’s a brothel. A house of ill-repute. A whorehouse!

JIMMY is shocked...

CAGNEY
Oh,.. Not me. I don’t do that stuff.. But Madeleine,.. the other girls...

CAGNEY is at a loss for words in the face of JIMMY’s disbelief..

CAGNEY
Look, here’s your paper. I just gotta make a telephone call. I’ll be back soon.. Stay here!

CAGNEY leaves the room hurriedly. JIMMY sits down.

25. INT - STAIRCASE/BROTHEL HALL ___ DAY
CAGNEY steps down into the foyer. She bites her lip in uncertainty before she picks up the phone, checks that no-one is around, then dials.

CAGNEY
Hello. Ted Griffiths? I’ve got your man.. Meet me at the Ree-Alto, room 202... Eleven o’clock. ... Yeah, um,... sorry about that. It won’t happen again. But listen,... Don’t forget, bring the money..

MADAME DREAM steps forward from her apartments behind the stairs. She watches coolly.. CAGNEY sees her.

CAGNEY
Uh,.. gotta go now. Bye.

She hangs up.

MADAME
So, my little princess has come around, has she?.. The MADAME grabs CAGNEY by the hair, and drags her back up the stairs to her room...

The MADAME grabs CAGNEY by the hair, and drags her back up the stairs to her room...
very nose! Get in there! I’ll deal with you!!

The MADAME slaps CAGNEY viciously, and enters her room. MADELEINE emerges from her door nervously, listening to the sound of over-turning of furniture as the MADAME searches.

MADAME V.O.
So here it is..

Cagney’s door opens, and the MADAME stands on the threshold holding a roll of notes.

MADAME
You’ll keep your appointment today.
And you’ll return the takings to me..

With that she locks CAGNEY in and storms down the stairs. MADELEINE comes forward from her own door, and knocks softly.

MADELEINE
Are you okay honey?

She receives a muffled sob in reply.

MADELEINE
Hey, don’t leave without... Ah, just make sure you come to my room.

MADELEINE returns to her room.

27.       EXT - STREET      DAY

JIMMY looks back at the brothel. He notices anew the secretive side entrance, the red light shining around the door panels, and the lower windows which are all blacked out. He stands in the street..

JIMMY
CAGNEY!

.. And runs.

28.       INT - TED’S OFFICE     DAY

TED is busy in the safe, ruefully counting out $50 000. His keys sit prominently on the safe shelf, when DEREK knocks. TED, in his guilt slams the safe door and twirls the combination hurriedly, then turns to deal with DEREK. DEREK immediately holds out a contraption which looks like a huge bear trap with vicious teeth..
DEREK

Mr Griffiths, I just wanted to show you my...

TED reels back.

TED

What the... Take that thing away from me! You’re insane!!

DEREK

But it’s my new ‘Secure Safe Robber Deterrent’..

DEREK’s words become inaudible behind the sharp slam of Ted’s door in his face. DEREK returns, hurt, to his desk. TED, back to the door and DEREK, looks stricken, and then horrified as he recognizes that the safe door is closed.

29. INT- MADAME’S OFFICE DAY

MADAME DREAM is sitting at her desk when MADELEINE knocks gently on the open door. The MADAME looks up over her eyeglasses, and nods.

MADAME

What can I do for you?

MADELEINE moves to sit opposite the MADAME, but is stopped.

MADELEINE

Sorry,.. I..

She stands again. The MADAME softens.

MADAME

Sit, sit.. I must say this is unusual. You haven’t come to talk with me for quite a while.

MADELEINE

Well, you..

MADAME

Yes. I became the Madam of this establishment and you became my employee. Now what can I do for you?
MADELEINE looks at a painting of a dance hall girl on the wall.

    MADELEINE
    I remember how I admired you ...

    MADAME
    Yes. Well that was a long time ago, Madeleine. However, I am sure you
didn’t come down here to reminisce.. Did you?

    MADELEINE
    No.

    MADAME
    So state your business.

    MADELEINE
    You know I brought Cagney here because
she had nowhere else to go..

    MADAME
    Yes. And I believe I have been more
than generous to her over the six
months...

    MADELEINE
    She isn’t a prostitute. It doesn’t suit
her..

    MADAME
    Oh? And it suits you?

    MADELEINE
    You know what got me into it..

    MADAME
    Yes. And you were resistant at first.
And now it is your life. Why should
you expect anything different for her?

    MADELEINE
    I want to buy her out.

    MADAME
    Well, that is very noble of you. But
you can’t afford it.
MADELEINE
You could set a price I can afford!

MADAME
But why would I do that, dear? She will come around, and then you will both be earning me good money. I can hardly imagine that you on your own would be worth as..

MADELEINE
I’ll do other stuff..

The MADAME is a little shocked at this...

MADAME
Madeleine!

MADELEINE
What does it matter to you, anyway?! Do you have to crush everything that is young and beautiful?!

MADAME
I think you’ve said enough!

MADELEINE gets up to leave. When she is at the door the MADAME speaks...

MADAME cont’d
I don’t want you to think I am softening in my old age... However, if

MADAME cont’d
you can pay me one thousand dollars each, you can both leave.

MADELEINE gasps audibly at the large sum.

MADAME cont’d
I don’t expect my retirement will be too disadvantaged with that amount.

MADELEINE again moves to leave.

MADAME cont’d
Of course, I expect both of you to work equally hard until I receive that amount. And where she falls short, I expect you to make up.. as your protege.. Now go. I hate the sight of you!
MADELEINE leaves.

30. EXT - STREET/RILEY’S YARD DAY

JIMMY is crumpled in front of a gate. The gate opens, and OLD MR RILEY appears..

OLD RILEY
Hey son, what’re you doing there? ..
The coach’l be .. Oh.

OLD RILEY stops when he realizes JIMMY is in tears..

OLD RILEY cont’d
Gotta be a broken heart .. or a dead horse. Same thing. Youth! Come on, son.

OLD RILEY picks JIMMY up, and steers him inside.

31. INT - RILEY’S KITCHEN DAY

JIMMY emerges, looking refreshed. OLD RILEY serves breakfast.

OLD RILEY
Now I know a man’s gotta make his own decisions, but let me say this young man... You and your girl have had a spat. Maybe she was to blame, maybe you were. But you ran out on her originally, an’ now you’ve done it again. Do you want this girl or not!? Now you said you needed some money. Well, I got this shop, an’ I’m getting old and worn. I could use a hand around here. Pay you fifty cents a week. You can live here. Just don’t expect me to eat your cooking! .. Save some money, son. Set yourself up.. Get this girl. You obviously love her.. Or go. Hit the road. And be a drifter your whole life. .. But that’s my offer.

The bell rings inside the shop..

OLD RILEY cont’d
I’l jus’ be a sec..

He exits through the curtain. JIMMY looks through after him, and sees TED GRIFFITHS.
INT - RILEY’S KITCHEN DAY

OLD RILEY reappears through the curtain..

OLD RILEY
So. Whaddya think, son?

JIMMY
I’ll take it, sir... Thankeyou.

OLD RILEY
One condition though.. Don’t ‘sir’ me.
Makes me feel like flamin’ Custer.

EXT - RILEY’S YARD DAY

JIMMY is stacking kegs of gunpowder in the shed when MADELEINE slips through the gate and approaches him.

MADELEINE
Hey, Jimmy!

JIMMY turns, startled.

JIMMY
What are you doin’ here?

MADELEINE
I need to talk to you. Cagney needs your help.

JIMMY
Oh, Cagney needs me, does she. Well just you tell Cagney that I’m here, working at a job, so that we can have a future together, if she wants to come and join me.

MADELEINE
Come on, Jimmy. She loves you. You think it’s her choice to live in that place, be sleazed on by all those .. ?

JIMMY
Yeah. I think it’s her choice. I left her with money, I mean, cash.. More’n she could spend in a whole lifetime. Plus she knows where I hid..

JIMMY stops himself.

MADELEINE
Yeah, well I don’t know where the money went. But when I came across her she hadn’t eaten for three days..

JIMMY
Yeah, so you just set her up nice and comfy, to whore for you!

MADELEINE recoils..., then recovers.

MADELEINE
You don’t know nothing, Jimmy Cashflow.

She starts to leave..

MADELEINE
You don’t deserve her. But if you decide you want to help, just pass a thousand this way. That’s what she really needs!

JIMMY
I can’t. It’s. Doesn’t matter.

JIMMY hears MADELEINE slam the gate. He leans against the wall, distressed.

34. INT- CAGNEY’S ROOM DAY

CAGNEY uses her nailfile to unscrew the lock from her door.

35. EXT - BROTHEL YARD DAY

CAGNEY is about to slip out into the street when a huge hand grabs her by the shoulder. She turns in fright, finding MR X standing over her.

MR X
Where are you goin’ then, Princess?

CAGNEY
Why, hello Nathan. Just out for a stroll.

MR X
A stroll, eh. Well now, I wonder what the Missus would say about that. Last I
'eard you was meant to stay in your room..

CAGNEY
I won’t be gone long.. You could cover for me..

MR X
Now why would I do that?

CAGNEY kisses him seductively..

MR X
A very interesting proposition..

He grabs her forcefully around the waist...

CAGNEY
I’ve just got a little errand to run...

MR X
Don’t get smart wiv me, girl. I’ll get my pound of flesh,.. when I’m good an’ ready.

He holds her tightly by the neck as he pushes her towards the back door..

MR X cont’d
But for now, I believe you’re wanted by one of our ‘clients’, see...

36. INT- BROTHEL LANDING DAY

MR X, still holding CAGNEY, looks at the dismembered doorlock.

MR X
Tut, tut, tut..

37. INT - CAGNEY’S ROOM/ (intercut) BROTHEL LANDING DAY

MADELEINE ascends the stairs wearily. CAGNEY comes eagerly forward behind her locked door ..

CAGNEY
Madeleine,.. Madeleine!

MADELEINE
Yeah.. How’re you goin’ in there?

CAGNEY
I got out. ... But X caught me.

MADELEINE
Oh, Cag..

CAGNEY
I need to get to Jimmy, Mad. I really need him.

MADELEINE
Forget it Cagney. That man’s nothin but trouble..

CAGNEY
No, seriously.. Ted’s gonna give me fifty (thousand dollars..)

MADELEINE interrupts..

MADELEINE
The only thing Ted is gonna give you is the clap.. Get real girl..

MADELEINE is startled by MR X and the MADAME on the stairs below..

MADELEINE
Here they come!

MADELEINE slips into her room.

CAGNEY
But Mad, don’t just..

Her door opens, and there stand MR X and the MADAME. X pulls her to her feet, while the MADAME speaks..

MADAME
Time to start earning your keep.

MADELEINE comes forward out of her room.

MADELEINE
Hey, she doesn’t know the rules. Let me show her..

MADAME
Alright. But be swift.
MADELEINE takes CAGNEY into her own room.

38. INT - MADELEINE’S ROOM DAY

MADELEINE turns urgently..

MADELEINE
Listen.. The Ree-Alto .. there’s some back stairs leading into the yard.. Go right at the top of the stairs.. Get to the railway siding...

CAGNEY
I’ve made a deal with Ted.

MADELEINE
Get out, Cagney. You’re not gonna get away with it. Leave town now.

CAGNEY
I can’t.

MADELEINE shakes her head and exhales in frustration..

MADELEINE
Well then .. use these..

She dumps a small cap-shaped rubber device and a small sea sponge in CAGNEY’s hand. CAGNEY turns away in disgust..

CAGNEY
Ugh!

MADELEINE
Look, put the cap on first, and dip the sponge in vinegar and insert it.. Come on girl. You gotta know these things sometime.

CAGNEY recovers just enough to say a vague..

CAGNEY
Thanks, Madeleine.

MADELEINE
Well, it’s better than.. you know..

CAGNEY gives a weak smile and turns to leave..

MADELEINE
You could always knee him in the goolies.. Nah.. that’d just get you
into more trouble. At least seem to want to please him...

The door is opened. MR X steps in and takes CAGNEY by the elbow and leads her out.

39. INT - BROTHEL LANDING DAY

The MADAME looks approvingly at CAGNEY, dressed as Delilah.

MADAME

What’s yours, is mine... Now remember, if you ever want to get your life back, you better just behave ... like a whore!

With that the MADAME turns on her heel and goes down the stairs. MR X leads CAGNEY after her...

40. INT - TED’S OFFICE DAY

TED is fiddling with the misshapen coat hanger, trying to open one of the locks on the safe door. He glances at the large clock on the wall which says 11 o’clock...

TED

Shit!

.. abandons the coat hanger and hurries out of the office.

41. EXT - BRISTLY HILLS STREET DAY

MR X is enjoying his power as he holds CAGNEY’s elbow hard and steers her along the street. She suddenly jerks herself free...

CAGNEY

You coward. Can’t you pick on someone your own size!? Now just you get this straight. I ain’t running no peep show. So you better just keep out of sight. You wouldn’t want to lose your respectable job, would you?...

MR X

Don’t you threaten me, ya little tart...

He takes her arm again, but has clearly taken in what she has said.

42. INT - SALOON BAR DAY
CAGNEY enters, with MR X entering quietly a little behind her.

CAGNEY
Now stay there! I’ll be down soon..

MR X sniggers and sits at a seat by the door.
CAGNEY walks confidently past JOE and up the stairs.

43. INT - CORRIDOR DAY

CAGNEY knocks softly on a door, and enters.

44. INT - HOTEL ROOM/LANDING DAY

TED stands as CAGNEY enters.

TED
It’s you! .. Where is he?

CAGNEY
Do you think I’m stupid? Show me the money, and I’ll bring him up...

TED
I wanna know you’ve got him first...

CAGNEY
Show me the money!

TED
I’m beginning not to like you.. Show me that you’ve brought him, and I’ll show you the money...

CAGNEY has to brazen it out.

CAGNEY
He’s sitting in the bar,.. at a corner table by the door. Walk along the landing and have a look...

TED leaves the room hurriedly, trying not to look as eager as he is feeling.. CAGNEY immediately begins searching for something which might hold fifty thousand dollars...
TED bursts back into the room, interrupting her search..

TED
You’ve brought me that moron from the brothel!

CAGNEY
Yeah. .. Well..

CAGNEY swallows, her false confidence shattered..

CAGNEY
He’s .. my protection. For the money. Hand it over and we’ll take you (to him.)

TED
You lousy little whore! I’ll have you for this!

TED storms out of the room. CAGNEY runs after him.

45.       INT - SALOON BAR/LANDING      ____DAY

TED storms down the stairs ...

CAGNEY
TED! Ted!

She falls weakly on her knees on the landing. JOE looks up dispassionately. MR X stands and sidles across the bar room towards the stairs. TED grabs him by the collar in passing and hisses.

TED
You tell that Madame of yours she’s a lousy lay..

He storms out of the bar. CAGNEY pulls herself to her feet. MR X reaches her and takes her again by the elbow. He leads her out.

46.       INT - TED’S OFFICE       ____DAY

TED storms into his office, opens the safe, and takes out the ledgers. He sits at his desk and picks up a red pen, preparing to begin work on them.

47.       INT - BROTHEL HALL          ____DAY

The MADAME comes out to meet them, as X and CAGNEY enter.

MADAME
Did she earn her keep?

MR X
He said she was a lousy lay.

The MADAME turns to CAGNEY and slaps her on the face.
MADAME
Don’t think you can get out of it that easily.. Take her to her room and lock her in it! You’ll start behaving, girl, or you won’t keep that pretty face very long. I’ll get X to see to that.. From now on I’m going to make your appointments for you, starting with Richard Glossup. .. Lock her up!

With that the MADAME turns on her heel. MR X grabs CAGNEY’s arm and takes her upstairs.

48.       INT - BROTHEL LANDING          DAY

MADELEINE watches as CAGNEY is thrown into her room by MR X. As soon as he is gone, she hurries to CAGNEY’s door.

MADELEINE
Cag,.. Cagney.. You alright in there?

49.       INT - CAGNEY’S ROOM/
          (intercut)       BROTHEL LANDING          DAY

CAGNEY
Sure, Mad. I didn’t have to do it.

MADELEINE
Hey, good on you, girl. How’d you manage? That Griffin’s got more arms than an octopus!

CAGNEY
You know what a griffin is? A celtic dragon!

MADELEINE
Is that why he thinks he’s such hot shit!

The women laugh, relieved to forget their troubles..

MADELEINE
Hey, you know, .. You shouldn’t make fun of him. He’s an eligible bachelor... You need cash. He’s got a whole bank full of it. You play your cards right girl, you could be set up for life..
CAGNEY can’t help but burst out laughing again. She has to stifle it...

MADELEINE
Cag,... Cagney. It’s a damn good idea. ... Or ask him for a loan. He’d do it for you..

CAGNEY
Yeah, I’ll just go in, like any regular customer. .. Say ‘Mr Griffiths, I’d like a loan from your bank’.

The women break into laughter. The sharp click of the MADAME’s heels and the phone being dialled downstairs causes them to be quiet. They overhear a snippet of conversation...

50. INT - BROTHEL HALL DAY

The MADAME is on the phone..

MADAME
Ah yes, Richard. Quite to your liking. A delicate little thing, quite refined. Needs to be broken in... You know the sort of thing ...Yes, yes,... Your carriage will come and pick her up then...? Fine. Goodbye.

She hangs up and ascends the stairs.

51. INT - BROTHEL LANDING/ (intercut) CAGNEY’S ROOM DAY

MADELEINE scuttles back to her room before the MADAME knocks on CAGNEY’s door.

CAGNEY V.O.
Yes...

MADAME
I’ve arranged that appointment. Richard Glossup is one of our most eminent clients..

CAGNEY doesn’t respond.

MADAME cont’d
You’ll be picked up in his carriage..
Remember, .. you earn me good money, and you’ll get treated right... Oh, and dress like a lady, not a whore.

The MADAME leaves. MADELEINE returns..

MADELEINE
Oooh, Sir Richard Glossup. Now he’s a catch, Cagney. You’d do better to smooch up to him...

Behind the door CAGNEY is anxious.

CAGNEY
Don’t tease Madeleine. This is serious!

MADELEINE
Aaww he’s like all of them.. A kitten who likes to think he’s a tiger.. You’ll be fine.

MADELEINE isn’t as confident as her words make out..

CAGNEY
You’ve been with him then?

MADELEINE
Sure .. And he tips real well. Suzanne got nearly two hundred dollars..

CAGNEY
Two hundred dollars!

MADELEINE
He must’ve been in a good mood that day.. Anyway Cag, dress up real pretty, and .. well,... you’ll be fine. I gotta go.

MADELEINE scuttles back to her room, worried. CAGNEY, somewhat cheered, throws on a wig of blond ringlets, and practices her ‘southern belle’ smile.

52.   INT - GUN SHOP     DAY

    JIMMY is in the back room when a nasty-looking gunman enters. JIMMY is about to enter through the dividing curtain when he stops short in alarm, grabbing onto a shelf while he peers out at the gunman. Suddenly, the shelf falls to the ground, causing Jimmy to become covered in gun powder. The gunman draws in anticipation.. Jimmy trips through the curtain, rubbing at his eyes..
WILD BOB
What the hells goin’ on there? Scare me half to death..! Can I get a bit o’ service around here?

JIMMY is coughing and rasping from the powder he has breathed in..
WILD BOB comes extremely close, still holding his gun erect.

WILD BOB
You look kinda sick. Better not to eat that stuff. Gives ya indigestion. ... Hey, .. don’t I know you?

JIMMY
No,.. no,.. I .. I don’t think so. I’m not from these parts..

WILD BOB
It’s a funny thing.. I’m not from these parts neither. Where ya from?

JIMMY coughs..

JIMMY
You want to buy something?

WILD BOB
You remind me o’ someone... someone I used to know real well..

JIMMY
Really..?

WILD BOB
You remind me of someone who owes me a lot of money..

JIMMY brings his handkerchief up to his face..

WILD BOB
Funny thing is,.. I ain’t seed him for quite a while... Heard he was in gaol. You ever been in gaol?

JIMMY
Me!?

WILD BOB
I never forgit a face. Ha, .. but I don’t think my friend would be working
behind a counter. More likely to be this side of it.

WILD BOB waves his gun suggestively.

WILD BOB
So I guess he ain’t you.

JIMMY
No, I guess not.

WILD BOB
I sure would like to get my hands on him though...

JIMMY nods and smiles weakly. WILD BOB is making his way towards the door. He turns back.

WILD BOB
Oh, almos’ forgot. What was it I needed again?? Goddam’, I just hate
WILD BOB cont’d
shoppin’! I just ain’t good at it. I’m good at killing. Now I’m gonna have ta go back where I come from jus’ ta remember what it is I came for! You ever do that?

JIMMY shrugs.

WILD BOB
Guess not. Too domesticated. Well, nice chatting to ya. I’ll be seeing ya.

WILD BOB swaggers out of the shop. JIMMY rushes through to the back room.

53. INT - GUN SHOP BACK ROOM DAY

OLD MR RILEY is cleaning a six-shooter while he sits down to a cup of tea. JIMMY rushes through, throws water over his face, dries himself and grabs some things while the old man talks.

OLD RILEY
Hold ya horses son... You’re liable to knock old folks over at that speed. Now listen Jimmy, have ya unpacked those crates yet? Ya know Fester’ll be over this noon ta collect ‘em. I don’t want him hanging around.
JIMMY pats him on the shoulder.

    JIMMY
    Thanks for everything, Mr Riley, but I gotta go..

JIMMY rushes out, leaving a very surprised old man.

    OLD RILEY
    But Jimmy, ya pay..

54. INT - CAGNEY’S ROOM DAY

    CAGNEY is dressed in ribbons and lace and looks as fresh-faced as a pampered southern belle. She admires herself. There is a harsh knock on the door, and MR X barks.

    MR X V.O.
    It’s time, princess..

55. INT - MADELEINE’s ROOM DAY

    MADELEINE is sitting on her bed, agitated. She suddenly decides, and hastily throws on a pretty dress, tripping over as she steps on its skirts.

    MADELEINE
    Shit!

56. INT - BROTHEL HALL DAY

    CAGNEY descends the stairs with X close behind. The MADAME greets her at the bottom of the stairs.

    MADAME
    You look well enough. But I’ll judge your performance by your income.

The MADAME turns away. X escorts CAGNEY to the front door.

57. EXT - BROTHEL YARD DAY

    MR X and CAGNEY emerge from the house. Two ruffians, JUDD and IVAN, shove CAGNEY into the coach. She sits alone while JUDD and IVAN chat with MR X.

MADELEINE looks down from a second floor window. She hurries away.

    JUDD
    The workers’ll never unite. You got rocks in y'r head, Nath...
MR X
Listen, if your life wasn’t so cushy you’d be in on it.. I tell you...

IVAN
(heavy Russian accent)
Where I come from, the people are starving,.. for centuries.. living worse than slaves.. They don’t have the strength to rebel. Their will is broken. It’ll never happen.

MADELEINE appears at the carriage window away from the men.. CAGNEY is startled..

MADELEINE
Look, I’ll go to Dickhead, you go to the gun shop,.. Jimmy’s there.. Maybe he’ll help you..

CAGNEY
You didn’t tell me that yesterday!

MADELEINE
Yeah, well.. Jus’ get out o’ here now!.. I need the cash.

MADELEINE smiles weakly. CAGNEY hesitates, then gets out of the coach, letting MADELEINE take her place..

CAGNEY
Gee Mad, you look really pretty..

MADELEINE
Yeah, I had it once.. Now go!

CAGNEY
But won’t he recognize you..

CAGNEY’s speech is cut short by JUDD and IVAN suddenly breaking from their conversation and returning to the coach. CAGNEY has to duck under the carriage to avoid being seen. JUDD gets into the coach next to MADELEINE. He looks her up and down, puzzled. MADELEINE smiles sweetly and hides her face behind her fan. JUDD lets the thought go, leans out of the window and taps on the roof, signalling IVAN to go. The carriage pulls out of the yard..
CAGNEY is left kneeling where the coach was. She stands and hurries out of the yard, brushing off her dress as she goes.

58.     INT - GUN SHOP    DAY

OLD RILEY is hammering the shelf up when the bell rings signalling CAGNEY’s entrance. He turns..

OLD RILEY
My, what a beautiful sight for these old eyes to behold!.. What can I do for you young lady?

CAGNEY
I believe a young man named Jimmy...

OLD RILEY
Yes. Of course. Young Jimmy..

CAGNEY
Is he here?

OLD RILEY
‘Fraid not. Left in a hurry this mornin’.

CAGNEY
Left! Will he be gone for long?

OLD RILEY
Truth is, I don’t reckon he’s comin’ back here...

CAGNEY looks devastated..

OLD RILEY
.. But he’ll come back for you, my dear. He’ll come back for you.

OLD RILEY pats CAGNEY’s hand in comfort.. She turns to go.

OLD RILEY
Forgive him his youth. He’ll get over it...

CAGNEY keeps walking. OLD RILEY puts his hand in the till and hurries to intercept CAGNEY.

OLD RILEY
Oh, and here’s his pay. I reckon it’ll get to him, if I give it to you..
CAGNEY takes the coins. OLD RILEY blinks his eyes reassuringly. CAGNEY smiles her appreciation for his kindness and leaves.

59.

INT - TED’S OFFICE  DAY

HENLEY the accountant is hunched over the bank ledgers protectively, while TED tirades over him...

TED
Whaddya think I pay you for! It’s called creative accounting. Ya just make the sums add up.

HENLEY
But..

TED
And don’t give me that bullshit about the safe! D’ya think I’d trust you in there!? You can’t even add up!.. How do I know you can count!?

HENLEY
It’s not fair! I don’t deserve to be bullied like this! I.. I can find another post!

TED
Sure,.. And do you know what it would look like when they discover you can’t even make the sums add up..?

HENLEY exhales in outrage..

TED
Come on, Henley. You just have to make them add up..

HENLEY
We haven’t got enough!

TED slams his fist down to make his point..

TED
Do you think I don’t even know what’s in my own safe!?

60.  EXT - BRISTLY HILLS BANK  DAY
A well-dressed MAN tips his hat to CAGNEY as he passes on the street. Another younger man does the same, saying..

YOUNGER MAN
G’day Ma’m.

CAGNEY steals a glance at herself in the Bristly Hills Bank window, and appreciates the view. A gentleman exits the Bank with a wad of notes which he pockets. CAGNEY sees this, thinks quickly, and enters...

61. INT - BRISTLY HILLS BANK DAY

Through the glass partition we see TED still berating HENLEY. DEREK comes forward to serve CAGNEY.

DEREK
Can I be of service to you, M’am.

CAGNEY
(southern accent)
Why yes, young man. I was hoping to see your manager..

DEREK is quite captivated.

DEREK
Yes sir! Immediately, Miss!

In his haste, DEREK walks right into Gloria’s desk as he beelines for Ted’s door. He hides his pain, looks into Ted’s office, reconsiders, and turns back to her..

DEREK
Umm,.. I’m sorry M’am.. The manager is unavailable..

CAGNEY is immediately downcast. DEREK tries to placate her. TED looks up from inside his office, and immediately bundles the books and HENLEY up..

DEREK
We could make an appointment for you...

CAGNEY
No, that’s alright..

CAGNEY turns to leave, very depressed. However, TED pushes HENLEY out through his door. HENLEY careers into DEREK, as
TED barges past through the swinging half door and into the foyer. He stops CAGNEY short.

TED
Excuse me, Miss. You want to see me?

TED smiles sweetly, and gestures for CAGNEY to enter the inner offices..

CAGNEY
Why thank you Mister..

TED
Griffiths, Edward Griffiths.. Ha ha,.. of the ah.. Ferny Hollow Griffiths..

CAGNEY
Really..?

62.     INT - TED’S OFFICE   DAY

TED
..Well,.. a relative.. Not as illustrious as you, Miss...

CAGNEY
Rockford, .. Clarabelle Rockford.. of the ah,.. Delaware Rockfords.

TED
Well, Clarabelle,.. it’s a pleasure to meet you. And may I say how honoured I am, that you have chosen my bank, for you, and your family’s quantifiab.. qualitit.. quite ah, .. ah .. extraordinary wealth..

CAGNEY
Why thank you, Mr Griffiths.

TED fusses over bringing a chair for CAGNEY to sit down on.

CAGNEY
Well, actually,...

TED
Yes, it’s um.. well.. I can’t express my excitement...

CAGNEY
You see..
TED
The Delaware Rockfords.. Let me see,...

CAGNEY
.. I have a little difficulty..

TED
.. Are they.. ah.. cattle.. No, no,.. oil..?

CAGNEY
Potatoes actually...

TED
Oh yes. Of course.. The famous Delaware potatoes.. I mean, potato Delawares... I mean, rock potatoes..

TED laughs to cover his embarrassment..

TED
So now.. Tell me Miss er.. Rockford. How much would you like to deposit?

CAGNEY
Well, actually sir, I am expecting that my family has already deposited a sum in my name ...

TED
Really..?

CAGNEY
Yes. I left express instructions for my lawyer to wire through a sizeable sum. Has it arrived?

TED
I see, ..oh.. We don’t seem to have received..

CAGNEY
But what am I to do!?

TED
Well, of course Miss Rockford, our motto is.. Er... How much is your family wiring to you?

CAGNEY
Oh, two or three..
TED

Hundred?..

CAGNEY

No silly! Hundred thousands!

TED

Well Miss Rockford.. I’m sure we can help you..

CAGNEY

Perhaps you could forward me an advance .. A few hundred, until it comes through?

TED laughs embarrassedly..

TED

Well, um .. maybe .. you could .. apply for a loan?..??

CAGNEY

Yes, a loan!

TED

There is some paperwork involved...
Just a few questions.. And some collateral ..? 

CAGNEY casts her eyes down pitifully..

TED

But since you are of such good family... Maybe we could waive it this time...

CAGNEY looks up gratefully.

TED

Yes. .. So, fill out these forms, and bring them back tomorrow.

CAGNEY

Tomorrow!

TED

..And.. then we’l1l hurry it through..

CAGNEY fixes him with her large eyes. TED laughs nervously..
TED
So,.. tomorrow then..

CAGNEY
If it must be.

CAGNEY exits. TED resumes his work mode..

TED
Henley! HENLEY! Bring those books.

HENLEY appears at Ted’s door in trepidation..

63. INT - SALOON BAR DAY

JIMMY is sitting in the bar. JOE comes up to him.

JOE
Can I get you something?

JIMMY
Nah.

JOE
Down on your luck?

JIMMY
Maybe.

JOE
Most folks like a drink while they’re sorting out their problems. This is a saloon.

JIMMY
Are you saying I can’t sit here unless I order..?

JOE
Either that or do some work. There’s only two sorts o’ people in this bar. The drinkers, and the workers..

JIMMY
Well I’d rather be a worker.

JOE
Dead set? Well now, we might be needing someone around.. stoke the
ovens,.. feed the chickens,.. wait on tables, chop wood.. All the little chores ..

JIMMY
You mean it?

JOE
Yeah.

JIMMY
Hang on,.. is there any bar work involved?

JOE
You ain’t one o’ those religious freaks are ya? They don’t go down too good around here.

JIMMY
No. I just don’t fancy hanging around in a saloon. .. Counter work doesn’t suit me.

JOE
Okay,.. But understand me,.. Now we ain’t a whore-house, but some of our customers meet with young ladies here. And when they do, we don’t interfere.. You got it?

JIMMY
I guess so.

JOE
Right. Okay. You’re hired. You can sleep out in the back room if you need a bed. Meals with the cook. Start immediate.

JOE yells out the back..

JOE
Ethan! We got your new boy..! Go through..

JIMMY stands and moves off..
MR X enters the bar. JOE brings a drink over to him..

MR X
.. There a game on tonight??
JOE
You ain’t settled since the last one.

MR X
I know, I know. But I got regular employment now, Joe. A man can afford a few luxuries..

JOE
Well, I’ll have to check. Glossup don’t like being kept waiting for his money..

JIMMY re-enters, now wearing a dust jacket. He hovers close to JOE...

MR X
Anyone’d think you were my mother!

JOE
So how’s the girls?.. Begging you for it.. ?

MR X
‘Course. ... Had three last night.

JIMMY looks down, agitated..

JOE
Strike me dead! (to Jimmy) Whadda you want?

JIMMY
The mop?

JOE
Out in the yard.. (to MR X) Three, eh? JIMMY leaves the back way.

JOE leers unbelievingly.

MR X
Hey,.. Let me into the game and I’ll supply the entertainment...

JOE smiles widely.

64. INT - BROTHEL STAIRCASE/LANDING DAY

CAGNEY is sneaking up the stairs when MR X accosts her..

MR X
Thought you were s’posed to be entertaining Richard Glossup.

CAGNEY
So what’s it to you?

MR X
Well now, it might mean I can take advantage of the situation to persuade you to accomp’ny me this evening.

His grip tightens on her hand.

MR X
We’re goin’ ta play parlour games wi’ the gentlemen. So dress sexy!

CAGNEY continues to her room. X hovers, and locks the door once she is inside.

MR X
Wouldn’t want ya to fly the coop.

65.(intercut with 66.) INT - REE-ALTO BACK ROOM NIGHT

WILD BOB, TED AND RICHARD GLOSSUP are around a table when MR X brings CAGNEY through the door. TED looks up and scowls at CAGNEY dressed as Delilah.

GLOSSUP
So, you finally showed. Thought you might not.

MR X scowls at him, and sits.

WILD BOB
Let’s play! (to Cagney) Get us some drinks...

CAGNEY leaves the room. WILD BOB begins to deal.

GLOSSUP
So, you’re new around here.

WILD BOB
I keep movin’. How ‘bout you?

GLOSSUP
You seen the property out west of here?

WILD BOB nods.
GLOSSUP
That’s mine. I invite my friends over sometimes, get some women, her sort, have a real fun time. You might want to drop in ...

WILD BOB
Yeah, I might. Women though... don’t have a lot o’ time for them. Steal a man’s vittals, that’s what...

TED giggles..

GLOSSUP
What are you laughin’ at!? You’re not invited!

TED
Yes sir.

GLOSSUP
Where’re the drinks!

He stands aggressively and exits..

MR X
Sod ’im! (to Wild Bob) How long you in town for then?

WILD BOB
Jus’ passin’... Lessin’ som’at catches my eye. Saw a fella today in the gun shop.. Looked real familiar ... Like he owed me a lotta money.

TED
The gun shop!?

WILD BOB
Yeah, .. tools o’ trade.. Ya know, I live ... outside the law ... How ’bout you?

MR X sniggers ... TED looks uncomfortable.

TED kicks him under the table.

TED
Oh,.. really.. What ah .. line of trade..? ... Rustling..?

WILD BOB
I asked you first!

TED
Yes um .. banking...

WILD BOB
Ha! Wha’ a joke. You ‘n me sittin’ down playin’ cards! Ya know, I never found a bank manager I didn’t get on with. Nice fellas in general, always real co-operative..

TED
Yes,.. I’m sure..

WILD BOB
Yeah... We’re a team.. You guys collect the money, I come an’ take it, .. Insurance pays, an’ no-one gets hurt.. Long as everyone co-operates.

TED smiles weakly. GLOSSUP re-enters with CAGNEY behind him with a tray of drinks. The men begin to play.

66. (intercut with 65.) INT - SALOON BAR NIGHT

CAGNEY comes up to the bar. JOE greets her.

JOE
What! Did he bring you!?

CAGNEY
Whisky all round, Joe.

JOE
(loudly) Jimmy!.. (to Cagney)
Cheapskate! Or you going on your back tonight?

JIMMY enters. CAGNEY at first doesn’t see him.

CAGNEY
In your dreams...
CAGNEY gasps when she sees JIMMY, who is also shocked... He stares at CAGNEY as GLOSSUP comes up behind her and wraps his arms around her possessively. CAGNEY tries to shrug him off, but GLOSSUP holds her even tighter..

JOE
(to Glossup) You won’t have any joy with her, Boss. She’s saving herself.

JOE cont’d
(to Jimmy) Crate of whisky, .. in the cellar..

JIMMY turns abruptly and leaves. JOE reaches for the last bottle of whisky on the shelf and hands it to CAGNEY, who turns as best she can...

CAGNEY
(to Glossup)
Better get this in there, before they start a riot...

GLOSSUP
How come I haven’t seen you before?
I must be losing my touch.

CAGNEY
Seems to me you’ve still got a lot of it. ...
Shouldn’t we get back to the game?

GLOSSUP
Hell no. They’ll wait. ... You’re so irresistible
I wanna kiss you!

He pushes CAGNEY back against the wall and kisses her forcefully. JIMMY re-enters to see this, but ducks behind the bar to put the crate down, not seeing GLOSSUP withdraw when CAGNEY bites his lip.

GLOSSUP
You little...!

GLOSSUP is too conscious of the watching eyes of JOE and JIMMY to cause a scene. He storms back into the back room. CAGNEY follows. JOE laughs to JIMMY.
Shouldn’t pick on that one.. Fights like a tigercat. Reckons she’s only an escort!

67.  INT - REE-ALTO BACK ROOM       NIGHT

CAGNEY is singing a blues song while the men finish the play.
MR X throws his hand down in disgust..

MR X
Bleedin’ game!

GLOSSUP
You better pay up or shut up..
By the end of the week!

They each collect together their takings, TED pocketing a wad of bills. CAGNEY finishes her song and there is a knock on the door. She opens it. It is JIMMY. She quickly pushes him out into the corridor...

68.  INT - REE-ALTO CORRIDOR       NIGHT

CAGNEY
Jimmy! What do you want?

JIMMY
You baby... I’m sorry.

CAGNEY embraces him.

CAGNEY
So you’ll take the job then..? Let me tell..

JIMMY grabs her as she turns to re-enter the room..

JIMMY
No! I’ve got a job, Cagney.. I thought you’d come and live with me..

CAGNEY
Jimmy, there’s something I should tell you.. I’m wanted..

JIMMY
Oh great!...

CAGNEY
Yeah, well if it hadn’t been for that stupid job you pulled..!
MR X bursts through the door, interrupting them. They pull away from each other guiltily.

MR X
Come on. We’re goin’ ‘ome.

He grabs CAGNEY. JIMMY is about to object when WILD BOB and TED appear at the door. Seeing WILD BOB, JIMMY turns and leaves abruptly.

TED
Don’t forget.. Tomorrow..

WILD BOB
Hell, I never bin invited to a bank before..

They leave drunkenly.

69.      INT - BROTHEL LANDING            NIGHT

MR X, in a drunken state, fumbles with the key to unlock Cagney’s door. CAGNEY takes it from him..

CAGNEY
Here, let me do it..

MR X
You’re beautiful...

He bends over to embrace her. CAGNEY steps inside her room..

CAGNEY
Go to bed Nathan..

She pushes him gently away and closes the door. He turns and staggers down the stairs..

70.      INT - CAGNEY’S ROOM              NIGHT

CAGNEY is fast asleep when there is a creaking on the stairs..

71.      INT - BROTHEL LANDING            NIGHT

MADELELEINE steps onto the landing, and goes to her door. Her gait is awkward. We do not see her face.

72.      INT - BROTHEL LANDING            DAY
We hear the key turn in the lock and CAGNEY emerges from her room in her dressing gown. She taps softly on MADELEINE’s door. There is no answer, so she cautiously opens it, and enters.

73. INT - MADELEINE’S ROOM DAY

MADELEINE is curled up on the bed.

CAGNEY
Mad,... Mad.. Are you alright?

MADELEINE
You still here!

CAGNEY
I found Jimmy.

MADELEINE
Well good on you, girl. Is he gonna take you away from all this?

CAGNEY
If you’re going to be like that...

MADELEINE
What are you doing here, girl?
This ain’t no place for you.

CAGNEY
Mad?.. What is it?

MADELEINE swings over, so that CAGNEY can see the ugly bruises and puffiness of MADELEINE’s face. CAGNEY recoils..

CAGNEY
Madeleine..!

MADELEINE
You hear me girl. Get out!

CAGNEY
But I can’t leave you...

MADELEINE
I made my own bed.. I’ll lie in it.
Just leave, leave as soon as you can ...
Get out!

CAGNEY
But Mad...
MADELEINE
Keep the faith, girl... keep your faith. It’s the most important thing you’ve got. And don’t sell your body. It’s all you’ve ever really got that’s your own.

MADELEINE coughs, unable to finish her sentence.

CAGNEY
I’ll get some water..

MADELEINE
Cagney... I talked to Dream... She’ll let you go... for a thousand dollars...

CAGNEY gasps. MADELEINE presses some money into her hand.

MADELEINE cont’d
Don’t wait. Buy X off. Here..

CAGNEY wants to refuse.

MADELEINE
Take it you damn fool! Now get outta here. I don’t want to ever see you again! Leave!!

CAGNEY exits..

74.   INT - CAGNEY’S ROOM   _____DAY

CAGNEY is anxious. She leaves in her Clarabelle outfit with a travelling bag.

75.   EXT - REE-ALTO YARD   _____DAY

JIMMY is collecting kindling when WILD BOB sees him and enters the yard, sneaking up on JIMMY..

WILD BOB
Well... I’ll be... If it ain’t Snake..

WILD BOB swings his hips, hands hovering over the guns at his side, about to draw..

WILD BOB
You gonna fight, flatbelly?

JIMMY
I... I..
JIMMY looks at his bare gun belt.
WILD BOB draws and shoots. Little flags pop out of the end of his guns, and he doubles over in laughter..

WILD BOB
Ha.. Got ya! Whatta joke!

WILD BOB comes over to JIMMY, still laughing. When he gets close he turns serious...

WILD BOB
You ‘n me’ve got a little outstanding business, ain’t we, pardner. .. That train robbery, few years back,.. You split with all the takings, .. didn’t ya?

JIMMY
No, I’ve never seen you before in my life...

WILD BOB
You better do better ‘n that, Snake. This is Wild Bob you’re dealing with here.. An’ I wants my money...!

JIMMY
But I don’t owe...

WILD BOB
Clever little ruse that, startin’ all chummy suggestin’ we pull a job, then leave me with counterfeit.. Well lucky for you I ain’t been caught for it... An’ I won’t be.. But I still wants my share. You gonna give it up or what?

WILD BOB is pointing his toy gun at JIMMY’s neck.

JIMMY
But..

WILD BOB
I ain’t interested in excuses.. Now you gonna give me my money or not?

JIMMY
I.. I.. I’m not Snake..

WILD BOB holds JIMMY tighter.

JIMMY
Okay..., okay. I’ll go an’ get it, an’ meet you...

WILD BOB
No you won’t. Wherever you go, I go. Until I get my just desserts. So where d’ya wanna start?

JIMMY
This way..

JIMMY and WILD BOB leave the yard together...

76.     INT - TED’S OFFICE/
BRISTLY HILLS BANK          DAY

TED pats HENLEY jovially on the back as HENLEY packs up ledgers and quills in resignation.

TED
Never mind Henley. As long as I’m manager there’ll be a job for you here. You’ve done well!

TED calls out the door as he ushers HENLEY out..

TED
Derek, Derek! Have you found that book of “Who’s Who” yet!?

DEREK scurries to TED’s side..

DEREK
Yes Mr Griffiths. But I can’t find..

TED
Splendid, splendid boy. How about you run out and buy some flowers for the foyer. Place needs a bit of brightening up. Here you go.

TED hands DEREK a hundred dollar bill. DEREK is agog..

TED
What are you waiting for boy? Miss Rockford will be here soon! An’ a box of chocolates too!

DEREK scurries out.
CAGNEY is in her corset and bloomers, her dress hanging over a tree as she digs in a dry river bed. She throws the spade away and pulls out a grubby bag.

DEREK enters past the dusty cactus.

DEREK rings the bell on the dust-laden counter. A shrivelled old Indian woman sways out from the inner room. There is not a flower to be seen..

DEREK
I’d like some flowers please.

He waves the hundred dollar bill importantly.

WHITE FEATHER
What sort flower you want??

DEREK
Well... uh..

WHITE FEATHER
We got geraniums, delphiniums, daisies, spinifex, cactus.. very popular this time of year..

DEREK
Cactus!?

WHITE FEATHER
Look like water lilies,.. beautiful flower..

She gestures towards a dust-laden cactus in the corner, bereft of flowers.

DEREK
But there aren’t any flowers on it!

WHITE FEATHER
No. It need water.
DEREK
Well can you suggest anywhere that I can get a colourful bunch of flowers!?

WHITE FEATHER
Reverend’s garden. But he run out of roses, geraniums, delphiniums, and daisies. Hasn’t got any cactus or spinifex either. Him no gardener.

DEREK turns and exits. WHITE FEATHER calls after him.

WHITE FEATHER
Try White Feather Love Potion. Aphrodisiac! Much quicker effect!

80. EXT - CHURCH/MAIN STREET  _____DAY

DEREK notices the Reverend leave the church and walk into the garden of the manse. There is not a flower to be seen. DEREK cautiously mounts the steps to the church..

81. INT - CHURCH     DAY

A woman gets up from praying and pushes past DEREK to leave. He moves forward, mesmerized by the three beautiful bunches of flowers there on the dais. He comes close to one, and closes his eyes to take in the luscious smell. His face changes and he touches it..

DEREK
Fake.

He shrugs. Smiles as he pockets the hundred dollar note, and grabs the bunch, vase and all. He moves cautiously to the entrance and steps into the sunshine.

82. EXT - CHURCH/MAIN STREET  _____DAY

DEREK checks the street from the portico, till he decides it is safe. He then walks nonchalantly along the main street, flowers bursting forth from behind his back. The REVEREND emerges from his front door, sees DEREK with the flowers, and starts to yell...

REVEREND
My flowers! He’s got my flowers!

The SHERIFF turns from his conversation further down the street, and runs towards DEREK, who has by now broken into a run. The SHERIFF launches himself onto DEREK. He catches him
by the ankles, and both sprawl in the street. Flowers are strewn all around them.

JIMMY hurries around the corner with WILD BOB close behind. He trips over the SHERIFF, falling face to face with DEREK. DEREK recognizes him instantly. The SHERIFF cusses..

SHERIFF
Goddammit!

JIMMY and WILD BOB hurry away. The SHERIFF takes his annoyance out on DEREK, dragging him to his feet.

SHERIFF
What do you have to say for yourself, son? Stealing flowers from the house o’ the Lord!!

DEREK stammers..

DEREK
But... but...

REVEREND
Lynch him! He’s the one who’s been stealing my geraniums..!

DEREK
Look! Him! He’s the bankrobber! You’ve got the wrong man!

DEREK is brought up smartly and finds the SHERIFF looming over him.

SHERIFF
Now come along, son. You’ve been caught redhanded. I think you should pay us a little visit... at the sheriff’s office...

DEREK is dragged hapless along the street. The REVEREND follows, abusing DEREK as he goes.

REVEREND
You are nothing but a heathen. A heathen I say..!

The onlookers disperse.. DEREK and the SHERIFF disappear around the corner...

83. INT - SHERIFF’S OFFICE DAY

DEREK is pushed in ahead of the SHERIFF.
DEREK  
..He robbed the Bristly Hills Bank!  
I’ve got a photograph.

SHERIFF  
Oh, and my Aunt’s the Queen of Sheba!

The SHERIFF looks at DEREK and ‘tuts’. DEREK gets very frustrated..

DEREK  
Look at your report! .. Mr Griffiths my manager wrote a (report..)

SHERIFF  
Griffiths eh? He’s that dude who waves a lot o’ hundred dollar bills around, ain’t he?

DEREK nods gleefully, and produces the hundred dollar bill from his pocket. The SHERIFF snatches it.

SHERIFF  
Give me that! Okay,,.. I’ll just pay him a little visit.

DEREK eagerly moves to go...

SHERIFF  
Not you! Now get in there!

The SHERIFF shoves the hapless DEREK into the cell...

DEREK  
But I’m just a clerk!

The cell door slams.

84. EXT - DRY RIVER BED  ____DAY

JIMMY is counting paces, followed closely by WILD BOB. They round a tree and there find... An empty hole..

JIMMY (simult.)  
Goddamn!

JIMMY (simult. #2)  
I been robbed!
WILD BOB (simult. #2)
Ya bin robbed!

JIMMY
Why, that cotton-pickin’ little...!

WILD BOB
You know who done this?

JIMMY
I got a fair idea...

WILD BOB
That’s good, cos I ain’t expectin’ t’ inherit your misfortune..

JIMMY
You’re darn right!

WILD BOB
So where to now?

JIMMY
Back to town.

85. INT - TED’S OFFICE/ BRISTLY HILLS BANK DAY

TED is in the safe counting...

TED
Six thousand nine hundred and..

..He looks out and sees CAGNEY enter, dressed as Clarabelle. He slams the safe door and hurries out to greet her..

TED
My dear Miss Rockford.. beautiful as ever..

CAGNEY
Why, thank you Edward..

TED
Come in to my office,.. do.

86. INT - TED’S OFFICE DAY

TED
Here, let me take that bag for you..
TED cont’d
It looks rather heavy for a young lady..

CAGNEY
Well, it is a little. But daddy insisted I bring it!

TED dumps it down heavily.

TED
I’m afraid I still haven’t received the wire..

CAGNEY
Oh no! That means this is all I have!

TED
Er... All you have?

CAGNEY
Yes. Well,.. I had to bring it with me. I barely trust those folks in the hotel..

TED
Ah... What exactly is in your bag?

CAGNEY
Oh, loose change..

CAGNEY opens the bag briefly to show TED the wads of bills filling the bag. TED is speechless..

CAGNEY
It’s such an inconvenience! What do you think? Is it safe to leave in my hotel room?

TED
No no Miss Rockford!.. I would feel much better if you left it here with me..

CAGNEY
Why, what a brilliant idea Mr Griffiths! I could open an account, and withdraw it as I (want)..

TED
Oh no, no, no.. All the inconvenience, forms, paperwork.. Hardly worth the bother.. Why don’t I just look after it for you?

CAGNEY hesitates..

CAGNEY
And I can take money out through the tellers?

TED
No.. Of course, you will have to talk to me..

TED grabs the bag proprietorially.. CAGNEY grabs its other end..

CAGNEY
I really think it would be much more convenient ...

CAGNEY notices the SHERIFF at the counter speaking to GLORIA. To TED’s surprise she lets her end go. TED stumbles..

CAGNEY
On second thoughts..

GLORIA knocks on the door and in steps the SHERIFF.

SHERIFF
Well, howdy doody Mr Griffiths.. I believe you’re the manager o’ this fine establishment..

TED
Yes sir.. Manager, yes..

CAGNEY
Well, I best be going, Edward...

The SHERIFF tips his hat to CAGNEY, who hurries to the door, until she hears...

SHERIFF
Had any robberies, lately?

TED
Robberies?.. Ah .. Not that I recall...

No..

CAGNEY interrupts..
CAGNEY
Why Edward, I forgot to get that note of receipt from you..

CAGNEY seats herself again. The SHERIFF continues..

SHERIFF
No robberies, eh... That’s good, isn’t it. Sleepy little town, hard-working folk.. They need to know their money’s safe, don’t they..?

TED
Yes sir. Safe as houses. Our safe is the safest.. No problem there.

SHERIFF
Would you mind if I.. check the contents of your safe?

TED
Oh no.. never! I could never let you do that. Money, personal effects, property deeds.. Highly confidential material..

SHERIFF
I’d like to see inside your safe, so that I could feel reassured that our community’s wealth was in good hands...

TED
Sir!

SHERIFF
Let me advise you Mr Griffiths. I have your assistant in my cell. He was caught stealing flowers from a community church. Now when I started questioning him, he claimed that this was yours...

The SHERIFF holds out the hundred dollar note. TED laughs weakly..

TED
Did he..?

SHERIFF
He also told me an extraordinary tale.. about the bank being robbed on Tuesday.
TED
Robbed..?

SHERIFF
And it still hasn’t been reported. Now why would that be, Mr Griffiths?

TED
Sheriff, are you suggesting..

At this point CAGNEY interrupts..

CAGNEY
Well now Sheriff, I am gratified to know that the law is being upheld. However, in my brief acquaintance with Mr Griffiths I would say he’s a real gentleman, and couldn’t possibly have anything to hide, could you Edward?

TED
Well,.. no...

CAGNEY
So why don’t you just open the safe, Edward, to reassure our sheriff here...

TED
No!... There are delicate security systems in place...

SHERIFF
Well,.. so the safe couldn’t have been robbed, as such, could it?

TED
Yes,.. No!..

SHERIFF
So all the money and goods in there must truly .. add up!

TED
Oh yes, of course, of course. I’ll get my... HENLEY! ... my accountant... HENLEY!

HENLEY shuffles in from the outer office with the ledgers...

TED
Henley, .. show this gentleman the ledgers...

HENLEY
Yes Mr Griffiths...

The SHERIFF looks over them while CAGNEY whispers...

CAGNEY
Edward... Why don’t you open the safe for the gentleman.. so we can get back to our business...

TED nods, desperate.

SHERIFF
All looks alright.. But looks can be deceiving... The point is, .. is there enough money in the safe..?

HENLEY looks extremely nervous...

SHERIFF
Whadda you say, Henley...?

HENLEY
Yes sir, no sir..

SHERIFF
Well.. that’s a curious answer.

CAGNEY
If I may say so sir, I think your imputations are a little heavy-handed. If Mr Griffiths’ bank was robbed, surely he would have nothing in his safe. Isn’t that right, Edward?

TED nods..

CAGNEY cont’d
In which case, if we could prevail upon Mr Griffiths to show us the contents - not to touch or smell or count.. but merely to observe... Would that not renew your confidence, Mr Sheriff?

TED
Yes, yes..

SHERIFF
Well ... okay.. I can see your point
Miss...?

CAGNEY

Rockford.

SHERIFF

Miss Rockford. If Mr Griffiths will
open the safe, I will be satisfied, for
the moment...

TED

Good ... good .. Well, then ... I’ll
just ...

TED grabs the keys, unlocks the safe, and spins the
combination wheel four times. Each move is watched intently
by CAGNEY and the SHERIFF, while TED barricades his moves as
best he can with his body. .. Finally he turns the handle and
the heavy door swings open. All three peer into the vault..
All are awed by the experience.. TED slams the door
quickly...

TED

Well.. I expect you’re satisfied now,
Mr Sheriff. If you’d be so kind...

TED gestures towards the door.

SHERIFF

Not so fast! There is the other
matter...

TED

Other matter?

SHERIFF

The hundred dollar bill.. Most folks
don’t carry that kinda money on the
streets, .. I wonder how your clerk
came to be holding it. He said he got
it from you.

CAGNEY grabs the proffered bill quickly and stuffs it into
her corset...

CAGNEY

Well, I thought the office needed some
brightening, so I asked the boy to buy
some flowers... And now I think I must be going.. Sheriff, would you escort me to my hotel...?

SHERIFF
Why certainly, Miss..

CAGNEY
Goodbye Edward.. I’m sure we can finish our business at some other time...?

TED
Of course Miss Rockford..

The SHERIFF and CAGNEY leave. TED shoves HENLEY out and eagerly eyes CAGNEY’s bag of money..

87.   INT - BROTHEL LANDING/
    (intercut)   MADELEINE’S ROOM     DAY

       MADELEINE is resting on her bed when she hears voices on the landing..

MADAME
.. Our invalid.. Madeleine.. fell down the stairs..

IVAN nods..

MADAME cont’d
..Oh, and this one here.. You should be familiar with.. I sent her to you the other day.. Uncontrollable.. I’m keeping her under lock and key at the moment, to teach her a lesson..

MADELEINE
(to herself) ..Ivan!

The MADAME raps on Cagney’s door. There is no reply. MADELEINE listens anxiously..

MADAME
Come on girl,.. Answer me!

The MADAME turns CAGNEY’s door handle, but the door is locked..

MADAME
Sulking.. Anyway,.. you’ll meet her soon enough.. Now come into my office..
The MADAME and IVAN descend the stairs.

88. EXT - BROTHEL YARD DAY

CAGNEY is creeping into the yard, careful not to be seen, when she is overtaken by MR X, who holds his head as he strides past and enters, ignoring her. From inside we hear the MADAME call..

MADAME V.O.
X!.. X! Where are you!

CAGNEY gives an involuntary shiver.

89. INT - BROTHEL HALL/
(intercut) TED’S OFFICE DAY

The MADAME is holding out the phone, furious.

MADAME
I am not your secretary, Mr X.
You can see me after..

MR X takes the phone..

MRX
Who is it.

TED
Where’ve you been! I’ve got a job.

MR X
I don’t want your flamin’ job.. Ya hear?

TED
Come on... I’m sorry. I’m sorry..
Listen.. I’ll pay.. Don’t hang up!

MR X
How much?

TED
Ah.. don’t you want to hear what it is first?

MR X
I want to see the colour of your money, for all the inconvenience you put me through.
TED
Inconvenience?.. Don’t fool yourself. Let me tell you what I want you to do.. My assistant is at the Sheriff’s office. I need to get him out. I want you to organize it, .. without mentioning my name. Take him home, and make sure he understands how to keep quiet.. Ya got that?

MR X
Yeah..

TED
Good. So I’ll see you at the Bank then,.. in thirty minutes..

MR X
It’ll cost you a thousand.

TED
A thousand dollars! But,.. but..

MR X
Listen, Gibbon.. I don’t care a damn about saving your arse. I do it for money. An’ that’s my price..

TED
(hoarsely)
Okay..

MR X
Good. I’ll see you in thirty minutes then.

MR X slams down the phone. TED gasps for breath, then moves to the safe to reassure himself.

90.   INT - MADAME’S OFFICE/
(intercut with 91.) BROTHEL HALL/STAIRCASE   DAY

The MADAME is seated at her desk.. MR X enters.

MADAME
I fear your other business affairs are intruding on your duties here, Mr X and I am therefore terminating your employment immediately.
MR X
You bitch!

MADAME
Rather than looking after my girls, I find you much more interested in taking advantage of your situation here. You should be grateful I am only withholding your wages.

MR X draws back his arm to strike the MADAME, but IVAN steps from behind the half closed door and pins his arms behind his back. The MADAME gets up coolly.

MADAME
To show my magnanimity, I will not have Ivan beat you this time. However, if you ever come close to my establishment again, I will see to it that you rot in hell.. Throw him out!

IVAN takes MR X out the door roughly.

91. (intercut with 90.) INT - BROTHEL STAIRCASE       DAY

CAGNEY sneaks cautiously past the MADAME’s door, which is closed. The MADAME’s voice within is muffled..

92.         INT - MADELEINE’S ROOM/
            BROTHEL LANDING/CAGNEY’S ROOM       DAY

CAGNEY knocks gently and enters MADELEINE’s room. MADELEINE looks around anxiously..

MADELEINE
Oh thank God! Cag, get back to your room.. The Bitch has hired a new.. CAGNEY ignores her in her excitement..

CAGNEY
Mad,.. Have a look at this..

She withdraws a roll of notes from her purse.. MADELEINE stares..

MADELEINE
Cagney!

CAGNEY
Two thousand.. She’ll have to let us both go!
MADELEINE
Two thousand dollars! I don’t believe it!

CAGNEY
Yep, two thousand smackeroonis.. Well, a little more. Train fare, hotel bills. So we can go first class..

MADELEINE
Oh Cag!

CAGNEY throws the notes into the air, and the two embrace, laughing and squealing, until MADELEINE indicates they are too loud..

MADELEINE
But seriously, we’re not gonna be chased or anything, are we?..

CAGNEY
(lies)..Absolutely legit.. Are you well enough to travel?..?

MADELEINE
Always well enough to leave this hole! .. Hey, but guess what. Ivan’s the new screw..

CAGNEY
No time to waste then. I’ll pack your things. What do you need?

CAGNEY goes to the wardrobe and begins pulling out clothes when MADELEINE’s door flies open, and there stand the MADAME and IVAN. The MADAME is furious.

MADAME
What is this!? Get back to your room!! I thought I’d taught you a lesson! Ivan,.. get your belt!!

IVAN begins to undo his belt. CAGNEY wavers, but then collects herself..

CAGNEY
Put that away, Ivan.. Here! Here is the money for my freedom. and Madeleine’s. We are no longer your employees..

CAGNEY hands over the few bills she still has in her hand, and gestures to the rest.
CAGNEY
We would appreciate not being hindered..

The MADAME grabs the money, livid..

MADAME
You little upstart! As if would let you go after all the trouble you’ve caused me.. Ivan,.. beat her!

IVAN lunges for her. CAGNEY ducks, and attempts to scramble for the door. The MADAME grabs at her, but only gets her skirt.. There is pandemonium, while CAGNEY kicks and screams as IVAN tries to get a hold and the MADAME shouts instructions. It takes several seconds before anyone recognizes the piercing ring of the doorbell. When she does, the MADAME straightens her hair and posture, and barks to IVAN..

MADAME
Throw her in her room.. I want to watch!

She storms out of the room. IVAN gets hold of CAGNEY and forces her towards her room while MADELEINE remains shuddering on her bed.

93.   INT - BROTHEL HALL   _    DAY

The MADAME opens the door with poise. There on the doorstep are JIMMY and WILD BOB. JIMMY is wearing WILD BOB’s hat and a scarf over his face like an outlaw..

MADAME
Good afternoon gentlemen. Come in. What can we do for you?

WILD BOB
We wanna see a girl.. Blond hair, early 20’s, blue eyes..

MADAME
I know just the one.. IVAN! Show these gentlemen through to the Dream suite..

IVAN appears on the landing and indicates with his head. JIMMY looks uncertainly at WILD BOB who goes ahead.

MADAME
Two for one.. I like that. She’s a wildcat.. likes to play rough.. She can take whatever you give..

The MADAME nods to IVAN before he leads JIMMY and WILD BOB down the corridor.

94. INT- BROTHEL CORRIDOR    DAY

IVAN indicates a door at the end of the corridor, and returns to fetch Cagney. JIMMY goes to enter. WILD BOB follows.

JIMMY
Hang on.. Do you mind if I speak to her alone!

WILD BOB
Yeah, well,.. I’ll be waiting..

95. INT - BROTHEL LANDING/ CAGNEY’S ROOM   DAY

IVAN unlocks and opens CAGNEY’s door, grabs her roughly, and drags her out. MADELEINE appears at her door, concerned for CAGNEY, who looks back with frightened eyes.

96.(intercut with 97.) INT - DREAM SUITE   DAY

With a push from IVAN, CAGNEY almost falls forward into the room. She scampers behind the standing screen and begins to talk while she pulls Ted’s hundred dollar note from her corset with shaking fingers. JIMMY slowly turns to face her, pulling down his face scarf.

CAGNEY
Hey, cowboy.. This is your lucky day.. I got something extra special for you... I got..

CAGNEY peers out from behind the screen to see JIMMY staring at her.

CAGNEY
Jimmy!!

JIMMY
You lied to me!

CAGNEY
No I didn’t... You’re the first,.. I mean.. Dream is gonna,.. I was gonna...

CAGNEY holds out the hundred dollar note weakly..

JIMMY
Oh yeah,.. I’m the first. .. Is that the last of it?

CAGNEY
What?

JIMMY
The last of the money I put away.. for you and I,.. You took it, didn’t you..

CAGNEY
No.. Yes! It’s in the bank.

JIMMY
In the bank!? 

CAGNEY
Yeah, I was trying to get (real money).. 

JIMMY
That money’s traceable..

CAGNEY
Traceable..?

JIMMY
Yeah,.. to me. They could lynch me.

CAGNEY
Yeah. Well it’s traceable to me too.

JIMMY
To you?

CAGNEY
Yeah. It’s counterfeit.

JIMMY
Don’t lie to me! I took it out of the bank myself. .. (glares at her) Not earning enough?

CAGNEY
You bastard, Jimmy! ...If you’d have
offered me a future. If we could’ve had any future, apart from a hanging.

JIMMY
Yeah,.. Well I’m doing it now! What are you doing!?

CAGNEY
I’m just trying to get out of this place..

CAGNEY collapses on the bed, with no energy to argue..

JIMMY
What did you do with the real money?

CAGNEY
Don’t you get it? There never was any real money! You were cheated!

JIMMY
That lousy little..

CAGNEY
Probably the reason you got caught too..

JIMMY
Well that’s great! Now I’ve got an irate outlaw waiting to gut me, and you’ve given the money into the hands of the law! 

CAGNEY
Hardly! Anyway, I can get it back..

JIMMY
Don’t bother! I’ll do it myself!

He turns angrily to exit. CAGNEY grabs at his sleeve..

CAGNEY
Don’t Jimmy.. Let me. At least then only one of us is wanted..

JIMMY
Yeah,.. s’pose you’re right..

CAGNEY
You’ll have to pay Dream .. to take me
out.. Here..

She holds out the hundred dollar note to him. He hesitates..

    JIMMY
    Haven’t ya got anything smaller!? 

CAGNEY looks at him ruefully.. He takes it.

    JIMMY
    At least it’s not real..

CAGNEY sighs deeply, without correcting him.. She stands to
leave..

    JIMMY
    And when we get this, you can leave?

CAGNEY looks at him..

    CAGNEY
    I don’t know Jimmy. There’s Madeleine..

    JIMMY
    Hell Cagney, how many other excuses
can you find?..

He turns abruptly. At the door he checks the corridor before
they depart.

97.(intercut with 96.) INT - BROTHEL CORRIDOR     DAY

    WILD BOB, left alone in the corridor, wanders towards the
two doors at its end. He opens the first one, but closes it
quickly..

    WILD BOB
    ‘Scuse me.

.. He opens the other door into a luxurious bathroom replete
with king size hip bath. He enters it and closes the door..

98.          INT - BROTHEL CORRIDOR          DAY

    JIMMY exits the dream suite cautiously, with CAGNEY
following. There is no sign of WILD BOB. Just loud hearty
singing emanating from the end room.. JIMMY slips down the
stairs at the end of the corridor..

    CAGNEY
    pauses..
I just have to get changed..

She slips into her room.

99. INT - BROTHEL HALL DAY

As soon as JIMMY’s foot hits the hall floor, the MADAME appears from her office..

MADAME
Did she suit you?

JIMMY
Yes thankyou Ma’am. So good I wanna take her out with me.. This enough?

He waves the hundred at her. CAGNEY appears at the top of the stairs as Clarabelle..

MADAME
A hundred..? Well ..!

The MADAME sees CAGNEY..

MADAME
Well my dear.. You look very nice..
I’m sure Madeleine will envy you..
She’ll be here you know,.. for when you return..

CAGNEY understands the scarcely veiled threat.

MADAME
(to Jimmy) Bring her back safely now..

JIMMY
Certainly will!

JIMMY leaves. MADAME DREAM returns to her office, well-satisfied..

100. INT - SHERIFF’S OFFICE DAY

DEREK is talking incessantly to the office space in general.. The SHERIFF and DEPUTY are both wearing ear plugs..

DEREK
..They’ve never done an audit,.. never.
For years he’s been doing it. ..
Getting away with it. He just walks into the safe and takes money, a hundred here, five hundred there.. You
know, I’m glad really, that all this has happened. Now it gives me a chance to tell someone. It’s been a burden. Believe me, a burden... I’m just a clerk... a loyal servant in the cause of commerce, but to see how he got away with it.. And I... my whole future ahead of me...

MR X enters the office. The DEPUTY sidles over to the counter..

DEPUTY
What can I do for you?

MR X
I’m here to collect that lad..

DEPUTY
Thank God!! Here’s the papers.. Just sign. I’ll fill in the details. Just take him outta here..

MR X
How much?

MR X pulls out several hundred dollar bills.. The DEPUTY grabs two.

DEPUTY
Hell, doesn’t seem quite fair. I’m getting the bargain..

This doesn’t stop the DEPUTY taking another one..

DEPUTY
Who should I say? ...

MR X
Nathan Honeycombe..

DEPUTY
Just sign there please..

MR X signs a big “X”.

DEPUTY
He’s all yours..

He unlocks the cell and brings DEREK out..

DEREK
I’m glad someone has brought them to their senses. Are you from Internal Revenue..? Boy, have I got a story for you. I’ve been working for a year.. well nearly two.. at the Bristly Hills Bank,.. quite an ordinary sort of job,. Do you want to hear about the robbery first, or the Bank Manager’s embezzling?.. I can tell you both..

MR X leaves with DEREK, still chattering incessantly.

101. EXT - STREET/HOUSE DAY

DEREK and X approach the house..

DEREK
.. my theory is, that he doesn’t want the robber to be found, because then they’ll investigate the bank.. more importantly the contents of the safe.. and then it will be all out in the open. Shall I show you the picture?

DEREK lifts up a floorboard on the porch and takes out the photograph of Jimmy..

DEREK
You see, you can tell it’s authentic because of the black burnt bits.. the flash exploding..

MR X is much more interested in who the man is. He smiles widely..

MR X
You’re an extraordinary young man, Derek.

DEREK
Thank you, sir.

MR X
..You are also fired.

DEREK
What!?

MR X
I am what you might call a business associate of Mr Griffiths..
DEREK gasps audibly and backs away..

MR X
.. And you have just done me a great favour. So I’ll do you one. Leave Bristly Hills and forget everything, and I promise you I will never come to hunt you down. You got me?

DEREK nods manically.

MR X
Now get!

DEREK doesn’t need to be told twice to run. X smiles down at the photo.

MR X
Not just a pretty face..

102.  INT - BROTHEL BATHROOM         _ DAY

WILD BOB finishes his song and reaches for a towel. He stands..

103.  INT - BROTHEL CORRIDOR/
      DREAM SUITE          _ DAY

WILD BOB knocks on the door of the Dream Suite. When there is no answer he throws it open. Seeing no-one inside he races down the corridor..

104.  INT - BROTHEL HALL                _ DAY

MADAME DREAM meets WILD BOB in the hallway..

MADAME
Ah, you’ve finished at last. I’d begun to think you had flown the coop.

WILD BOB grunts. He pushes her to one side and hurries out the door. The MADAME yells..

MADAME
IVAN! Get him!

105.  INT - TED’S OFFICE                  _ DAY
TED is bundling together strips of paper, each the same size and shape as the dollar note he is placing on the top and bottom before putting an elastic band around it. MR X knocks, and TED hastily shoves the box of these under his desk. He opens the door..

TED
I thought I told you I didn’t want to see you!

MR X
I don’t care. I want to see you Mr Gibbon. Now thanks ta you I haven’t got my respectable job no more. So I’m reconsidering your job offer.. You wanted me to find you a bank robber. Well, I’m ready to do it. Only I want twenty thousand for it. It’s gotta be worth that ta you..

TED
Twenty thousand! You’ve gotta be kidding!

MR X
I reckon it’s worth it, to save lounging in gaol the rest of your life..

TED
If I go down you’ll go with me!

MR X
I don’t think so, Mr Gibbon. Anyway, what I propose is good for us all.. You get your bank robbed, I get my twenty grand, and you get to keep your respectable job..

TED
You slimeball! As if I would give in to your .. extortion!.. I can rob the bank myself for cheaper than that! An’ anyway.. I’ve already compromised my position enough by having business dealings with you. If you ever come near my bank again, I will have you thrown off the property!

MR X
Compromised your position! What about the whore you hang around wiv. Cleverer
than you! Runnin’ you around like the fool you are. Get’s you out of the bank so her lover can rob it..

TED
What are you saying!?

MR X
You’re the king o’ the castle and I’m the dirty rascal... Not! You can’t see the wood for the trees, Mr Sickhead. So don’t be so clever wiv me in the future. You’re a whore’s sucker. Goodbye, and good riddance!

MR X storms out. TED opens his drawer and looks at the photo of Jimmy.

TED
(hoarsely)
Delilah!

106. EXT - BRISTLY HILLS BANK DAY

MR X snarls as he exits. CAGNEY, who is coming towards the bank as Clarabelle, ducks behind JIMMY when she sees him. X doesn’t look at them.

MR X
(to himself)
Well, if you won’t share the contents of that safe with me, I’ll just have to find someone else to open it.

107. INT - TED’S OFFICE DAY

TED is on the phone when CAGNEY as Clarabelle appears at his office door.

TED
Get me Delilah!

TED looks up startled, and hastily slams the phone down.

TED
Oh, Miss Rockford. What a delightful surprise.

CAGNEY
Why thankyou, Mr Griffiths. I am so glad you’re here.

TED

Oh..?

CAGNEY

Yes. So if you’d kindly give me my bag back. I’m hoping to catch the next stage..

TED

But that’s impossi..! I mean, its so dangerous, a young lady travelling with that amount of money. Why don’t you let me wire it through to you..?

CAGNEY

Well Mr Griffiths, I hardly think that has proven to be a very successful method..

TED laughs nervously..

TED

Well.. The truth is...

At this point TED is distracted by the sight of a mail boy speaking with GLORIA. He hands over a telegram. She brings it to TED’s door..

GLORIA

Mr Peabody is here, Mr Griffiths..

TED

Mr Peabody.. !! Where!?

GLORIA

In Bristly Hills. He said he will be in tomorrow morning to begin his audit..

TED looks aghast. CAGNEY too, looks concerned..

CAGNEY

Well.. As I was saying Mr Griffiths.. I would like my bag back please. It is most urgent that I leave today..

TED
No! ... I mean.. well .. Because of ..
Your bag is .. well .. it’s in the
system now,.. And with this audit...

CAGNEY
You mean I can’t have it..!

TED
It’s just ..

CAGNEY
Mr Griffiths, I am afraid you are
greatly mistaken if you think that I
will accept that as an answer. It is my
money.. And I need it immediately!

TED
Now, Clarabelle,.. Why don’t I take you
out to dinner..?

CAGNEY
No! If I cannot withdraw my funds, I
would rather have nothing to do with
you.. I’m sure my father will...

TED
PLEASE Miss Rockford..! Let me take you
to dinner.. I’m sure I can arrange to
have your bag by this evening..

CAGNEY
What time?

TED
Eight o’clock.. At the Ree-Alto..?

CAGNEY
Six.

TED
Seven.

CAGNEY
Oh,.. alright. But I need my bag.

TED
Yes, yes,.. you’ll have your bag... The
Ree-Alto?

CAGNEY nods and exits. TED sinks down at his desk..

108.   EXT - STREET   _         DAY
JIMMY is waiting as CAGNEY exits the bank.

JIMMY
So where’s the money?

CAGNEY
He hasn’t got it.

JIMMY
He hasn’t got it! Here,.. let me..

CAGNEY has to grab JIMMY’s arm to stop him re-entering the building. She drags him off the street..

CAGNEY
I’m having dinner with him this evening.. Seven o’clock at the Ree-Alto.. He’ll bring the money then..

JIMMY shrugs her off him..

JIMMY
Yeah,.. Well I’ll be waiting..

He hardly finishes his sentence before WILD BOB interrupts from behind, grabbing both their arms..

WILD BOB
Yeah.. I’ll be waitin’ too. I’m a patient sorta man.. But don’t push me..

He pulls JIMMY to the side and whispers..

WILD BOB
..Especially if you value that little ladyfriend o’ yours.. (to both) See you at the Ree-Alto then...

WILD BOB still holds both of them as he steers them back to the brothel.

109.    EXT - BUSHES, END OF TOWN      DAY

DEREK stops, exhausted. He falls under the nearest shade, and looks back down the road from whence he has come..

DEREK
I’m never gonna make it..

He pants profusely, until ...
DEREK
Hang on,. Why am I on the run? I’m not the crook.

He flops down on the grass, recovering.

110. INT - TED’S OFFICE/ BROTHEL HALL DAY

GLORIA appears at TED’s office door..

TED
Yes Gloria?

GLORIA
I found that book, sir.. the one that Derek had.. I can’t find any Rockfords from Delaware..

TED
Don’t be silly, girl! I’m sure they’re there.. Give me that book!

TED snatches the book and examines it. His eyes narrow as he says coldly..

TED
Thank you Gloria..

She exits. TED picks up the phone and dials.. The MADAME and IVAN both appear. The MADAME answers.

MADAME
Madame Dream’s House of Love.

TED
I want to make an appointment with Delilah.

The MADAME indicates with a nod to IVAN that he should bring CAGNEY down..

MADAME
Do you Ted? Dare I ask how you’re going with her? Or are you still at the heavy petting stage? As regards our other little arrangement, I’m afraid you’ve been pipped at the post..

TED
I told you,.. She’s a lousy lay! Now let me speak to her..

MADAME
Dare I hope for an improvement on your last little effort? I asked you to tame her, not tickle her, and pay for the privilege! I’m a business woman remember..

TED
She won’t come back the same. Now let me speak to her!

MADAME
Very well. Here she is.

CAGNEY descends the stairs and takes the phone..

CAGNEY
Hello.

TED
Delilah, I’ve missed you, Sweetheart.. I want to see you - tonight.

CAGNEY
Tonight? ..

The MADAME clears her throat. CAGNEY gets the message..

CAGNEY
Tonight will be fine..

TED
Good. I can’t wait to see your smiling face. Meet me at the Ree-Alto, seven o’clock. I’ll see you then Honeypie..

CAGNEY
Seven o’clock!? .. Okay Teddybear.. See you then.

They both hang up. TED smiles to himself.

TED
Revenge is a sweet thing!

111.    EXT - BROTHEL YARD               NIGHT

MR X lurks in the shadows, watching up at CAGNEY’s window.
112. INT - BROTHEL NIGHT

CAGNEY is in her bedroom. She chooses a few most personal things, and places them in a small travelling bag. She picks up the Clarabelle wig, admires its golden ringlets, and places it in the bag. She muses over her photo of Jimmy, then places it in her bag too. IVAN knocks harshly on her door. She stiffens at the sound.

CAGNEY
Recognize your limitations, girl. Maybe you are just a common call-girl.

CAGNEY takes her 'Delilah' wig, and pulls it on badly. She exits.

113. EXT - STREET/SALOON BAR NIGHT

IVAN has his arm firmly on CAGNEY as they walk towards the Ree-Alto. CAGNEY tries to be light-hearted.

CAGNEY
Lovely night tonight, Ivan.

IVAN grunts. CAGNEY knows to be silent. MR X shadows them...

114. EXT - BROTHEL YARD NIGHT

MADELEINE watches out the window as IVAN takes CAGNEY away. In alarm she also sees MR X.

115. INT - SALOON BAR NIGHT

JIMMY appears from behind the divide into the kitchen and talks to JOE at the bar.

JIMMY
Finished that Mr Spicer. What should I do now?

JOE
Sweep the landing upstairs, boy.

JIMMY disappears again. CAGNEY and IVAN enter. CAGNEY disengages herself and speaks to JOE at the bar. MR X enters and slips into a seat in a dark corner.

CAGNEY
Room for Mr Ted Griffiths.
MR X looks sharply round at hearing that name. CAGNEY looks him directly in the face. MR X snarls at her menacingly, but turns away when IVAN snarls back. CAGNEY turns and ascends the stairway. She goes to the room, turns the key in the lock, and enters. X watches her all the way. JIMMY appears at the other end of the landing with a broom and begins sweeping. JOE comes over to MR X, blocking his view of JIMMY.

    MR X
    Bourbon.. double.

    JOE
    Show us your money first.

MR X grabs JOE’s wrist and is about to force the issue when IVAN, watching from the other side of the room, stands threateningly.

    JOE
    We don’t like thieves and sponges around here. The Management would be happy if you’d settle your account.

    MR X
    But...

    JOE
    Settle, and you can play.

MR X takes out the money he earned for freeing Derek. He throws it down.

    MR X
    There you are. Now can I have that drink?

JOE takes the money, and returns to the bar. JIMMY finishes sweeping the landing. MR X gets up and leaves for the toilet. JIMMY descends the stairs and disappears into the kitchen. TED enters the bar. He goes directly to JOE.

    JOE
    She’s upstairs.. 202.

TED ascends the stairs. JIMMY reappears with a dustpan and follows him up. TED enters the room while JIMMY begins to sweep up the little pile of dust. MR X returns from the toilet and resumes his place.

    JOE
    You just missed loverboy.
MR X
What!

JOE
I presume that’s who you wanted..

MR X gets up to go upstairs..

JOE
Hey,.. hey!..

MR X stops reluctantly..

JOE
Don’t you go disturbing our clients!

MR X
Orright then. Give me another one. I’ll wait down here. .. Any objection to that?

JOE
Not as long as you’re ordering drinks..

MR X
You ever seen her with anyone else. A younger man?

JOE
Nah,.. Only ever seen her with him. You’re more likely to know..

MR X
Never seen her with anyone else,.. ‘cept the other night.

JOE
Well, must be some young buck’s lucky day..

MR X
Yeah..

MR X is thoughtful..

MR X
So what’s she see in him?

JOE
He’s got the keys to the bank, I guess..

JOE moves back to the bar. MR X settles back over his glass..

MR X
Keys to the bank!!

116. INT - HOTEL ROOM NIGHT

CAGNEY and TED are face to face. TED circles menacingly while CAGNEY teases flirtatiously.

TED
So,.. you miss me, little Sugarplum?

CAGNEY
I need money, Teddybear.

TED
Now, now, now Delilah.. Doesn’t Dream feed you enough?

CAGNEY
A girl needs something to fall back on.. I thought... two thousand.

TED
Two thousand?!.. Well,... Now I don’t know that you’re worth that much to me..

CAGNEY
Sure I am, Teddybear. Squeeze me an’ see..

TED comes forward and suddenly lunges onto the bed with CAGNEY. He viciously holds her down by the wrists..

TED
Now listen here, Delilah, Clarabelle, or whatever your name is.. I get the feeling I’m being taken for a ride. And I don’t like that, see? I’m gonna teach you a lesson you’ll never forget..

TED grabs the bell chord for room service, and rips it in half with his teeth. He begins to tie her wrists to the top of the bed.. CAGNEY gasps in pain with each forceful tug..
TED
That’s what I like to hear ...

There is a knock on the door. TED freezes..

TED
Who is it?

JIMMY V.O.
Room service,.. you rang..

CAGNEY yells out..

CAGNEY
Help! Help me!

JIMMY V.O.
What’s happening in there?

TED puts his hand over CAGNEY’s mouth.
CAGNEY manages to kick up at TED’s groin while he is half-
turned towards the door. He reacts, and let’s go his hand.
CAGNEY calls out..

CAGNEY
Help me!

JIMMY opens the door hurriedly, to see TED lying over CAGNEY
on the bed.. He draws his arm back, and punches TED out cold,
looks at CAGNEY, then runs out in anger and in pain..

CAGNEY
Jimmy! Oh, Jimmy..

In tears CAGNEY rifles through TED’s pockets, looking for his
wallet. At the same time as she finds it, she also finds the
keys to the bank.

CAGNEY
Jimmy..!

.. gathers herself, peers out, and exits the room.

117.  EXT - REE-ALTO YARD    ___   NIGHT

MR X, JOE and others watch, while IVAN and WILD BOB
circle..

WILD BOB
I ain’t paying f’r a bath..
118. INT - HOTEL LANDING NIGHT

CAGNEY tiptoes across the landing, but IVAN, MR X and JOE are not present.

119. EXT - REAR OF REE-ALTO NIGHT

CAGNEY looks around for Jimmy, before she disappears into the night.

120. EXT - STREET/RILEY’S YARD NIGHT

JIMMY is squatting against the gate, clearly distraught. After a while he gets up and slams his hand against the gate.

JIMMY
Whore!

The gate opens, revealing RILEY’s store of gun powders, bullets and other explosive items. He notices the dynamite.

121. EXT - BRISTLY HILLS BANK NIGHT

CAGNEY tries various keys before she finds the right one, and opens the front door to the bank. She cautiously steps inside.

122. INT - FOYER/TED’S OFFICE NIGHT

CAGNEY passes through the swinging half-door to the inner offices. She makes her way to the safe. She fumbles with the keys. Eventually one fits the lock. She turns it, triumphantly... And begins the process again for the second lock. Finally she puts her ear to the combination.. She remembers Ted’s moves and mimics them. Still the handle will not budge.

CAGNEY
Shit!

She tries to force it several times before she concedes defeat. She runs her hand over its surface, but finds nothing.

CAGNEY
SHIT!!

There is a clunk, and CAGNEY freezes in terror. In the dark she makes a knuckleduster of the keyring. She settles back into the shadows to wait.
JIMMY enters the office and comes straight over to the safe. He carries a hessian bag. Out of this he takes the dynamite, ready bundled. He shoves it between the safe door and the handle, and lights the fuse just as CAGNEY sticks the keys in his back threateningly..

CAGNEY
Don’t move. I’ve got you covered..

JIMMY moves quickly and desperately, turning and smothering CAGNEY with his hessian bag. She struggles, while JIMMY holds her down..

JIMMY
It’s gonna blow! Stop struggling, god damn you!

CAGNEY takes an opportunity to knee him in the groin. JIMMY lets go of her. For the first time in the light of the fuse CAGNEY recognizes JIMMY.

CAGNEY
Jimmy! Oh Jimmy it’s you!

She embraces him warmly. JIMMY isn’t quite so joyous.

JIMMY
Get down, you stupid woman! You wanna get us both blasted?!

CAGNEY
You’re the one who started it! Anyway, I got here first. You’re robbing my bank.

JIMMY
Your bank! I came here my first day in town. That entitles me to call it my bank.

CAGNEY
Excuse me. I’ve risked my arse for you trying to give you this bank to rob, and you refused. You wanted to have an honest job! Where are your scruples now?!

JIMMY
On the scrap heap, with memories of the girl I loved.

CAGNEY is silenced by this. JIMMY suddenly remembers the dynamite, and dives behind the desk, grabbing CAGNEY as he goes. They fall together. Silence. The hiss of burning
ceases. They both wait for the inevitable... It doesn’t happen.

CAGNEY
Call yourself a bank robber!

JIMMY
Call yourself my girl!

CAGNEY
I was your girl Jimmy! I mean, I still am. I haven’t done anything to change that!

JIMMY
Oh, so I suppose you were in that room with him to have a cup of tea and a chat!

CAGNEY
How else was I supposed to get these?

CAGNEY holds out the keys.

JIMMY
Cag! You’ve got the keys!

CAGNEY
Of course I’ve got the keys. It’s unlocked.. I just can’t (get it open..)

JIMMY
God damn woman. Watch this..

JIMMY moves to the safe. He feels around for the combination wheel and with his ear to the heavy steel door he listens and turns till he is confident it is free. CAGNEY listens too.

CAGNEY
What were you hearing?

JIMMY just grins, turns the handle with ease, and the heavy door swings easily open. CAGNEY and JIMMY look inside, with rapt expressions on their faces. JIMMY turns to lift CAGNEY as she turns to jump into his arms. They step across the threshold.

123. INT - HOTEL ROOM NIGHT

TED awakes, groggy. He feels his pockets, and races out of the room.

124. INT - LANDING/SALOON BAR NIGHT
TED staggers along the landing and down the stairs, running straight into one of the tables. The sound startles MR X out of his reverie.

MR X
Hey, Griffiths,.. I wan’ a word wiv you!

TED doesn’t pay any attention, but rushes straight out the door. MR X follows.

125.            EXT - STREET            NIGHT

TED hurries down the street, ignoring MR X, who tags behind.

MR X
Griffiths.. Ya can’t get away from me. I know too much.. I could ruin you.. You have to share with me.. Fifty - fifty, that’s fair..

126.            INT - BANK            NIGHT

JIMMY and CAGNEY each have a huge hessian bag full of the loot - including jewellery, gold and notes and the bag of counterfeit. CAGNEY looks back into the safe, where TED’s petty cash jar and retirement fund cashbox sit amongst a modest remainder..

CAGNEY
No need to be greedy..

She inserts the key into the safe door while JIMMY bundles the dynamite into his bag..

CAGNEY
That’s not dangerous, is it?

JIMMY
Nah..

CAGNEY
Best leave it, .. just in case.

JIMMY puts it back down on the floor, and JIMMY and CAGNEY slip out of the office. TED jiggles the rear door from the outside, trying to get in..
127. EXT - BRISTLY HILLS BANK, REAR NIGHT

TED is furiously jiggling at his rear entrance when MR X catches up. The noise awakes DEREK, who is sleeping behind a bush. He wakes, alert, and disappears into the night.

MR X
Are you gonna call me a partner or not? Not here, not here. The front door!

MR X has to slap TED, who seems catatonic with panic. TED snaps out of it, and runs around to the front of the building. TED and X arrive at the front door as CAGNEY and JIMMY disappear into the night.

MR X
Now take it easy, Ted. They’re crooks, remember. It might turn a bit nasty.

MR X prepares to enter first, but then stops, barring TED’s way...

MR X
Now we’ve agreed, sixty-forty.

TED nods, still too overwrought to speak. X proceeds inside, followed closely by TED.

128. EXT - SHERIFF’S HOUSE NIGHT

DEREK raps on the front door, then on the windows, then on the back door. Finally the SHERIFF, in his nightgown, answers.

SHERIFF
You again!

DEREK
They’re there... Mr Griffiths and that Nathan Honeycombe.. They’re breaking in to the bank.. Come on!!

With that DEREK flies off into the night. The SHERIFF grabs his clothes and reluctantly follows, dressing as he goes. He knocks on the house two doors down on his way, calling.

SHERIFF
Deputy.. Get out here!! (to himself) I ain’t gonna be the only one who has my sleep disturbed.
INT - TED’S OFFICE     NIGHT

TED and MR X briefly pause at the office door before they both run into the open safe. TED begins kissing the remaining gold, jewels and notes in rapture. X too, is overawed by the sight of the contents, and lovingly strokes a gold bar,.. until TED grabs his face in both hands and moves to kiss him. X backs away in horror. His foot kicks the dynamite, which rolls against TED’s chair leg, and explodes with smoke and flames. The two men fall back into the safe, and are rained upon by notes. When the smoke subsides the heavy figure of WILD BOB stands over them.. TED jumps in fright..

TED
Ah,.. Wild Bob.. So nice of you to join us..

WILD BOB
Well now, I always find that robberies go much smoother if everyone co-operates..

WILD BOB moves forward waving his gun at TED and MR X. The three men freeze however when there is the heavy pounding of the law on the rear door..

SHERIFF V.O.
Not here stupid.. The front door..!

TED is first to register..

TED
You called them!

MR X
Don’t be daft! Why would I do that?

TED
Well, as if I would! You double-crossed me!

MR X
Me!? You’re the one who embezzles on a regular basis! Don’t try to point the finger at me!

TED
You thief! You stole my money! Here, give that to me!
TED attempts to wrest the gold bar and notes from MR X’s hands and pockets. MR X fights back, snatching at anything he can reach.

130. INT - TED’S OFFICE NIGHT

TED and MR X are each holding an end to the Retirement fund when they are interrupted by the SHERIFF. Both look up stunned and say in unison..

TED/MR X (simult.)
It was HIM!

WILD BOB (simult.)
It was THEM!

DEREK grins widely..

131. INT/EXT - BROTHEL HALL NIGHT

JIMMY raps loudly on the brothel door. MADAME DREAM opens it..

MADAME
My, you’re keen.. Come in.. I’ve got a lovely brunette..

JIMMY
I want Madeleine.. And Louisa.. And I’m paying for Cagney too. How much?

MADAME
All at once!? 

JIMMY
Yeah,.. and they are coming with me..

MADAME
Well,.. Let’s see now.. Evening rate..

JIMMY
I’ll give you ten thousand for keeps..

MADAME
Well.. that’s very generous... But I’m afraid Cagney is (out with one..)

CAGNEY steps forward out of the shadows..

MADAME
You want all of them..?
JIMMY
Bring them down..

CAGNEY hurries past MADAME DREAM. She returns shortly with MADELEINE and the young girl, LOUISA. JIMMY hands over the money..

JIMMY
Here you go.. Ten thousand dollars..

They turn and leave.. The MADAME gloatingly counts the notes. Out of the shadows steps IVAN..

IVAN
I will be pleased to take those off your hands...

MADAME
Ivan!

She falls to the floor from his single blow. IVAN exits..

132.   EXT - RAILWAY SIDING     NIGHT

MADELEINE has her arm around LOUISA, JIMMY’s is around CAGNEY..

MADELEINE
Sure you can’t take first class with us?

JIMMY
It ain’t worth the risk..

CAGNEY
I think we’ll be cosy enough in here..

They smile at each other, and MADELEINE and LOUISA hurry towards the official platform.. JIMMY helps CAGNEY into the baggage car..

133.    INT - BAGGAGE CAR     NIGHT

CAGNEY snuggles into JIMMY’s shoulder as they watch the sunrise over the dusky plain. They kiss..

End Credit Sequence  MONTAGE - Credit Roll__NIGHT

The set of the “Cagney & Cashflow Movie Company” Various activities happening... MADELEINE and girls are dancers in the saloon, JIMMY teaches gun skills to the stunt
men, CAGNEY is in front of the camera doing a rehearsal for the director, crew activity... etc.

THE END
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SYNOPSIS: A pretty escort must dodge her Madame’s heavies and her clients’ lecherous intentions long enough to carry out the bank robbery that will win her freedom and a chance to be the woman she wants to be.

OVERVIEW:

Working from the notes submitted with this second draft of Cashflow, there are a number of specific observations and questions that should be addressed to help facilitate the writer’s preparation for moving on to the next draft in which the current, US-set story will be moved to Australia and Aussi-fied. The notes are helpful and I would like to start by addressing them individually as I believe it’s important to deal with the issues raised by the writer first, then to address any other observations that I may have as a naive reader.

From the Writer’s Notes on Cashflow:

Strengths:

- Ensemble cast.
- Female characters/point of view/friendship between Cagney and Madeleine.
- Exaggerated characterization/comic characters.
- Opportunity to tell a story set in the Australian goldfields/historical truth (e.g., electricity in the beginning of the 20th century in Australia, water supply, contraception).
- Derek the inventor, playing on the history of technology.
- Cosmopolitan mix of characters: English, American, Australia, Russian, etc.

Weaknesses:

- Genre? Intention is to keep the comic/fantasy feel; add musical numbers (performed by Cagney at poker game, alone in room).
- Complicated... too much back story implied/played out in the present but not clearly explained or relevant (e.g., Wild Bob’s
relationship to Jimmy, Jimmy’s past robbery); counterfeit money hidden but retrieved.

- Emotional balance – nastiness/threat vs light-hearted fantasy. What rating?
- Jimmy needs to be worthy of Cagney’s love.
- The suspension of disbelief... Delilah to Clarabelle to Cagney could be long shots.
- Role of Indigenous characters? White Feather obviously needs to be Aboriginal...
- Chinese characters/other European historically accurate to goldfields?

Key notes from Writer re: next draft:

I am now rewriting Cashflow for an Australian audience to be the best it can be. I have no particular attachment to any genre... suspect melodrama, but am more interested in enhancing the fun of the script. I will use the process of rewriting this screenplay to interrogate the development of voice; criteria to help identify voice in a work; and to explore the concept of an Australian voice’.
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Strengths:

Ensemble cast.

- Though clearly Cagney's story, the screenplay does provide a lively mix of fun and funny characters. Most vividly rendered are Cagney and Ted
- Griffiths; which is good as they provide a key protagonist-antagonist axis in the story (even more so than the
Cagney-Madame Dream conflict though I believe this is set up to be the key conflict).

- That said, Cagney still feels a bit all-over-the-place. I have a sense of what her motivation is and why (running off to become a movie star), but this clear motivation gets lost in the shuffle amid plot and tonal shifts between broad comic melodrama and more serious dramedy.

- Look to the stories of the secondary characters to give them a bit of arc.

- Where does everyone end up at the close of the piece?

- Female characters/point of view/friendship between Cagney and Madeleine.

- The relationship between Cagney and Madeleine has real backstory and that helps the relationship have depth. It would be nice to see it play more in the story.

Exaggerated characterization/comic characters.

- Certainly Mr. X falls into this category as do most of the secondary characters. The challenge with the next draft of the story will be to make these more individual with full, 360-degree stories that don't just rely on having them be sight gags and funny accents. There is a critical need in terms of writer's preparation to answer the question: why are all these people here? Why now?

- Opportunity to tell a story set in the Australian goldfields/historical truth (e.g., electricity in the beginning of the 20th century in Australia, water supply, contraception).

- Immediately *Quigley Down Under* leaps to mind in this context and provides an interesting reference point. Consider making Jimmy an American or Englishman to provide some of the needed fish-out-of-water humor that stories like this can exploit to great effect.

- Derek the inventor, playing on the history of technology. He is delightful and takes the "whacky inventor" character in a nice, new direction. Derek certainly provides a lot of the comic engine for the
piece, can easily be relied on if the story slows down and, I suspect it would be very nice if Derek could end up running the bank and getting some play with Gloria when the dust settles at the end of the script.

Cosmopolitan mix of characters: English, American, Australia, Russian, etc.
- This will help sell the project to international markets as long as the various nationalities are not rendered too stereotypically.

Weaknesses:

- Genre? Intention is to keep the comic/fantasy feel; add musical numbers (performed by Cagney at poker game, alone in room).
- At the moment, the screenplay seems headed for comedic Western and suggests several reference films: *Cat Ballou, Paint Your Wagon, Quigley Down Under, even a bit of Blazing Saddles*. More recent references: *The Wild Wild West, Maverick*. All of these films come from earlier eras of storytelling style and so the challenge for the writer will be how to embrace the genre while updating the story material (i.e., relationship dynamics) and storytelling so that the piece has a modern feel while preserving the lovely vintage sensibility. This is a worthwhile goal and, if achieved, will give the piece a very “hip” feel. But it is a big job to balance and execute on the funny and the period elements.
- Complicated... too much back story implied/played out in the present but not clearly explained or relevant (e.g., Wild Bob’s relationship to Jimmy, Jimmy’s past robbery); counterfeit money hidden but retrieved.
- Complicated? Perhaps. Confusing? Definitely. Necessary? Unsure. Certainly the elements of the story surrounding the retrieved counterfeit money seems to come out of the blue and raises questions. It would seem that there’s some kind of implied double-cross between Cagney and Jimmy, but if Cagney knows where the money is all along, why does she wait until now to dig it up? So, too, what’s the importance of Wild Bob’s relationship with
Jimmy, and Jimmy’s past robberies? Is he a bank robber who is so hapless that he’s never managed to actually be responsible for the robbery, but somehow became infamous because of “luck”?

- Here, I don’t think it’s necessary for Cagney and Jimmy to have backstory other than she knows him by reputation. Essentially, if the bank robbery is Cagney’s “solution” for her current mess, then meeting Jimmy and getting him involved in her plan takes on a different dynamic if they don’t have a previous relationship.

Emotional balance – nastiness/threat vs light-hearted fantasy. What rating?

- At the moment, the piece feels quite PG. While there is implied violence and implied sex, there is little on-screen realization of either. Indeed, any rendering of sex or violence is in a kind of slapstick—there’s no-blood way that will keep the rating appropriate for families. There are places where the dialogue veers into something more sinister (and tonally inconsistent). These are primarily anywhere there’s talk about Cagney’s “virginity” and threats to same. Dialogue fixes are easy, but care should be taken to find a way to cue the threat without the tonal shift.

Jimmy needs to be worthy of Cagney’s love.

- If Jimmy is a hapless bank robber (maybe he’s drafting off of one really big job that he wasn’t actually responsible for) then the audience sympathy quotient for his goes up exponentially. It also helps serve the story that he may actually become a real bankrobber by helping Cagney. Ultimately, if Cagney thinks Jimmy is worthy of her love then the audience should go with her. The suspension of disbelief... Delilah to Clarabelle to Cagney could be long shots.

- None of this material is problematic. It feels like a more difficult task in the writing because you don’t have the visual cues to help identify the actor, but once the audience sees Cagney’s face, no amount of her dressing up as anything else will shake the audience.

Role of Indigenous characters?
• White Feather obviously needs to be Aboriginal... Chinese characters/other European historically accurate to goldfields?

Here, the key will be to create roles that don’t devolve to stereotypes. Some amount of black-and-white storytelling is supported by this kind of format, but the story has more to offer than that and I think the writer can deliver a set of characters who will be memorable and appropriate to the time and setting of the piece.

Genre and Issues of Voice:

Per the previous notes, I think the genre is comedic Western, regardless of rewriting it for Australia. I think one of the key things that Westerns (as a genre) give a writer is the opportunity to explore the us-against-Nature/us-against-Anything material that is common to the generic Western. The dynamic is big to start with and the landscape of Australian lends itself quite well to that survive-against-the-odds kind of conflict that is often at the heart of these kinds of pieces. While that sounds all so grandiose, ultimately, Cagney’s desperate struggle to get free of Madame Dream and Ted Griffiths and stake her claim in the world is exactly that kind of conflict, consequently the Western genre serves her core story very well.

In terms of the comedic element, the writer has a lively imagination and a clear, innate sense for the moments in which to insert humor; particularly as a sight gag. The challenge with this type of piece, however, will be to write it with a modern storytelling pacing such that the humor doesn’t feel too anachronistic for the viewing audience. In this respect, as the next draft is anticipated, don’t worry too much about making people “sound” funny. That kind of dialogue writing often comes across stilted and self conscious. Instead, find the humor in the conflict between people. At the moment, Derek and Ted Griffiths provide some of the best material;
as does Gloria. Somehow, the rest of the piece needs to better and more seamlessly incorporate the flavor of these interactions throughout. And here is where it will be fun and interesting to see the writer's voice come through.

At the moment, the piece feels almost a little antiseptically disassociated from place. Almost like a stage play, where characters are in a space but don't inhabit it. Hopefully with the change to an Australian landscape and sensibility, more of the sense/impact of place will find its way into the story and will give the story a lovely lift of energy and impact as the writer finds a bit of freedom of voice.

STRUCTURE:

On the whole, I think the piece has a sense of structure such that it ebbs and flows with the proximate rhythms we expect with this type of piece. In the set up, it quickly become clear that Cagney is our protagonist; however, what we learn about/from her in the first few pages isn't as obvious as it should be nor is her desperate need to get away from Madame Dream' brothel. The backstory with Jimmy does more to set him up than her, as does the shift of POV to Ted Griffiths. The first act might be better served to nail down who Cagney is and what she hopes (freedom and fame) and fears (slavery and ignominy). If you delete any connection to Jimmy in the backstory, but play that in the present (i.e., he becomes the answer to her “prayers”) you might get more story energy from the first few scenes between them. Right now those scenes seem to be playing out a lot of backstory and not much else.

The inciting event is, most certainly, the arrival in Cagney's life of Jimmy the bank robber. As such, this is both a straight comedic and a rom-com beat. (It might be advisable to look at how the rom-com structure suits this piece as there are many carryovers from that form in this screenplay).
The end of the First Act set up is hitting at approximately page 22 when Cagney hijacks Ted’s plan (re: bank robbery) and sets herself up as the go-to person. It also sets in motion all the relationship dynamics needed for the Cagney-Jimmy, Cagney-Ted, Cagney-Madame, Cagney-Madeleine relationships. Ultimately, Cagney’s desire/intention/need to rob the bank is the defining outer motivation that guides the story. How that exterior action impacts the interior/emotional relationships with each of the other characters is the work that will deepen the piece and give the characters more dimensionality. The end of the Second Act low point isn’t quite as clear and seems to be divided out between Cagney’s exposure by Ted and then the confrontation with Jimmy during the heist itself. Neither of these feels like it’s playing hard enough as it’s unclear how either represents Cagney being as far away from her goal as she can be. In traditional screenplay architecture, this low needs to be low so that the high of the climax really feels high. So… what is Cagney’s hope/fear (want/need) and how does she set herself on the road to get it (i.e., rob the bank to buy her freedom). At the moment when she is furthest from this, who is the person that’s seemingly triumphed at the expense of Cagney’s hope? While the current version of the story seems to suggest that it’s Ted, the real antagonist for Cagney is Madame Dream (as evidenced by the climax). It would seem that Cagney’s low point needs to be better rendered in relationship to the triumph of her antagonist.

Climax moment when Cagney buys her freedom is a foregone conclusion and doesn’t have nearly the oomph it needs for this kind of comedic Western. While the main focus of antagonism gets off-loaded to Ted, really Cagney’s nemesis is the woman who keeps her imprisoned. Just having enough money to pay her off doesn’t feel as satisfying as it needs to for the comedic pay off required here because, honestly, it’s not money that Cagney needs to get out from under Madame Dream’s thumb. It is self-confidence, independence, bravery… all the characteristics that she doesn’t believe she possesses as the beginning of the piece but that she demonstrates throughout.
CHARACTERS

Cagney has lot of potential and doesn’t just read as the stereotypical hooker-with-a-heart-of-gold character typically inhabiting these kinds of pieces. As the foregoing discussion points out, who she is in terms of hopes/fears (wants/needs) must be more focused such that “being a star” is shorthand for something more fundamental: love, security, belonging. Her journey in the story is to comprehend that she has within her everything she longs for, she just has to discover it. Everything she does in the course of the story demonstrates these things.

Jimmy has the beginnings of dimensionality, but the current set up (and title) seems to suggest that he’s the protagonist, which isn’t true. In the next draft it would be good to see Jimmy’s character reworked so he helps to serve Cagney’s story far better. As noted earlier, their relationship shows many signs of a rom-com connection and it might be helpful to look to that format for support in understanding who Jimmy is and how he needs to figure into the story. Ultimately – and I’d argue strongly for he and Cagney no to have history together – his arrival in Cagney’s life is the thing that makes it possible for her to embark on the adventure that changes her life for the better.

Madame Dream/Ted Griffiths seem to me to be two sides of the same coin and I’d suggest that you can get much more mileage out of them if you find a way to strategically align them as characters. This does not mean that they can’t be working at cross-purposes to each other throughout the film; but ultimately, they both represent the same thing for Cagney: slavery. Madeleine is who Cagney’s going to be if she doesn’t take charge of her life. There seems to be a lot of emotion going from Madeleine to Cagney, but not much going back the other direction. How does Cagney feel about Madeleine? The possibility of turning into someone like Madeleine?
Mr X, Derek, Gloria, Wild Bill, Deputy, Joe... Of these, Derek is the most interesting and memorable with Gloria (a relatively non-speaking part) coming a close second. Mr X – for all his presence in the story – feels like he’s not really doing much. The Deputy and Joe are necessary to the story, but don’t do much else. Wild Bill feels like a bit of an outlier. He has backstory with Jimmy, but it’s unclear how he’s really adding to the plot.

POV

As noted above, Cagney is our POV character and the way into the world. Because the story is comedic and supports a more ensemble approach, switching POV to Ted or Madame Dream doesn’t present a problem as they’re in direct conflict with Cagney and, therefore, elements of the main POV-driven A story. But I would push harder to really understand how this is Cagney’s story and embrace the outlandish lengths and breadths you can go when playing around in this comedic Western paddock. You can get away with a lot of things and I think you should push as hard as you can to do that. Use the POV character to your advantage by making sure she gets the funny lines (the actor cast in the role will demand it) and also that the final lines in the scenes belong to her. It’s her journey we’re charting here.

-----

Ultimately, Cashflow isn’t going to be a three-laugh-per-page kind of story, but it is going to need to be a one-laugh-per-page script. Already, the screenplay demonstrates that the writer isn’t looking for humor at the expense of her characters but in their essence. This is so important as the piece will find a home with a kind of gentle, genteel sensibility where the people take themselves seriously no matter how outlandish they may be. Sense of place will help to find that grounded humor and the writer is already showing elements of this. More pushing and a real grasp of the dynamics of the genre will help to ensure that the piece lands with an audience that, ultimately, would be characterized as “family.”
TO: Rose Ferrell  
FR: Barbara Connell, AWG Assessor  
DATE: 14 April 2014  
RE: CALICO DREAMS  

GENERAL COMMENTS
Thank you for sending in CALICO DREAMS. The story, set during an interesting period of time in Western Australian history has all the kinds of elements that make for an appealing costume drama/Western of the kind that could work in a theatrical setting or in a televised, mini-series for an ABC-type broadcaster. For television – and given it is not based on true events – casting would become a critical factor in realizing the piece as a commercially viable product. As a feature, it might be an easier sell; however, given that it is a period piece, budget would become a rate-limiting factor and keeping it at the low end of the marketplace (without sacrificing production values) will be important in terms of eventually attracting a producer.

In general, the piece has several strengths and, as a First Draft, it seems to be a good starting place to begin to nut out the story and focus the storytelling. The screenplay also has weaknesses – as all screenplays at this early stage do. As you’ve identified both in your notes, I think it would be most helpful if I speak directly to your notes first of all and then deal with other, more specific notes in a more scene-by-scene approach (not every scene, but highlighting a few representative scenes).

Strengths (from your Writer’s Notes):

1. An exciting historical time and place in a little known world (Kalgoorlie, West Australia 1906).
   - I concur. This is a rich period of time and lends itself to “Western” style stories where action/conflict can be played easily and you don’t have to hampered by the strictures of modern life (i.e., mobile phones). The piece feels well grounded in the history and authentic in terms of how you’ve dealt with the setting, buildings, costumes, etc. It has a sense of place that will only get better through each draft.

2. Complementary stories: Caroline’s coming of age (A story) enables Nathan’s redemption story (B-story).
   Dual protagonists?
   - It is an important decision if you want to make this a dual protagonist story. It is also a more difficult task in terms of writing. Yes, I
agree that the stories complement each other, but I do believe you need to pick your protagonist and understand that the audience will come to the piece through her POV. At the moment, because the story shifts so radically between POVs (Nathan, Madame, Caroline, Lisette), it reads more like it’s written for a television construct than for a feature film.

Well-rounded secondary characters (Louisa, Nathan). I concur that you have some very interesting secondary characters. Unfortunately, they’re pulling the story focus from your protagonist in this draft of the story. This is Caroline’s story and what happens to her/what she does are the key priorities of the structure. Too much time spent with other characters detracts from allowing the audience to bond/invest in Caroline. Ultimately, the most important thing for you to achieve in your storytelling is for the audience to worry and care about what happens to Caroline. We need to invest our emotions in her.

An unusual structure, which could serve the story very well (if it works). I’m not sure if this is an unusual structure given that you indicate you’ve taken a sequence approach. You note that your intention was to “resist falling into the ‘classic (Hollywood) 3-act’ structure, which privileges masculine fight & derring do over womens’ everyday experiences”. I’m not sure I subscribe to the viewpoint that a three-act structure, by its nature, privileges such traits. I believe a three-act structure privileges a strong central protagonist whose wants and needs, actions and desires dictate the plot decisions such that at key moments of the narrative, the story finds its narrative drive from the internal/external journey of the protagonist.

Weaknesses (from your Writer’s Notes):

Complexity.

The screenplay doesn’t seem unduly complex. There are times when it is difficult to follow or to know who is whom; this is more because in the set up a lot of characters are introduced at the same time, with little description to help readers new to the material sort out what
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character is what. This is an easy fix and, again, looking at creating Caroline as a more active/central protagonist will help to define who needs to be introduced when. For example, the choice to hold the introduction to Caroline to page 2 seems ill advised; particularly if you see this as a female story. Why isn’t Caroline the first person you present to the audience to bond with?

- Passive main character (compensated by strong B, C & D stories with own beats).
  - Yes, I agree. Caroline is a passive protagonist with much of the action of the story taking place around/without her. While Nathan’s got his own story and that is interesting in it’s way, I don’t believe B/C/D stories should be compensating for a lack of emphasis on the A story. Again, servicing multiple story threads feels more like a television strategy than a feature film strategy.
  - Further with regard to the protagonist, the screenplay will take on more of a strong “female” voice if the female at the center of the story takes a more active role in her own coming of age. Certainly, she’s a young girl in a strange place at the beginning and there will be a degree of “in-built” passivity that goes along with that. However, for the sake of the story, you will need to find a way to make her actively passive if you want the audience to cheer for her.

- Nathan’s redemption story/Caroline’s coming of age... are all the beats obvious/there?
  - I suspect they are, but the characters don’t really feel like they interact much until the very end. Would like to see their relationship build over time, from antagonism and opposition to tentative alliance and then partnership.

- Shared antagonist role (Madame, Wallace, Francine).
  - Yes, having multiple “Forces of Antagonism” works very well in this. Indeed, the antagonists feel like the better-realized characters (as is often the case in a first draft). Certainly Madame and Francine work well as “evil step mother/step sister” archetypes. Wallace is unclear and I’m not quite certain what’s going on with him. Is he a lech who’s into virgins and the Madame’s selling them to
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him for profit? Is this an on-going business?

Is he procuring them for others? That plot feels a bit murky

Integration of Lisette/music & dance sequences into story.
- These are not working so well and, on the whole, feel like they are sitting outside the main narrative. I’m not quite sure what to suggest here, but I think it needs to be looked at closely particularly as it becomes part of Caroline’s denouement and the “up” note the script seems to land with.

Believability of Wallace as a character.
- At the moment, he’s a bit of a one-dimensional baddy. I’m not sure who’s the mastermind behind the “plan”? Is he in league with Madame?

OTHER NOTES
I think your intention to build a distinctive “myth” of the Australian frontier is exciting and interesting, and I love the idea that you’d approach that using females as the focal point: female protagonist, female antagonist, men in there making mischief; but largely females doing what they need to do to make a life for themselves. It’s a strong approach and it’s not about them sitting around knitting, but finding a way to solve their problems in a world largely not of their own making. So keep that at the forefront and don’t shy away from focusing the story around a 16-year-old who finds a way to grow up in a situation that’s intended to make her a victim not a victor.

Of course, this isn’t HUNGER GAMES and Caroline’s not going to succeed because she can hunt and kill; she’s going to succeed because she finds the right way for her to survive, whatever way she can find to do it. AND, she’s going to help Louise in the process and also some of the other women/girls in the town. In that respect, by the end of the story she’s going to transform a place of female enslavement into a place of female empowerment; where women are in charge of what happens to their bodies – how they’re displayed, what’s done with them (e.g., the can can). So, without getting too preachy about it in the screenplay, don’t shy away from doing that. Get Caroline’s story clear and nail that down; ensure that whatever structure you use, Caroline’s wants/needs are driving the story. It is her action that, ultimately, results in Nathan finding redemption not the other way.
around.
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**SOME SCENE NOTES**

Sc3: I’m not sure why you’ve chosen to introduce Nathan before Caroline. This tends to make the story feel like it belongs to Nathan. Why not introduce us to the world of Kalgoorlie through Caroline’s eyes?

Sc6: I’m not quite sure what’s going on in this scene. It feels like the dance stuff comes out of nowhere, the brawl among the women feels manipulated and Caroline is lost in the process. Given that we don’t come back to her until Sc10, she really does get lost from the narrative. The same goes for the later scene when Lisette goes to the Photographer’s studio. It feels like a parallel story that distracts from the main plot.

Sc11: This is one of those places where too many characters (that are seemingly too similar) are introduced all at the same time. The important one is Louise and it would probably be helpful to the screenplay to focus in on that.

Sc15: One of many scenes in which I got confused about what was going on between Nathan and Madame.

Sc52: Not quite sure what’s going on with this scene. It feels like it’s a bit more slap-stick than foregoing material. Also, there is a scene later on when it comes out that the girls aren’t supposed to be out on the streets. Not quite clear what the laws/rules are about this.

Sc74: Not sure what the benefit of Scrawny is in this scene; feels like it confuses more than helps the story.

Sc147: Why doesn’t Madame just send Louisa in the first place? If she’s around and available (and still a virgin)? I love that in Sc148, Caroline sees a young girl and that’s what motivates her change of heart, but I’d like the story to build more organically to this.
Questions for Screenwriters (and Writers) about ‘Voice’

This survey is intended primarily for those who write for all forms of audiovisual media. It hopes to discover if writers perceive a personal ‘voice’ in their work and if so, which elements they consider display this most clearly. PLEASE NOTE: In all cases ‘Screenwriter’s voice’ and ‘Writer’s voice’ are intended to refer to the same concept, and are seen as interchangeable.

INTRODUCTION
In the Glossary of Literary Terms, Abrams describes Voice as ‘point[ing] to the fact that we are aware of a voice beyond the fictitious voices that speak in a work, and a person behind all the dramatic personae, and behind even the first-person narrator. We have the sense of a pervasive authorial presence, a determinate intelligence and moral sensibility, which has invented, ordered, rendered, and expressed all these literary characters and materials in just this way.’ (Abrams, 1993)

The questions below are intended to ascertain whether writers believe Screenwriter’s Voice exists, and if writers can identify what it is that displays this in their work.
Writers for other media may also complete the survey based on their writing of other forms.

Writers may choose a single work which they believe most clearly displays their personal voice, OR answer based on all their works. The work may or may not be solely credited to the writer, and may or may not exist as a screen product (film, television, interactive game etc).

SURVEY DESIGN
The survey is broken into two parts: the first part contextualises responses and asks about beliefs and attitudes. (10 mins)
The second part invites the writer to reflect on the experience of voice in their craft, and is intended to identify what writers consider displays voice in their writing. (20 mins)
Writers may choose to answer only ONE or BOTH parts. (Total 30 mins)

FURTHER INFORMATION
This research is being conducted by Rose Ferrell as part of a doctoral thesis being completed through the West Australian Academy of Performing Arts, Edith Cowan University, Perth, West Australia. It has been approved by the ECU Human Research Ethics Committee.

Completing and submitting this survey implies willingness to share your opinions with the researcher in the full knowledge that the information offered may be used in the thesis ‘The Wild West that WOZ: Why the western never played in Australia OR Recovery of an Australian Voice’ and other related public or published works (journal articles, conference papers etc).
While we do request some personal information to contextualise your answers, your anonymity is assured.

This survey is being conducted between June 2013 and June 2014. If you have any further queries about this project, please contact the researcher, Rose Ferrell, through this email account: rferrell@ecu.edu.au. If you have any concerns about this project and would like to discuss these with an independent person, please contact Research Ethics Officer, Edith Cowan University, on phone number +61 08 9213 2780 or email: research.ethics@ecu.edu.au
Thank you very much for your time.
Introduction ~ Personal Information

Let us know a little more to contextualise your responses.

Nationality
I consider myself:

Cultural Background
What cultural group do you consider your own? (Eg. a nationality, or maybe a subcultural group)

Occupation
Do you consider yourself a:

☐ Screenwriter exclusively (All ‘screens’)
☐ Writer - including stage, radio, novels, other
☐ Writer - director (of audiovisual programs)
☐ Other:

Gender
☐ Male
☐ Female

Age Range
Choose the appropriate
Screenwriter’s Questionnaire

**Primary Income**
Choose your major source of income:
- [ ] Screenwriting (all / any screens)
- [ ] Script editing, assessment, management of screenwriting
- [ ] Other writing (any format)
- [ ] Other: [ ]

**Type of Programming**
Choose one or more related to voice in your writing.
- [ ] Drama
- [ ] Documentary
- [ ] Multi-media / Transmedia / Games
- [ ] Other: [ ]

**Industrial Sector**
I consider myself part of the:
- [ ] Commercial production sector
- [ ] Independent production sector
- [ ] Both
- [ ] Other: [ ]

**Format**
I primarily work on: (Choose all which are appropriate)
- [ ] Feature films
- [ ] Television serials
- [ ] Television mini-series, series, telefeatures
- [ ] Documentary for theatrical release
- [ ] Documentary for television
- [ ] Internet/web-based programming (including games)
- [ ] Other: [ ]
# Screenwriter’s Questionnaire

**Longevity (Years spent writing)**
Choose the number of years you have been actively writing including years in 'apprenticeship'

**Years as Professional Writer**

**Other Comments**
Let us know if you have a particular understanding/experience of Voice

## PART ONE - Beliefs about Voice

**Respond to these statements**
There is such a thing as writer’s voice.
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

I experience voice in my own work.
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

I expect my screenwriter’s voice to develop over time.
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
Screenwriter’s Questionnaire

Only outstanding writers develop a personal voice

- Yes
- No

I associate the concept ‘screenwriter's voice’ MOST CLOSELY with:
(Choose one)
- Imagination ~ my mind consciously imagining
- Creative imagination ~ related to the unconscious workings of my mind, in some way surprising
- Inspiration ~ related to an etheric source, a sense of ‘channeling’ or ‘being helped’ or guided from a spiritual source
- Serendipity ~ luck intervenes, giving me unexpected solutions to story problems
- Mastery of craft skills ~ practice
- Talent
- Other: ________________________

Screenwriter’s voice is derived from:
(Choose one OR several)
- Natural talent
- Longevity of practice
- Craft skills
- Something internal to myself
- Something external to myself
- Other: ________________________

The Experience of Writing
While writing, I most strongly experience: (Choose one)
- Directing the programme in my head
- Experiencing the programme as an audience member
- Living the character's life/s
- Other: ________________________
Screenwriter’s Questionnaire

This aids screenwriter’s voice.
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

I experience the writing process as:
- [ ] Difficult
- [ ] Easy
- [ ] Other: __________

- [ ] Fulfilling for myself
- [ ] I do it for others
- [ ] Other: __________

For me, writing is a: (Choose one)
- [ ] Joy
- [ ] Necessity
- [ ] Way to earn money
- [ ] Other: __________

When voice occurs
I am always in my ‘voice’ when writing
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Other: __________
Screenwriter’s Questionnaire

Voice comes and goes in my work
- Yes
- No
- Other: [space for input]

Voice is related to my mental state
- Yes
- No
- Other: [space for input]

Describe your observations about when voice occurs in your work.

[space for input]

Describe characteristics you have observed in yourself or your writing when your voice is most present.

[space for input]

END OF PART ONE

You may scroll to the bottom of the form and click “Submit” if you wish to finish here.
Thank you for your time.
Part Two ~ Elements Displaying Screenwriter's voice

Since voice suggests a characteristic way of writing which is recognisable and unique to each writer, this section seeks information on what patterns you have noted in your writing which may give clues to defining a personal voice. It may also enable us to draw conclusions about what having a developed voice means, and how it might be recognised by ourselves and others.

Describing your Voice
Which best describes 'writer's voice' in your own work? (Choose one)
- I have a strong, individual voice in everything I write
- My writer's voice is only present in my most personal work
- I write to the project, voice isn't relevant

Point of View
There is a characteristic point of view I often adopt in my writing
- Yes
- No
- Other [ ]

Please describe:
(e.g. championing the underdog; revenge is sweet; survival of the fittest; life is cruel...)

[ ]
Screenwriter’s Questionnaire

This point of view is related to:
Choose one or more

- My personality
- My belief systems
- My psychological make-up
- My life experiences
- My hobbies
- My family of origin - situation and issues
- Observations of life
- Desire for change
- Fear
- Other: __________

Voice
This point of view is related to my personal voice

- Yes
- No

Genre
This point of view is associated with genre for me.

- Yes
- No

Choose which best describes how genre relates to your voice:

- I prefer to write in a specific genre/s and this aids my voice
- I write across all genres and styles; my voice adapts to each
- When constrained to a genre my voice becomes weak
- Other: __________
### Defining Craft Areas

These questions ask you to rate craft areas which display your voice most strongly. Choose the most accurate rating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong association with voice</th>
<th>Weak association with voice</th>
<th>Irrelevant to voice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storyworld</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramatic situation/s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural choices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characters and Characterisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language ~ Descriptive paragraphs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language ~ Dialogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style ~ Tone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of humour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme/ premise / message</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of music, special effects, sound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motifs, repetitive elements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Storyworld

There are common elements in the storyworlds I create:

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

Tell us what patterns you have observed.
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Dramatic Situations
There are common elements in the dramatic situations I place my characters in.

☐ Yes
☐ No

Tell us what patterns you have observed.


Storytelling modes
Is your voice related to a particular structural pattern? (Choose one)

☐ Single protagonist, hero’s journey narrative
☐ Multi-protagonist / group protagonist narrative
☐ Dual narratives interwoven
☐ Not associated with a specific structure; works across many
☐ Other: ____________

It is most often true that my:

☐ Dialogue carries story beats
☐ Action carries story beats
☐ Either, dependent upon story/genre
☐ Both within the same screenplay

Character and Characterisation
My main character tends to be:

☐ Male
☐ Female
☐ Relatively even number of each over all projects
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I have noticed patterns in the type of characters I use:
☐ Yes
☐ No

Describe:

Language ~ Descriptive passages
My descriptive paragraphs tend to be: (Choose one)
☐ Sparse, describing concrete elements and actions only
☐ Concise, but conveying all necessary elements of action and emotion
☐ Lyrical, using poetic & stylistic devices (metaphor, similes, humour, etc.) to describe emotion and action

They are intended to: (Choose one)
☐ Describe action only
☐ Convey actions and character/story detail such as gestures, costume, mood, intent
☐ Paint a full picture in the reader’s mind while also being enjoyable to read (as literature might be)

Language ~ Dialogue
Choose the language you use in dialogue which may be considered part of your ‘style’ or ‘voice’
☐ Slang
☐ Accents (different ways of speaking)
☐ Pacy dialogue
☐ Cryptic dialogue (i.e. I am happy to keep my audience guessing)
☐ Heavy subtext (i.e. subtext used a lot)
☐ Other: __________

Patterns through other Elements
There are certain ways that I use these elements which I have identified as being part of a personal style or voice.
☐ Motifs (Visual, sound...)
☐ Music
☐ Dance / movement
☐ Special effects
☐ Time frame / playing with time
☐ Use of sound
☐ Visual language (shot sizes; camera angles, movement, etc)
☐ Other: __________

Personal Conclusions
We would love to hear any insights you have gained about voice or your personal voice through completing these questions.
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Introduction

The screenwriters’ survey was intended to gather information of screenwriters’ perceptions about the experience of voice in their own work, particularly, whether writers felt that they knew what it was within their own writing which displayed voice, and if there were particular elements which carried voice more than other elements. The questionnaire was divided into two parts, with Part One aimed specifically at attitudes and beliefs about voice, and Part Two delving more deeply into the experience of personal voice.

It was a basic survey intended to introduce the topic, however respondents were given the opportunity to expand upon their answers, and many took this opportunity to explain themselves at length. Of course, as in many such endeavours, the responses led to ever more questions, and so this questionnaire can only be seen as a very preliminary work, which I hope will be built on by myself and other researchers into the topic Screenwriter’s voice.

Distribution

Within Australia:

Australian Writers Guild, via electronic newsletter to national membership over three months; to West Australian Members only; over one newsletter.

Also posted via Facebook on Australian Writer’s Guild facebook page; Australian Director’s Guild facebook page.

International:

Screenwriter’s Research Network (international), via electronic server list;

Israeli Writers Guild, Irish Writers Guild, and Writers Guild of Great Britain were contacted and agreed to publicise the questionnaire.
The total number of responses is small, meaning that no absolute statements can be made about whether screenwriters as a body do or do not consider themselves to be working in a media for which the concept voice has any relevance. And yet as expected, the quality of those responses which were received suggests that the respondents, at least, feel quite strongly about the topic.

With regard to the questionnaire itself, these further questions made me very aware of the truth that researchers leave the seeds of their own opinions within the text of the questions. For this reason, it seemed useful to offer a critique of the questions themselves, to point out where this has been the case.

The opening blurb makes clear that the questionnaire is aimed at screenwriters, though other writers are also invited to fill in the survey. This was a way of casting my net more widely, and seemed logical, since many professional writers operate in a variety of formats. It was also desirable to invite writers in other media to contribute, since historically voice has been known, spoken of, and theorised for poets and novelists, though not previously for screenwriters. It would be silly to suggest that writers in the medium of the screenplay are not capable of having a 'writer’s voice', if other writers of dramatic works do. And yet, here is a good example of the way the designers' opinions can bleed into a survey: through the assumption that an opinion must be universal because it seems so self-evident to the holder of it. Further to this, I believe strongly that elements of voice are highly likely to cross between writing forms, and it would be throwing the baby out with the bathwater to fail to draw on the more various experience offered by fiction writers in other formats who have also encountered voice. Beyond this, since voice is a concept with dubious merit in the professional world of screenwriting, it was never clear that I would succeed in getting any responses at all, so it was only sensible to encourage as many writers as possible to respond.
1. Nationality

Range: Australian British Welsh Scottish Irish Finnish Estonian American KindaWASPY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/23</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>≈52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/23</td>
<td>UK/Ireland</td>
<td>≈26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/23</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>≈13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/23</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>≈4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/23</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>≈4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than half of the respondents were Australian, and the overall majority are native English speakers from an Anglo-saxon background. This is likely to be due to my relationship to the Australian Writers Guild while other guilds (of Great Britain, Ireland, Israel..) showed varying degrees of helpfulness ranging from failure to respond at all to positive declaration of cooperation and assistance.

The writers’ guilds in the USA were very unhelpful, perhaps reflecting the strongly industrialised nature of the film industry there, and the comparatively aggressive labour and industrial relations amongst writers, directors, producers and company executives within an industry which is more commercially successful (leading to higher stakes and a more competitive environment). I would speculate that this environment leads to a sense of protection over one’s work perhaps even to the point of a reluctance to share insight into their craft.

A more targeted and coordinated approach to dissemination of the questionnaire may have led to a larger number of respondents from a greater variety of nations. As it stands, the questionnaire can only be considered to indicate answers from those who already have an interest and perhaps positive views on screenwriter’s voice.

This may be as much a reflection of Australian writers and the Australian industry
particularly, which has long had a culture of government support. This establishes a
certain set of attitudes towards writing and writers and the arts in general, and eases
the pressure and aggressive competition which naturally inheres in a more
commercially-driven industrial context. This is not to say that gaining funding in
Australia is not competitive, nor that it is easy to attain. Perhaps it means Australian
writers are allowed more scope to tell individual stories through this system.
Australian writers, directors and producers are less able to succeed by competing
with the industrial complexes and financing as it is available in the United States,
where genre and formulas can seem to drive which stories are supported. There is
more opportunity for smaller, more idiosyncratic projects from writers and directors
to be supported within a system which is not as strongly driven by market forces.
Voice therefore, may be positively encouraged and rewarded within the Australian
industry.

2. Cultural Background

While almost half the respondents are from Australian backgrounds, 75% of these come from mixed cultural backgrounds. These are generally British and Irish, with a smattering of Persian, Chinese and other European.

Some respondents took up the invitation to more specifically describe their socio-cultural group, such as “People from Lapland” (ref 7); “urban left wing liberals” (Ref7); and “culturally Trans-Atlantic” (Ref 14); “melbournite!” (Ref 5); “inner city/coastal” (Ref 22) and “KindaWASPy” (Ref 24).

4. Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>11</th>
<th>50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a paper presented at the Voice Presence Absence conference in Sydney in 2013, GregoriaManzinspoke of the observation by Adriana Cavarerothat vocality has been traditionally read as standing in opposition to the reason and the corresponding
realm of philosophy. Cavarero links this initial observation to a critique of the patriarchal system which identifies the corporal and physical sphere with womanhood, and the rational sphere with manhood" (Manzin, 2013). Manzin and goes on to explain that Cavarero’s analysis effectively includes literature in the discussion of how both vocality and womanhood have been “excluded from the dominant patriarchal discourse” (Manzin, 2013). I see similarities in her thesis with my own thoughts on the deliberate distancing of industrial ‘authorship’ from intuitive ‘voice’ in the context of screenwriting. For this reason, it was gratifying that the number of male and female respondents on this questionnaire to do with voice were even.

5. Age Range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 - 30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - 60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The age ranges of respondents also represent a ‘bell curve’ pattern, where the majority of respondents are between 30 and 60 years of age, with many fewer respondents either younger or older than this. This is pleasing because it is in line with the expected age range of writers guild and/or Screenwriting Research Network memberships, reflecting those who have written for long enough to have encountered voice (presuming that longevity at writing plays some part in a greater awareness of voice in general). It may be useful to compare this age range with statistics from the Australian Writers Guild, to see if there are discrepancies in the age of members in comparison to the age of most respondents. It may be that fewer younger writers are aware or interested in voice, or that fewer younger writers are members of the guild. It would seem likely that writers who consider themselves professional are older in general.
3. Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Screenwriter exclusively (All ‘screens’)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writer - including stage, radio, novels, other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writer - director (of audiovisual programs)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Primary Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Income</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Screenwriting (all / any screens)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Script editing, assessment, management of screenwriting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other writing (any format)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It may be useful to compare the responses between question 3. Occupation, and question 6. Primary Income. While some respondents may consider themselves professional writers, it is not unusual – certainly in Australia – for screenwriters to earn their primary income in other related areas. The questionnaire suggested “editing, assessment and management of screenwriting”, while still others earn their income primarily as teachers of screenwriting, that is, as academics within film schools and/or universities.

In this case, the number of screenwriters who exclusively write for ‘screens’ almost exactly matches the proportion whose primary income is from screenwriting. That 30% (representing 9 people) earn their primary income in an area other than screenwriting is reflective of the Australian situation, certainly. The other information gleaned from the individual responses (not included here) is that there are 35 responses from 23 respondents, showing that several people ticked more than one category of primary income. Under the “Other” category 3 added lecturing or teaching, 1 was a child, and 3 were of other professions (including retired).
This pattern of earning income elsewhere while pursuing an arts-related profession is not uncommon. (REF to study – FIND).

7. Type of Programming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-media / Transmedia / Games</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In referring to the excel spreadsheet, 21 respondents write Drama; 3 write Documentary; and 1 each write Multimedia/Transmedia/Games; copywrite, write on spirituality, write poems, and write short stories. Therefore of 23 respondents, several write across different areas. Here, the question could be thought to presuppose that voice is possible across all of the categories mentioned.

8. Industrial Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial production sector</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent production sector</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The spreadsheet here records a different number of responses, again showing that respondents have ticked more than one category. The question is clumsily worded, since ‘Both’ duplicates the previous two options, making it easy for respondents to accidentally double up. The one ‘Other’ recorded is educational programming, which could come under either commercial production or independent. The two categories ‘commercial’ and ‘independent’ themselves need some clarification, since both can be understood in different ways. This question also gives the impression that there is no separation between the process of ‘writing’ itself, and the process of production,
whereas writers may feel this distinction keenly in a number of ways.

9. Format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feature films</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television serials</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television mini-series, series, telefeatures</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary for theatrical release</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary for television</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet/web-based programming (including games)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, these responses reflect multiple answers from individual writers. Arguably, the category for web-based programming should more specifically allow for distinction between the multiple formats possible within ‘internet,…’, and ‘games’. The question is skewed towards drama – both theatrical and television - and away from commercial copywriting, transmedia writing, scripting of rock clips, and other new and hybrid forms of writing, where voice could also be present.

10. Longevity of practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 24 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 25 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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11. Years as Professional Writer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resp .</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
<th>9.</th>
<th>10.</th>
<th>11.</th>
<th>12.</th>
<th>13.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>20/25+</td>
<td>20/25+</td>
<td>6/-24</td>
<td>6/-19</td>
<td>7/-14</td>
<td>6/-14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23/25+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6/-25+</td>
<td>21/25+</td>
<td>56/25+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These two questions (10. Longevity of practice, and 11. Years as a professional writer) are intended to separate a period of ‘apprenticeship’ when a writer is learning craft but not necessarily earning a living, from working in a professional capacity where the writer is remunerated at standard commercial rates.

The table above indicates the years of writing (results from Question 10.), giving only the top range in numbers (eg. >25 indicates the category “more than 25 years”; ≤14 indicates the category “10 – 14 years”. Each column indicates one respondent’s response, so that all 23 respondents’ answers can be displayed. They are numbered to match the excel spreadsheet of all responses.

The average number of years in professional writing is just over 18 years each, from 20 responses (and 3 abstainers). But the range is very broad, including 2 respondents with 0 years as a professional, up to one with 56 years of professional writing, and
this respondent gave other amounts (e.g. 30 years of writing for other formats as well), reflecting the tendency to write across multiple formats which is reflected in question 3. Occupation and question 6. Primary income for screenwriters.

As is evident above (refer to table, Question 10.), the greatest number of respondents claimed more than 20 years longevity (10 respondents or 43%), with 8 of these claiming more than 25 years of writing practice. Unsurprisingly, this group claimed many more years in professional practice, suggesting that the respondents to the questionnaire are highly experienced screenwriters and/or writers. It could be expected then, that their observations about voice are grounded in a long history of experience of professional writing, and begs the question whether voice becomes more important or obvious to writers the longer they write. This is of course, suggested by Alvarez, and has also been theorised in Csikszentmihalyi’s work on creativity.

Referring to the table at question 11., the most common answer for years in professional practice was 6 years (4 respondents), and yet these respondents came about from a range of longevity categories, from 5 – 9 years, to 15-19 years. Nine respondents claimed 20 years or more of professional writing (9 respondents), both from longevity categories of more than 20 years. Two respondents from the “more than 25 years” longevity category claimed 0 years as professional writers, pointing to another circumstance common to an arts industry: that income from arts work does not necessarily increase with length of practice, nor is it in any way guaranteed to flow from that practice, despite the dedication shown through longevity over many years or a lifetime.

The total number of years spent writing from all respondents was estimated to be 412 years (23 respondents), while the total number of years in professional practice was 367+ years (from 18 respondents who claimed years as professionals). It is not possible to draw a meaningful conclusion from these figures, so the data needs to be viewed within year categories, comparing years of practice (10. Longevity) with years as a professional (11. Years as Professional Writer).
Within the “more than 25 years” longevity category, there were 10, amongst whom 2 respondents claimed no years as a professional writer. Of the remaining 8, all claimed 20 years or more as professional writers. Here it is not possible to make further claims about the proportion of time spent in apprenticeship learning and mastering craft, because the possible longevity is insufficiently defined.

Within the “20 – 24 years” longevity category there were 2 respondents, claiming 15 and 20 years of professional writing respectively. In this category there could be as few as 0 years spent learning craft, if the respondent with 20 years as a professional became professional immediately upon beginning writing, and has only written for 20 years. This could be plausible in certain proscribed circumstances, but it is more realistic to suggest that this person of 20 years’ experience is at the “24 years” of longevity end, suggesting that 4 years was spent learning craft, which has been the basis of 20 years of professional writing.

In the “15 – 19 years” longevity category, the 2 respondents claimed 6 years as professional writers, suggesting that here, each had spent between 9 and 13 years learning their craft before considering themselves “professional”. Within the “10 – 14 years” longevity category, 4 respondents claimed between 6 and 12 years as professional writers, suggesting that the range of years spent learning craft was somewhere between a minimum of 2 years and a maximum of 8 years. Within the “5 – 9 years” longevity category, 2 respondents claimed 4 and 6 years as professional writers, suggesting that each spent a minimum of 1 year and maximum of 5 years learning their craft. The single respondent in the “0 – 5 years” longevity category claims no years as a professional, and also claims to be a child, though within the 15 – 30 age range. Four respondents claim no years as a professional, though their years of practice (longevity) range from 5 years to more than 25 years.

The figures above indicate any period of apprenticeship, from 0 to 13 years for those who have become “professional”, and yet the figures are meaningless in light of the lack of definition of what “professional” means. For my purposes I only sought to
gain insight into the concept of voice, and so invited respondents to be self-selecting and self-defining with relation to their level of professionalism within an industry. The question of professionalism in an arts-related field is vexed (Conor, 2010), as noted earlier, where skill or craftsmanship offer no certainty with regard to income. Amongst the 5 respondents who abstained from answering or claimed 0 years as a professional writer, 2 indicated alternative income streams in the “primary income” question; another respondent named teaching as amongst their income streams; one gave no indication of income; and one was a child. So while it seems that most respondents spent some years writing while not considering themselves professional, we are left in the dark about how and why these writers now consider themselves professional. But that is a labour issue, and the material for another questionnaire.

12. Other Comments

The last question of the Introduction section asked respondents to add other comments, but gave no guidance on what these comments should include. Nine of the 23 respondents chose to make comments, 6 of which show that these writers experience their own voice in their work (Respondents 12, 18, 17, 14, 19, 3). A further 2 respondents recognised voice in general in the work of writers (Respondents 11 & 23).

Several comments reflected very definite views about how voice comes about, as in this quote from Respondent 11: “a screenwriter creates the world of the story, the events, the people in it - all these elements are filtered through the author” (REF 11), whose “attitude towards the subject matter, their understanding and views on personal, social and political issues, towards storytelling (which will reflect in the style), and their personality (down to earth types writing different stories from, say, extroverted speed junkies).” (REF 11) will affect the voice. This understanding is reflected in this comment from Respondent 17: “I understand that my voice represents the truth of who I am and my belief system coming through my work in a creative dramatic way” (Ref 17).

One respondent (23.) reflected admiration for individual writers because of their
voice: “I return to a writer for insight, intelligence, fluency and more ... because I can hear that writer's voice speaking to me in a way that not only pleases me but inspires me and sometimes even fills me with awe” (Ref 23). While one writer expressed dissatisfaction with their voice: “I have not been able to find my voice - or at least, a voice I'm happy with” (Ref 19); one writer identified voice as an unfortunate thing: “It slips through sometimes. Editors fix that” (Ref 3).

With regard to an Australian voice, one writer stated: “At times I have written projects that were: an Australian story, told in an Australian way, for Australian audiences” (Ref 2), but added that “most times, I totally sell out. eg Try to speak to an international audience” (Ref 2). One writer expressed confusion with regards to their own voice as it was developing, stating that: “I only became aware of my 'voice' as I became older... . Others pointed it out (as a good thing) and for a few years it messed me up as I started to parody what others had praised” (Ref 14). This writer found their own way back to a more natural voice when they “pushed and elaborated what was the most unselfconscious part of my writing. It took me a while to get back to [my natural voice]. Now I often try to purposely write in other voices - fully confident that my own voice will come through, no matter what I try. It's me” (Ref 14).

Another comment was a strong political statement: “A screenwriter ... uses the same tools as playwrights and novelists (character, drama, conflict, etc). A screenwriter is an author and to claim otherwise is unethical” (REF 11). One of the salient points in other comments was the description of voice variously as “style” (Ref 18), and as “tone-of-voice” (Ref 12). As discussed in Part I v, voice includes style markers, and tone of voice, but voice itself is more than this. Most notably, and as confirmed in the comments here, it is a reflection of the personhood of the writer, a subset of the totality of all that comes together to create an individualised human being.
Part One – Beliefs about Voice

13. There is such a thing as screenwriter’s voice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. I expect my screenwriter’s voice to develop over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Only outstanding writers develop a personal voice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summarising questions 13.to 16., it is clear that all writers who responded to the questionnaire had already accepted the concept of screenwriter’s voice, experience it in their work, and most expect it to develop over time. The 2 respondents who answered no in question 15. may have done so because they both have 20 years professional writing experience or more. If this is the case, it may be that in their understanding and experience, their own voices are as fully developed as they will become. There may of course, be other reasons I cannot guess at for this answer.

Question 16. poses an interesting dilemma in its interpretation. Because there is no correlation between those who experience voice in their work, those who expect it
to develop over time, and those who answered yes or no in this question, it leads me to think that within the category of those who answered yes and those who answered no, are those who either believe they are outstanding writers and answered yes, or believe they aren’t outstanding writers and yet experience voice in their work, and so answered no. The question then becomes about self-esteem and/or self-evaluation of the quality of writing each produces. I do not have enough data to suggest which is the case. However it is worth noting that the majority of writers do not agree that only outstanding writers develop voice. This may be because writers believe that developing skills and mastering craft will lead eventually to the experience of voice in their work, by themselves or by others.

This question may also display cultural difference too, in that in Australia at least, the ‘tall poppy syndrome’, which is the tendency to dislike and target high achievers for negative attention, is almost a golden rule learnt by every school child in their earliest playground experiences. Australians therefore, are likely to deflect praise and positive attention from themselves, and refrain from openly declaring their achievements, or if they are declared, downplay their importance or prestige. This translates to a form of humility (whether real or feigned) in many aspects of social life and professional life. If this behaviour is operating here, it is more likely that Australian respondents answered no, following the thinking that if they can do it themselves (experience voice in their own work), then it must be possible for those who are not outstanding writers. Another way this may operate for Australians is that they may answer no because of a general dislike of anyone who may be seen to be ‘blowing their own trumpet’, that is, publicly declaring their skills or ‘specialness’.

In other cultures, this behaviour may not operate so strongly or at all, leading to a higher proportion of respondents agreeing that outstanding writers only experience voice (considering themselves within that category). While not conclusive, it is interesting to note that when comparing responses to nationality, 8 of the 12 Australians answered that it is not only outstanding writers who develop voice. The 4 Australians who answered yes are notably experienced writers, recording more than 20 years of writing practice in 3 of the cases, and between 5 – 9 years in the last case. It may be that these writers believe themselves to be outstanding writers for reasons
to do with their longevity of practice.

Of the 5 others who answered that it is only outstanding writers who develop a personal voice, their nationalities are British, American, Finnish, and Scottish. Two respondents from other nationalities answered no. These were Estonian and Irish. There is also a last respondent who did not identify his nationality and records himself as a child (age range 15 - 30 years), who answered no. From other answers given I believe this writer is also Australian.

17. I associate the concept ‘screenwriter’s voice’ most closely with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imagination ~ my mind consciously imagining</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative imagination ~ related to the unconscious workings of my mind; in some way surprising</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiration ~ related to an etheric source; a sense of ‘channeling’ or ‘being helped’ or guided from a spiritual source</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serendipity ~ luck intervenes, giving me unexpected solutions to story problems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery of craft skills ~ practice</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This question asked writers to choose one of the options, and while 16 respondents did this, 7 respondents chose multiple categories, leading to the 37 responses received. As is shown, the most commonly chosen answer was creative imagination, followed closely by mastery of skills. That more respondents chose creative imagination --which includes the unconscious workings of the mind -- supports the thesis, proposed elsewhere in this document, that the source or origin of voice is experienced as being complex, involving more than conscious imagining shaped by craft. Imagination ranked third (7 respondents), and was followed by Other (6 respondents). Within other, respondents named: bio-socio-cultural predispositions and habitus; worldview; conscience; unique skills of communication; the authentic
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person; and political and social values. These can all be summarised under one main idea, that is, the individuality – what I call personhood - of the writer, because each of these notions points directly to that individual. It would seem then, that while writers see mastery of skills as important, they place more emphasis on what it is that makes each writer unique, when they think about voice.

This is reiterated in the responses to question 18. below, where something internal to myself is the most popular answer (15 respondents) to the question of where screenwriter’s voice comes from. Natural talent and craft skills share second place (10 respondents each), closely followed by longevity of practice (9 respondents). Within the answer Other, respondents added: life experience; and personality.

Within this question (18.), 4 respondents chose something external to myself. Unfortunately, I have no further indication of what respondents meant by that. My own meaning was that inspiration or ideas can come from the outside world, offering a pattern or theme which influences writing. In a further questionnaire I would be interested to extend this question to delve more deeply into this response.

18. Screenwriter’s voice is derived from:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural talent</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longevity of practice</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft skills</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something internal to myself</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something external to myself</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. The Experience of Writing

While writing, I most strongly experience: (Choose one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directing the programme in my head</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiencing the programme as an audience member</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living the character’s life/s</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. This aids screenwriter’s voice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>82%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a practitioner I have noticed that my approach to screenwriting has been influenced by my personal history as a technician working in crew positions. I have observed that I visualise the unfolding drama as if it were happening in front of me. Part of this ends up in the script, as I describe things which are considered part of a director’s role, and/or that of other crew members. For this reason, I consider myself a writer-director, because that is the role I am transitioning to. Questions 19. and 20. ask respondents to consider their own approach to writing, and whether this affects what voice they use.

The majority of respondents chose living the character’s life/s (12 respondents). However, it is clear that some respondents use more than one of these methods during their practice. Three respondents claim all of the above (from question 19.), while one states “getting into flow, it just happens” (ref 14). One writer who also directs expresses that “I see the scenes in my imagination, so I guess the Directing happens so fast I can’t notice it” (Ref 2). In responses to question 20, 4 respondents state that this does not aid screenwriter’s voice, by which I understand that these respondents believe that the method they use to write is not related to their own
voice as it is displayed in the writing they produce.

21. I experience the writing process as:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses to this question were very mixed, with 13 responses which indicated both difficult and easy at different times. Other responses included: “when in “the flow”, it’s a dream, otherwise it’s achingly hard!” (Ref 12); and “difficult, enjoyable compulsion” (Ref 20). The term ‘challenging’ was used by 2 respondents, and one answered that it was “Hard, but amazing” (Ref 17). Overall, it would seem that though most writers find writing difficult to some degree, the moments when writing was rewarding were enough so that these respondents at least, for the moment remain committed to the activity of writing.

22. I(also) experience the writing process as:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fulfilling for myself</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do it for others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the responses the most common answer, as shown, is that writing is fulfilling for the writer. Only one respondent suggested that they do it for others as their sole reason, leaving four respondents who chose both for myself and for others as their response. One respondent clarified that “I write for myself with the audience foremost in mind” (Ref 18).

23. For me, writing is a : (Choose one)
Joy 14 44%
Necessity 7 22%
Way to earn money 3 9%
Other 8 25%

The most common answer here, as shown, was that writing is a joy, though seven responses chose more than one of these, showing that at different times, writing covers all these experiences.

When Voice occurs

24. I am always in my ‘voice’ when writing

Yes 7 29%
No 12 50%
Other 5 21%

Responses to this question indicate that more of these respondents consider that they are not always in their voices when writing. These comments explain this statement further: “I can write without being “in my voice” – but the quality is always better when I’m “in my voice”! (Ref 12). This response points to a nuanced understanding of voice – or of the writer’s personal experience of it – which leads this writer to identify some writing practice as using voice, and other practice as not.

Another respondent suggests that flow is the indicator of writing with voice for him, stating that flow comes: “when I can get out of my own way, and write without judgement” (Ref 14). This response is similar to Alvarez’s description of listening with detached attention and without preconceptions, discussed in section I v of this work. Another respondent speaks of mixing 2 voices, both of which come from himself. This respondent also notes that the source of funding can dictate the needs of the project, and therefore changes the voice he may use (Ref 2).
25. Voice comes and goes in my work

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses to this question challenge the perception or experience of voice as it has been described in this thesis, which proposes that voice is pandemic, that it is present across all occasions of writing and all writers, because it is a human ability like athletic ability. Through questions 24 and 25, here, many of these writers are clearly showing that they do not consider voice in this way. 58% of respondents in fact believe that voice comes and goes. This illustrates one of the key difficulties with the concept of voice in general, which is its association with quality or qualities which may or may not be present in writing (and which are not necessarily perceived or experienced by every reader). This thesis proposes voice as an ability precisely as a means of sidestepping this problematic, but writers who responded to the questionnaire obviously feel that writing in general is something different from writing with a perceivable voice. It is yet to be shown whether this thesis will persuade its audience, and so the general understanding of voice will be changed over time.

The responses to 25, however, do indicate that some respondents (at least the seven who answered no) consider that voice does permeate their work all of the time, since 100% of respondents overall believe that there is such a thing as screenwriter’s voice, and that they experience it in their writing work (See responses to questions 13. and 14.). Amongst the category Other too, two respondents would seem to believe that voice is always present. On respondent claims: “I am active in keeping it out of my work so the editors don’t have to remove it” (Ref 3); and another respondent replies: “No, How can it [come and go]?” (Ref 22).

The respondent from question 24. who suggested that he mixes two voices, both his
own, offers another understanding of voice which is more in line with the understanding in the thesis, since it suggests, as Phelan does, that voice is a subset of the properties, traits, beliefs, attitudes of the writer. At its heart, the question centres on whether voice can be altered, or whether it is something intrinsic. Phelan’s position suggests there is some leeway to alter voice. Presumably changing the subset of characteristics would change the voice of any writer. And yet anecdotal statements often claim that though the writer tries to disguise their voice or write in another voice, their own voice comes through. This points towards what will be discussed in the next section, which is, which characteristics or elements within writing suggest or fix voice, and therefore, which are the elements which mark most distinctively, a certain voice.

26. Voice is related to my mental state

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12 48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8 32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this question again, there are more responses that respondents, meaning that writers gave more than one answer. That 48% answered that voice is related to mental state, and 20% answered that it wasn’t points us to the 32% in Other. Here, respondents point out that voice is affected by mental state and practical concerns (Ref 16); and physical state (Ref 22). Another respondent points out that the story situation can affect voice and mental state (Ref 5). Still another respondent modifies the proposition, saying perhaps voice is related to mental state. Overall, these responses show that voice may be affected by mental state to differing degrees, but that there are other factors too, which will impact on voice.
27. Describe your observations about when voice occurs in your work.

28. Describe characteristics you have observed in yourself or your writing when your voice is most present.

“I cannot answer this question” (Ref 21).

Question 27 received 18 responses, with 5 respondents abstaining, while question 28 received 19 responses. Overall, there were 20 respondents who answered one or both questions. I have combined the answers to these two sections, because though they are distinct in what they are seeking to uncover (Question 27 is directed towards when voice occurs in the written work, and question 28 asks for characteristics to do with a personal state (of mind or body) or characteristics in the work when voice is present), many of the responses contain information pertinent to each.

Having a relatively small sample group has allowed me to examine each response more closely. I am also leaving the responses here in full, in order that the reader may read them as they appeared. However, I summarise below.

I have organised the responses in relation to the type of information each response supplies in order to tease out the common threads and connect them between respondents. The topic names (shown under letters A. to I.) were devised through the process of reading and assimilating the responses. Thus, no topic was predetermined by myself. Each came from the content of the responses themselves. Since each response may include aspects of a number of different topics, I have repeated the responses in full under each category, but have bolded the specific phrase or sentence which is relevant to that specific topic, to aid in skim reading. The topics which emerged covered several specific questions: A. When voice occurs; B. How voice in writing happens (meaning what circumstances bring voice out in that writer’s writing); C. Evidence of voice in writing; D. Personal experience of re-reading voice in your work; E. Experiences you have while writing with voice; F. Flow (as an indicator of being ‘in voice’); G. Mind (and its relationship to voice); H. Personhood (and its relationship to voice); and I. Reward (pleasure or self-esteem gained from
writing with voice). Readers may skip forward beyond Letter I. to read my summary of these responses.

A. When voice occurs

“Dunno how to answer this? "Voice occurs" makes it sound like it just pops out every now and then. It's there from the first word in the script to the last” (Ref 18).

“feel in the zone and inspired and passionate about life. I realise how much broad life experience I have and how the highs and lows of my life have fueled my work” (Ref 17).

“It is fluent and feels natural. I am most at home as a writer when I allow my voice expression. In that way the kinds of writing that accommodate my voice are the ones I prefer to work in and feel most confident in” (Ref 4).

“It occurs most strongly when I have a passionate opinion about something (such as gender inequality or injustice); my personal opinions have an effect on characters, events and the tone of the story” (Ref 11).

“my own voice occurs in the moments of truth about character - rather than in the plot development moments” (Ref 5).

“The black humour of a situation, finding contrast within a moment in a story when humour can be contrasted against the seriousness of the situation, or vice versa - when, amid humour, a deeper more serious truth is briefly uncovered” (Ref 3).

“My voice creeps in most when characters are poorly defined, or I identify with them or the situation they’re in. I then edit back my voice to that of the character” (Ref 4).

“The more I write, the more clearly this voice begins to articulate” (Ref 16).
“After long enough spent with a story, my personal voice starts to emerge from the story, that previously was simply a plot line, a sequence of scenes, atmosphere etc. I have a tendency to write ‘past’ the subject for quite some time. After a ‘revelation’ hits - cannot really explain this phenomena better - the story takes a whole another turn, as there now is this more personal involvement with the story and the characters; something that cannot be removed, that has become the core of the story, the heart of it” (Ref 21).

B. How voice in writing happens

“I don't really "think" about my writing - I just see the movie in my head and write it as it goes. I "watch" the same scenes over and over if necessary, to get it right” (Ref 6 F). – shortcut to creative imagination /use of lateral and vertical/ unconsciousness

“I just put myself into a person's head and write” (Ref 13 M).

“The more I write, the more clearly this voice begins to articulate” (Ref 16 ?).

“the times when "voice occurs" in my work is when I'm least aware of it occurring (if that makes any sense?!?) - those are the times when I'm simply in the flow, and unaware of time-passing or any external distractions” (Ref 12 F).

C. Evidence of Voice in writing

“- Economy in big print and dialogue.

- Use "unfilmables" for tone and rhythm.

- Don’t like using questions in dialogue.
- Heightened reality” (Ref 18).

“My voice tends to not take itself too seriously. My voice is self-deprecating and dry, but it can also become explosive and irreverent. My projects are always rooted in farce” (Ref 24).

“Structural similarities, sometimes originating from "running for cover" when faced with a story problem”(Ref 9).

“We may be talking about different things but... I think of voice as something that one notices as a theme in one’s work, or as choices of characters, and even quirks of dialogue. When I originate a screenplay the subject tends to be one of certain themes I've worked on over the years. I never tried to do this, indeed I've tried to stay away from it - but it's inevitable. Another kind of voice (and maybe what you're more interested in) is when screenplays 'write themselves'. Most of my work is, to be honest, drudgery (I subscribe to Dorothy Parker's famous 'I hate writing but love having written') BUT - one is hoping for those moments when hours fly by and I discover I've written twenty pages in which characters have said things I did not expect. Then it feels like I write directly from the unconscious, and that's the best stuff” (Ref 14).

D. Personal experience of re-reading voice in your work

“It is fluent and feels natural. I am most at home as a writer when I allow my voice expression. In that way the kinds of writing that accommodate my voice are the ones I prefer to work in and feel most confident in” (Ref 4).

(Previous question) “re-reading the script while editing should trigger certain very specific emotional states (in me - the writer) during each word/line (see: Neuro-Linguistic Programming, etc) ie Each word, has an emotional effect, and a series of words has more emotional effect” (Ref 3).
“Losing track of time, experiencing strong emotions; when re-reading that part of the text the emotional intensity never fades. It feels sincere” (Ref 11).

“The flow state (see: Csikszentmihalyi on Flow.)
ie Ironcally, a complete lack of self consciousness / self awareness.
ie - In ‘the zone’.

But that’s while writing,

As I say, when re-reading something old of mine that has my writing voice stamped all over it in big dirty footprints (the ‘claw of the lion’ as they said about Sir Issac Newton’s voice in some calculus equations he anonymously wrote once), I sort of feel something akin to attaining all 6 levels of Maslow’s Hierarchy of Human Needs I guess. Just to be purposefully humble for a change” (Ref 2).

“Some of what I said above fits here too. But I can only say I feel satisfied that I have used words in the way which conveys a feeling of my voice and produces a voice in my writing which could only be mine” (Ref 23).

“Getting into flow and writing from the unconscious produces fast, crackling, focused scenes and unpredictable 3 dimensional characters - it all comes alive. And suddenly one can go back into other parts of the script and apply this new vitality.

I do a huge amount of rewriting for producers, and novel adaptations. Often the themes and characters are far from my chosen concerns and it’s a struggle to get to my voice, but once it happens the screenplay becomes ‘mine.’” (Ref 14).

“We may be talking about different things but... I think of voice as something that one notices as a theme in one’s work, or as choices of characters, and even quirks of dialogue. When I originate a screenplay the subject tends to be one of certain themes I’ve worked on over the years. I never tried to do this, indeed I’ve tried to stay away from it - but it’s inevitable. Another kind of voice (and maybe what you’re more interested in) is when screenplays ‘write themselves’. Most of my work is, to be honest, drudgery (I subscribe to Dorothy Parker’s famous ‘I hate writing but love having written’) BUT - one is hoping for those moments when hours fly by and I
discover I’ve written twenty pages in which characters have said things I did not expect. Then it feels like I write directly from the unconscious, and that’s the best stuff” (Ref 14).

E. Experiences you have while writing with voice
“tears, nerves, revelations, catharthis, truth” (Ref 5).

“Losing track of time, experiencing strong emotions; when re-reading that part of the text the emotional intensity never fades. It feels sincere” (Ref 11).

“humour, irony, sense of fun, pleasure, precision, oddness, detail, meaning in the work
sense of tapping into something bigger than myself and sense of purpose when it is going well. When it is going well sense of exhilaration” (Ref 20).

“I don’t really "think" about my writing - I just see the movie in my head and write it as it goes. I "watch" the same scenes over and over if necessary, to get it right” (Ref 6).

“It can feel like the heightened adrenaline rush of a football match when everything is simultaneously slow and fast and your brain is able to process at a quicker rate. It can feel like these ideas and thoughts are coming from somewhere else but I think actually it is because my perception of how these thoughts are arriving has changed” (Ref 15).

“I have an emotional reaction experiencing the full spectrum of feelings and I sense that I have a role in the world. I feel excited and driven as I go along but feel a bit flat when I finish the work!” (Ref 17).

“When voice is working for me, I am completely lost in what I am doing and the writing moves well. Glitches occur when I know I am not hearing my own voice in what I am writing. This occurs even in non-fiction writing” (Ref 23).
“We may be talking about different things but... I think of voice as something that one notices as a theme in ones work, or as choices of characters, and even quirks of dialogue. When I originate a screenplay the subject tends to be one of certain themes I've worked on over the years. I never tried to do this, indeed I've tried to stay away from it - but it's inevitable. Another kind of voice (and maybe what you're more interested in) is when screenplays 'write themselves'. Most of my work is, to be honest, drudgery (I subscribe to Dorothy Parker's famous 'I hate writing but love having written') BUT - one is hoping for those moments when hours fly by and I discover I've written twenty pages in which characters have said things I did not expect. Then it feels like I write directly from the unconscious, and that's the best stuff” (Ref 14).

“Getting into flow and writing from the unconscious produces fast, crackling, focused scenes and unpredictable 3 dimensional characters - it all comes alive. And suddenly one can go back into other parts of the script and apply this new vitality.

I do a huge amount of rewriting for producers, and novel adaptations. Often the themes and characters are far from my chosen concerns and it's a struggle to get to my voice, but once it happens the screenplay becomes 'mine.'” (Ref 14).

“After long enough spent with a story, my personal voice starts to emerge from the story, that previously was simply a plot line, a sequence of scenes, atmosphere etc. I have a tendency to write 'past' the subject for quite some time. After a 'revelation' hits - cannot really explain this phenomena better -the story takes a whole another turn, as there now is this more personal involvement with the story and the characters; something that cannot be removed, that has become the core of the story, the heart of it” (Ref 21).

“I find this use of 'voice' a little annoying. Voice? What is it again? OK, so I've defined it as (go back to top) surprising creative imagination and political/social values. So I'm often surprised when characters take over, and I consciously bring politics to my work” (Ref 22).
F. **Flow**

“**feel in the zone** and inspired and passionate about life. I realise how much broad life experience I have and how the highs and lows of my life have fueled my work” (Ref 17).

“It is fluent and feels natural. I am most at home as a writer when I allow my voice expression. In that way the kinds of writing that accommodate my voice are the ones I prefer to work in and feel most confident in” (Ref 4).

“We may be talking about different things but.... I think of voice as something that one notices as a theme in ones work, or as choices of characters, and even quirks of dialogue. When I originate a screenplay the subject tends to be one of certain themes I've worked on over the years. I never tried to do this, indeed I've tried to stay away from it - but it's inevitable. **Another kind of voice (and maybe what you're more interested in) is when screenplays 'write themselves'.** Most of my work is, to be honest, drudgery (I subscribe to Dorothy Parker’s famous 'I hate writing but love having written') BUT - one is hoping for those **moments when hours fly by and I discover I've written twenty pages in which characters have said things I did not expect. Then it feels like I write directly from the unconscious, and that's the best stuff**” (Ref 14).

“the times when "voice occurs" in my work is **when I'm least aware of it occurring** (if that makes any sense?)! - those are the times when I'm simply in the flow, and unaware of time-passing or any external distractions” (Ref 12).

“I think your voice is really the sum of you. It is what you write. What you write cannot be separated from you the person. **At times I do feel an unconscious 'flow' to my work where it can feel magically that a voice is appearing but that is a doubtful perception. My voice is more connected to my culture, background, experiences, politics, dreams, concerns and craft (or lack of it) than to any magical notion**” (Ref 15).
“When voice is working for me, I am completely lost in what I am doing and the writing moves well. Glitches occur when I know I am not hearing my own voice in what I am writing. This occurs even in non-fiction writing” (Ref 23).

“The flow state (see: Csikszentmihalyi on Flow.)

ie Ironically, a complete lack of self consciousness / self awareness.

ie - In ‘the zone’.

But thats while writing,

As I say, when re-reading something old of mine that has my writing voice stamped all over it in big dirty footprints (the ‘claw of the lion’ as they said about Sir Issac Newton’s voice in some calculus equations he anonymously wrote once), I sort of feel something akin to attaining all 6 levels of Maslow’s Hierarchy of Human Needs I guess. Just to be purposefully humble for a change” (Ref 2).

“I’m pretty much on auto-pilot” (Ref 6).

“Getting into flow and writing from the unconscious produces fast, crackling, focused scenes and unpredictable 3 dimensional characters - it all comes alive. And suddenly one can go back into other parts of the script and apply this new vitality.

I do a huge amount of rewriting for producers, and novel adaptations. Often the themes and characters are far from my chosen concerns and it’s a struggle to get to my voice, but once it happens the screenplay becomes ‘mine.’” (Ref 14).

“Losing track of time, experiencing strong emotions; when re-reading that part of the text the emotional intensity never fades. It feels sincere” (Ref 11).

G. Mind

“I just put myself into a person's head and write” (Ref13). – Creative imagination?

“I don’t really "think" about my writing - I just see the movie in my head and write it as it goes. I "watch" the same scenes over and over if necessary, to get it right” (Ref
“We may be talking about different things but... I think of voice as something that one notices as a theme in ones work, or as choices of characters, and even quirks of dialogue. When I originate a screenplay the subject tends to be one of certain themes I’ve worked on over the years. I never tried to do this, indeed I’ve tried to stay away from it - but it’s inevitable. Another kind of voice (and maybe what you’re more interested in) is when screenplays ‘write themselves’. Most of my work is, to be honest, drudgery (I subscribe to Dorothy Parker’s famous ‘I hate writing but love having written’) BUT - one is hoping for those moments when hours fly by and I discover I’ve written twenty pages in which characters have said things I did not expect. Then it feels like I write directly from the unconscious, and that’s the best stuff” (Ref 14).

“I think your voice is really the sum of you. It is what you write. What you write cannot be separated from you the person. At times I do feel an unconscious ‘flow’ to my work where it can feel magically that a voice is appearing but that is a doubtful perception. My voice is more connected to my culture, background, experiences, politics, dreams, concerns and craft (or lack of it) than to any magical notion” (Ref 15).

“Getting into flow and writing from the unconscious produces fast, crackling, focused scenes and unpredictable 3 dimensional characters - it all comes alive. And suddenly one can go back into other parts of the script and apply this new vitality. I do a huge amount of rewriting for producers, and novel adaptations. Often the themes and characters are far from my chosen concerns and it’s a struggle to get to my voice, but once it happens the screenplay becomes ‘mine.’” (Ref 14).

“It can feel like the heightened adrenaline rush of a football match when everything is simultaneously slow and fast and your brain is able to process at a quicker rate. It can feel like these ideas and thoughts are coming from somewhere else but I think actually it is because my perception of how these thoughts are arriving has changed” (Ref 15).
“humour, irony, sense of fun, pleasure, precision, oddness, detail, meaning in the work sense of tapping into something bigger than myself and sense of purpose when it is going well. When it is going well sense of exhilaration” (Ref 20).

H. Personhood
“Ozu deliberately beat (removed) his own `personality'/voice out of all 50 films - or whatever. Though ironically that Zen style (ie - no style, the style that cannot be identified, let alone named) became his `voice’”(Ref 3).

“It occurs most strongly when I have a passionate opinion about something (such as gender inequality or injustice); my personal opinions have an effect on characters, events and the tone of the story” (Ref 11).

“I think your voice is really the sum of you. It is what you write. What you write cannot be separated from you the person. At times I do feel an unconscious ‘flow’ to my work where it can feel magically that a voice is appearing but that is a doubtful perception. My voice is more connected to my culture, background, experiences, politics, dreams, concerns and craft (or lack of it) than to any magical notion” (Ref 15).

“Dunno how to answer this? ”Voice occurs" makes it sound like it just pops out every now and then. It’s there from the first word in the script to the last” (Ref 18).

“I don’t like my own voice. I would like to write through a character’s voice but I hear my own” (Ref 19).

“voice is who I am and expresses itself in everything from prose, phrasing structure character emotion meaning. Sometimes I will work extremely hard to develop a new style of writing but who I am essentially and how i see the world always expresses itself through whatever means I use. If I try to write outside this, ie to fit some external dictations or directions from someone, then the writing is not very good, even though I still have exactly the same craft experience to bring to it” (Ref 20).
“After long enough spent with a story, my personal voice starts to emerge from the story, that previously was simply a plot line, a sequence of scenes, atmosphere etc. I have a tendency to write 'past' the subject for quite some time. After a 'revelation' hits - cannot really explain this phenomena better - the story takes a whole another turn, as there now is this more personal involvement with the story and the characters; something that cannot be removed, that has become the core of the story, the heart of it” (Ref 21).

“I find this use of 'voice' a little annoying. Voice? What is it again? OK, so I've defined it as (go back to top) surprising creative imagination and political/social values. So I’m often surprised when characters take over, and I consciously bring politics to my work” (Ref 22).

“When voice is working for me, I am completely lost in what I am doing and the writing moves well. Glitches occur when I know I am not hearing my own voice in what I am writing. This occurs even in non-fiction writing” (Ref 23).

“My voice reflects who I am, the way I think, and the experiences I've had” (Ref 24).

“Getting into flow and writing from the unconscious produces fast, crackling, focused scenes and unpredictable 3 dimensional characters - it all comes alive. And suddenly one can go back into other parts of the script and apply this new vitality.

I do a huge amount of rewriting for producers, and novel adaptations. Often the themes and characters are far from my chosen concerns and it's a struggle to get to my voice, but once it happens the screenplay becomes 'mine.'” (Ref 14).

“You always give something of yourself away” (Ref 13).

“Some of what I said above fits here too. But I can only say I feel satisfied that I have used words in the way which conveys a feeling of my voice and and produces a voice in my writing which could only be mine” (Ref 23).
“We may be talking about different things but... I think of voice as something that one notices as a theme in ones work, or as choices of characters, and even quirks of dialogue. When I originate a screenplay the subject tends to be one of certain themes I've worked on over the years. I never tried to do this, indeed I've tried to stay away from it - but it's inevitable. Another kind of voice (and maybe what you're more interested in) is when screenplays 'write themselves'. Most of my work is, to be honest, drudgery (I subscribe to Dorothy Parker's famous 'I hate writing but love having written') BUT - one is hoping for those moments when hours fly by and I discover I've written twenty pages in which characters have said things I did not expect. Then it feels like I write directly from the unconscious, and that's the best stuff” (Ref 14).

I. reward
“Lack of credibility” (Ref 19).

“I don't like my own voice. I would like to write through a character's voice but I hear my own” (Ref 19).

“We may be talking about different things but... I think of voice as something that one notices as a theme in ones work, or as choices of characters, and even quirks of dialogue. When I originate a screenplay the subject tends to be one of certain themes I've worked on over the years. I never tried to do this, indeed I've tried to stay away from it - but it's inevitable. Another kind of voice (and maybe what you're more interested in) is when screenplays 'write themselves'. Most of my work is, to be honest, drudgery (I subscribe to Dorothy Parker's famous 'I hate writing but love having written') BUT - one is hoping for those moments when hours fly by and I discover I've written twenty pages in which characters have said things I did not expect. Then it feels like I write directly from the unconscious, and that's the best stuff” (Ref 14).

“feel in the zone and inspired and passionate about life. I realise how much broad life experience I have and how the highs and lows of my life have fueled my work” (Ref 17).
“The flow state (see: Csikszentmihalyi on Flow.)

ie Ironically, a complete lack of self consciousness / self awareness.

ie - In `the zone’.

But that’s while writing,

As I say, when re-reading something old of mine that has my writing voice stamped all over it in big dirty footprints (the `claw of the lion’ as they said about Sir Isaac Newton’s voice in some calculus equations he anonymously wrote once), I sort of feel something akin to attaining all 6 levels of Maslow’s Hierarchy of Human Needs I guess. Just to be purposefully humble for a change” (Ref 2).

“It is fluent and feels natural. I am most at home as a writer when I allow my voice expression. In that way the kinds of writing that accommodate my voice are the ones I prefer to work in and feel most confident in” (Ref 4).

“I have an emotional reaction experiencing the full spectrum of feelings and I sense that I have a role in the world. I feel excited and driven as I go along but feel a bit flat when I finish the work!” (Ref 17).

“humour, irony, sense of fun, pleasure, precision, oddness, detail, meaning in the work sense of tapping into something bigger than myself and sense of purpose when it is going well. When it is going well sense of exhilaration” (Ref 20).

“Some of what I said above fits here too. But I can only say I feel satisfied that I have used words in the way which conveys a feeling of my voice and and produces a voice in my writing which could only be mine” (Ref 23).

Summary of responses, Questions 27 and 28.

A. When voice occurs:
As stated before, the proposition put forward in this thesis is that a writer - anyone – cannot help but write in their own voice, since language and writing is a direct expression of who a person is. One respondent in this section pointed out that using the phrase ‘voice occurs’: “makes it sound like it just pops out every now and then. It’s there from the first word in the script to the last” (Ref 18M). I agree wholeheartedly with this. Still, I think it is also true that for all sorts of reasons, voice is not always clear and discernible to everyone. The question seeks to clarify then, what writers identify about voice when it does come through in their practice, and how and why it comes through more clearly at some times than at others.

The responses to this question generally cohered around some relationship to the writer’s self, either emotionally, psychologically or physically. For example, one respondent stated that they “feel in the zone and inspired and passionate about life” (Ref 17 F) when voice occurs. The positivity expressed in this statement is great, but it would be interesting to match this with information about when that feeling first occurred. Was this writer feeling good before she started writing, or was feeling good a consequence of writing in her own voice, or did something else create this positive mental state? We can’t know in this case, however it is common for writers to express positive feelings about the world, themselves, and their work when speaking about voice, as many of these responses show.

Another writer identified that they may or may not allow their voice to be expressed. This writer noted that writing becomes “fluent and feels natural” when he does allow his voice expression (Ref 4 M), meaning that “the kinds of writing that accommodate my voice are the ones I prefer to work in and feel most confident in” (Ref 4 M).

Both of these responses relate to the writer’s mental state, but other respondents note the relationship between moral concerns, self and voice. The concept of truth appears in three responses, referring to moments of truth, either about character (Ref 5 M), about a personal moral truth or passionate opinion “(such as gender inequality or injustice)” (Ref 11 F), and about glimpsing, “amid humour, a deeper more serious truth” (Ref 3 M). These responses reflect what Booth recognised as “moral and emotional content” (discussed in Part I v a. with the implied author.
concept). Interestingly, truth is also a strong element in Theory of Mind theory, where researchers point out the compulsion people feel generally towards knowing if information is ‘true’ or not, in order that they can assign a truth-value to information and/or note the perceived trustworthiness of its source (See Part I v b. Theory of Mind). These three respondents associate truth strongly with voice.

Another respondent noted that his voice slipped in when a character is less well-defined, suggesting that his voice ‘fills in the gaps’ when imagination or creative imagination is necessary. This writer also reported that voice steps in when he identifies with the character/s or situation/s. This is a new form of the ‘like me’ concept (described in Part I v b. Other Sources). And yet it is unlike the application in that section, where a writer gains kudos for being ‘like’ a reader in the reader’s mind. In this case, it suggests the writer attends more closely to the character’s experience in whatever situation the character is in when they feel the character or their situation had been or is similar to the writer’s. This could express itself within the writing as the character being drawn with greater detail than other characters, or as this character having a stronger emotional arc, or in other ways.

The above associate voice with some aspect of self, and also with what I term personhood – the sum of a person’s personality, history, attitudes and beliefs etc – through moral and emotional content. Two other responses associated it with longevity, or time spent with the characters and situations being written. Two respondents reported that voice emerged through time spent writing generally, or time spent with the storyworld, characters and situations in particular. One respondent states that “voice begins to articulate” more clearly the more this respondent writes. The second respondent stated that she tends to “to write 'past' the subject for quite some time [before] a 'revelation' hits” so that she now has a “more personal involvement with the story and the characters; something that cannot be removed, that has become the core of the story, the heart of it” (Ref 21 F).

B. How voice in writing happens:

Respondents to the questionnaire had a variety of experiences of how writing with
voice happens for them. One respondent puts himself into the character’s head to write (Ref 13). Another reported watching a movie in her head and writing it down (Ref 6). Still another respondent spoke of writing past the subject for quite some time before having a revelation which brings her into a new relationship with the story - a more personal involvement with story and characters - which becomes the core, or heart of the story (Ref 21).

Another respondent associates a lack of awareness of time-passing or external events (Ref 12) with writing in her voice, and still another respondent notes that the more they write, the more clearly the voice is articulated, though this person does not clarify what sort of time frame is implied in ‘more’.

C. Evidence of Voice in writing:

With regard to what respondents considered as evidence of their voice coming through in their work, one respondent noted economy in descriptive passages, and identified using “unfilmable” references to give tone and rhythm. He noted that he didn’t like using questions in dialogue, and that he tended to write a heightened reality (Ref 18). All of these are very concrete manifestations which can be seen in words on a page. Another respondent notes that his projects tend to be “rooted in farce” (Ref 24). His voice tends to be self-deprecating and dry, but can also be explosive and irreverent. Overall he notes a tendency for his voice to “not take itself too seriously” (Ref 24). This description suggests a stance, or attitude he adopts when writing with a strong voice. A further respondent noted “structural similarities, sometimes originating from "running for cover" when faced with a story problem” (Ref 9 M). This may be interpreted as using characteristic structural patterns which have worked for him in the past. Another respondent “thinks of voice as something that one notices as a theme in ones work, or as choices of characters, and even quirks of dialogue” (Ref 14). This respondent noted certain themes which recur in his work, about which he notes “I never tried to do this, indeed I've tried to stay away from it - but it's inevitable” (Ref 14).

What is interesting to note here, is the different ways individual writers recognise what they consider ‘hallmarks’ of their voices. While I have chosen only four respondents’ statements here, there is a wide range of other elements which may be
considered ‘evidence’ amongst other statements, which I have left out simply because they are too idiosyncratic or conceptual to be considered evidence. Rather than being exhaustive then, these three show the wide range of bases on which respondents see evidence of voice in their own work.

D. Personal experience of re-reading voice in your work:

Respondents noted the fluency of the writing as being a hallmark of voice (Ref 4), which I understand as an ease within the writing, so that words flow word to word and idea to idea without jarring the reader. Three of the respondents mention the strong emotional effect of the words and the sequence of words (Ref 3), which creates an emotional intensity in the work (Ref 3 and Ref 11), and also in the writer through their sense of ownership of the voice (Ref 23). One of the respondents noted that “it feels sincere” (Ref 11). Sincerity is one of the key concepts suggested by both Peter Elbow (Elbow, 2007; Luce-Kapler, 2011) and Al Alvarez (Alvarez, 2005) as a characteristic of voice (see Part I v for further discussion). Elbow names both sincerity and resonance as the two key perceptions gained by readers when they discern voice in a work (see Peter Elbow (Elbow, 2007)p179), though Elbow associates sincerity neither with good writing nor with truthfulness necessarily, but with a stronger sense of “genuineness” (2011, p. 164) – a ‘real human being’ behind the writing ((Luce-Kapler, 2011)p164). He defines resonance as “the quality of text where we feel that the ‘writer has gotten a bit more of his or her self in or behind or underneath the words’” (2007: p179; quoted in 2011: 164).

One respondent reported a sense that the work was recognisable as “mine” (Ref 14). This may be to do with the themes, choice of characters and “quirks of dialogue” (Ref 14) he noted as recurring in his work. Another respondent described his writing voice as being “stamped all over [his writing] in big dirty footprints” (Ref 2), and referenced “the ’claw of the lion’ [which] they said about Sir Issac Newton’s voice in some calculus equations he anonymously wrote” (Ref 2). This respondent then reports feeling “something akin to attaining all 6 levels of Maslow’s Hierarchy of Human Needs” (Ref 2) at once. This sense of satisfaction, confidence and self-esteem is noted by three respondents (Ref 2, Ref 4 and Ref 23). It is clear that though some writers find writing a challenging and sometimes difficult activity, one of the rewards is a pleasure in self – in our own abilities and competence.
E. Experiences you have while writing with voice

The responses were surprising in their earnestness and vivid description of writing with voice. I identified eleven responses which describe the experience of writing with voice, and the similarities within the comments are notable. While this section is similar to that focusing on how voice in writing happens, the responses, when isolating the personal experience of writing with voice, seem to have greater energy and, dare I say, sincerity.

One of the most common experiences for respondents was the sense of losing track of time (Ref 11, Ref 14 and Ref 23). One respondent described it as “getting into the flow” (Ref 14), and several others described an experience which sounded similar, but was expressed differently. These expressions included: “the writing moves well” (Ref 23); “screenplays ‘write themselves’” (Ref 14); “characters take over” (Ref 22); “the unconscious produces fast, crackling, focused scenes and unpredictable 3 dimensional characters” (Ref 14); and “I feel excited and driven” (Ref 17). Along with this energy is the sense of heightened emotion (Ref 5, Ref 11, Ref 15, Ref 17 and Ref 20). Two respondents noted experiencing a wide spectrum of emotions (Ref 5 and Ref 17). One respondent identified a “sense of fun, pleasure, precision, oddness, detail [and] meaning in the work” (Ref 20).

This idea of playing a role in producing social meaning was identified in several ways. Respondents described this as: “tapping into something bigger than myself “ (Ref 20), which gives a sense of purpose; and “having a role in the world” (Ref 17). One respondent spoke of consciously bringing her politics to her work (Ref 22). As well as one respondent stating the characters take over, two mentioned surprise or unexpectedness of some kind in the writing they produced (Ref 20 and Ref 22). Several respondents mentioned the feeling that the work came from or was inspired by something else which could be the unconscious (Ref 14, Ref 15 and Ref 20), though one respondent noted that this was a dubious assumption: “It can feel like these ideas and thoughts are coming from somewhere else but I think actually it is because my perception of how these thoughts are arriving has changed” (Ref 15). And one respondent noted an emotional arc of his own experienced through writing,
F. Flow:

There were eight responses which associate the concept of “flow” with their writing with voice. One of the respondents referenced Mikhail Csikszentmihalyi’s work on flow, describing it as “a complete lack of self-consciousness / self-awareness” (Ref 2). Other respondents also mentioned a lack of awareness, either directly (Ref 2, Ref 12), or through using the term “lost” in what the writer was doing (Ref 23 and Ref 11). Two respondents described it as being “in the zone” (Ref 2 and Ref 17), while other respondents used other expressions, such as “in the flow” (Ref 12, Ref 14 and Ref 15); “fluent” (Ref 4), “on auto pilot” (Ref 6); and “it moves well” (Ref 23).

Respondents commonly reported time passing (Ref 12, Ref 14 and Ref 15), and being unaware of distractions. Two writers associated this state with the unconscious mind (Ref 14, Ref 15). This may be because these writers feel they are not consciously deciding what to write word by word. One writer suggested that it feels like the screenplays “write themselves” (Ref 14). Another respondent mentioned that “glitches occur when I know I am not hearing my own voice in what I am writing. This occurs even in non-fiction writing” (Ref 23F). The idea that a writer “hears” their own voice in their head while writing is interesting when considered with Peter Elbow’s claim that “not only do most readers hear voices in texts as they read, they tend to hear people in the texts” (Elbow 2007, p180; quoted in Luce-Kapler et al, 2011, p163). It may be that writers experience their own voice coming to them in different ways, one of which is through an experience which feels like “hearing” an internal voice which is their own. This may be contrasted with, for example, “hearing” their character speak while writing.

Flow is also associated for some respondents with surprise and unpredictability in their writing, producing “unpredictable ... characters” (Ref 14) who say and do things the writer “did not expect” (Ref 14). Another respondent mentioned that “it can feel magically that a voice is appearing” (Ref 15), though again, this leads me to question whether this respondent “sees” their characters act, or are they seeing words appear
G. Mind:

The question of mind has relevance to voice because of the ongoing question of where voice springs from, what is its source or origin? That mind is often associated with voice has already been shown through many of these responses, and through the wider thesis. However, it is not clear if voice may be associated with consciousness more than with the unconscious mind, or vice versa. In question 17 it was suggested that voice can be associated with several different understandings, among which were imagination and creative imagination. While imagination is often thought of as a conscious process, creative imagination was defined as including an unconscious aspect, and the largest number of respondents (27%) chose this option. Linda Aronson seems to support the notion of some unconscious input when she notes that “many accounts of the actual writing process exist, all remarkably similar. They describe an interaction between imagination and technique, a dual process whereby a logical, craft-skilled part of the writer’s mind works to filter and make sense of streams of ideas, images and words coming from another part of the mind, usually loosely termed the 'imagination', 'subconscious', 'right brain' or, in earlier times, 'fancy'” ((Aronson, 2000) p1).

The seven responses here come from only 5 respondents, and of these, two specify that they feel that the voice they write with comes from the unconscious mind. The respondents who describe writing from the unconscious (Ref 14 and Ref 15) also report a sense of energy and ease about the process of writing. One respondent mentions screenplays writing themselves (Ref 14), and in a different response describes the result as “fast, crackling, focused scenes and unpredictable 3 dimensional characters” (Ref 14). This respondent finishes by saying “it all comes alive” with a “vitality” which can then be written into other parts of the script (Ref 14). The second respondent who associates his voice with the unconscious also experiences a sense of speed and effectiveness in his thinking. He reports the feeling that his “brain is able to process at a quicker rate”, and associates the experience with an adrenaline rush (Ref 15). Both respondents seem to believe that they produce the best writing this way.
Another respondent doesn’t name the unconscious, but does express the sense of “tapping into something bigger than [her]self” (Ref 20). This is also associated with a sense of purpose and exhilaration (Ref 20). While the respondents above seem to emphasise the role of the unconscious, two other respondents seem to take a more pragmatic approach which downplays the role of their minds, or at least ‘thinking’ in favour of ‘doing’. One respondent states that he just puts himself “into a person’s head and writes” (Ref 13), and still another respondent reports “I don’t really “think” about my writing - I just see the movie in my head and write it as it goes” (Ref 6). Both of these respondents also speak as though their writing comes easily. This is interesting in view of the difficulty one writer reported about being aware of his voice: “I only became aware of my ‘voice’ as I became older and it confused me. Others pointed it out (as a good thing) and for a few years it messed me up as I started to parody what others had praised” (Ref 14).

In all responses above, it is the conscious act of ‘thinking’ which is noticeably missing. Batty and Waldeback explain this as “often a writer is not aware of the elements that define their voice, and paradoxically if they become too self-aware of them, they can lose their impact” (Batty, 2008)p166) through over-use or exaggeration. It is almost as though by immersing themselves in an experience of imagining themselves as someone else, or by imagining a different source for their voices, the writers above can sidestep the ego which can tangle any artist up in self-consciousness.

H. Personhood:

Thirteen responses in questions 27. and 28. referred in some way to a sense of identifiable self, or personhood, in the way that voice presents itself. Four respondents (Ref 15, Ref 18, Ref 20, and Ref 24) reported that voice was omnipresent, because “voice is who I am and expresses itself in everything” (Ref 20).

Having an omnipresent voice, however, is not the same as using it. ‘Finding’ or ‘getting into’ a personal voice is not always reported to be easy and immediate. One respondent reported that her voice emerges after time spent with the story (Ref 21). When this happens for her, she describes a “more personal involvement with the
story and characters” (Ref 21), which somehow becomes the story’s core or heart, and “cannot be removed” (Ref 21). Another respondent reports that “who I am essentially and how I see the world always expresses itself through whatever means I use” (Ref 20), and yet this respondent also reports that “if I try to write outside this, ie to fit some external dictations or directions from someone, then the writing is not very good, even though I still have exactly the same craft experience to bring to it” (Ref 20). Still another respondent reports “I do a huge amount of rewriting for producers, and novel adaptations. Often the themes and characters are far from my chosen concerns and it’s a struggle to get to my voice” (Ref 14), but this respondent continues “once it happens the screenplay becomes ’mine.’” (Ref 14).

The same respondent particularly noted themes as a way of displaying personhood in voice, when he states “when I originate a screenplay the subject tends to be one of certain themes I’ve worked on over the years. I never tried to do this, indeed I’ve tried to stay away from it - but it’s inevitable” (Ref 14). Theme becomes important because of its relationship to the question of point of view, or world view carried by the writer, which itself is an expression of the totality of that writer’s life, experiences and understanding.

With regards to personality or personhood being intrinsic to voice, one respondent noted that “Ozu deliberately beat (removed) his own ’personality’/voice out of all 50 films - or whatever. Though ironically that Zen style (ie - no style, the style that cannot be identified, let alone named) became his ’voice’” (Ref 3). Three respondents suggested that despite writing in other styles or even with or through other voices, their own voice remains recognisable (Ref 6, Ref 19 and Ref 20).

One of the points raised through the responses was the way that the term voice is variably used to refer to the writer’s personal voice, but also to the ‘voice of a character’, or more generally as the ‘voice of a story’. One respondent reports wanting to hear the character’s voice, but instead hearing her own (Ref 19), while the opposite is true for another respondent, who expresses that “glitches occur when I know I am not hearing my own voice in what I am writing” (Ref 23).
As a reflection of the self, voice is seen as connected to “culture, background, experiences, politics, dreams, concerns and craft (or lack of it)” (Ref 15). It can present as “prose, phrasing structure character emotion meaning” (Ref 20), and political and social values (Ref 22). One respondent noted that voice is especially strong when the writer has “a passionate opinion about something” (Ref 11). This respondent also commented that “my personal opinions have an effect on characters, events and the tone of the story” (Ref 11). Another kind of voice (and maybe what you’re more interested in) is when screenplays ‘write themselves’. Most of my work is, to be honest, drudgery (I subscribe to Dorothy Parker’s famous ‘I hate writing but love having written’) BUT - one is hoping for those moments when hours fly by and I discover I’ve written twenty pages in which characters have said things I did not expect. Then it feels like I write directly from the unconscious, and that’s the best stuff” (Ref 14).

I. Reward:

The concept of reward here, is intended to tease out the personal satisfaction gained from writing. This is particularly apposite in light of the terms “struggle”, “challenge” and “drudgery” which have also appeared throughout these comments from writers. Under question ‘21. I experience the writing process as;‘, 25% of respondents chose ‘difficult’, while 8% chose ‘easy’. Of the 67% who chose ‘Other’, many responses reported both difficult and easy in turn. Rather than being a ‘walk in the park’ then, writing with or without voice would seem to require self-discipline to get through the more difficult times.

Two of the comments I have included here come from the same writer, and both suggest the opposite of ‘reward’. One states “lack of credibility” (Ref 19), though it does not explain whether it is the writer or the writing which displays this lack. Other comments from the same writer confess to not being able to find a voice of her own which she likes (Ref 19). This writer has been writing for over 25 years, but does not consider herself ‘professional’ under question 11. Years as a Professional Writer.
Amongst other comments however, seven respondents report relatively high rewards for having written. Responses range from “satisfied” (Ref 23), through “fun, pleasure [and] exhilaration” (Ref 20), to “attaining all 6 levels of Maslow’s Hierarchy of Human Needs” (Ref 2). Other respondents report “it is fluent and feels natural” (Ref 4); one reports feeling “excited and driven” (Ref 17), and having a “sense of a role to play in the world” (Ref 17). This is echoed by another respondent who reports having a “sense of purpose [and] meaning from the work” (Ref 20).

While one respondent describes much of his work as drudgery, he “loves having written” (Ref 14). He particularly associates this with times when he feels he is writing “from the unconscious”, when hours pass quickly and “characters have said things I did not expect” (Ref 14). A further comment refers to feeling “inspired and passionate about life” (Ref 17). This respondent gains a sense of how much broad life experience he has, and “how the highs and lows of my life have fueled my work” (Ref 17).

These rewards then, range from simple pleasurable emotions to a deeper sense of satisfaction and meaning gained through a sense of connection with the wider world, and a sense of purpose to the writer’s life. So though the writing process is unpredictable and often hard, the rewards writers experience can form a more fundamental sense of well-being in their lives through this deeper connection. Writing then, is one of those professions which offers different sorts of rewards from other types of labour, and thus, suits some types of people better than others. This translates to a labour issue - which is shared with other artistic professions - and which is far from solved.
Part Two ~ Elements Displaying Screenwriter’s Voice

Part Two looks more closely at how voice is manifested amongst writers, and seeks to define more specifically which craft elements most reflect screenwriter’s voice.

29. Describing your voice.

Which best describes ‘writer’s voice’ in your own work. (Choose one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have a strong, individual voice in everything I write</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My writer’s voice is only present in my most personal work</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I write to the project, voice isn’t relevant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses to this question, while strongly supporting the idea of voice generally, suggest that different writers have different understandings of the usefulness or value of voice. For example, of the three respondents who chose statement 3 ‘I write to the project, voice isn’t relevant’ here, each chose the option ‘I write across all genres and styles; my voice adapts to each’ in Question 35, which relates voice to genre. These respondents could have chosen the third option, which stated ‘when constrained to a genre my voice becomes weak’ there, but did not. It seems then, that in thinking about their own voice in their work, they have a pragmatic approach, taking each project according to its parameters, without focusing on whether their personal voice is or is not present or at work. Interestingly, these three respondents are also three of the most experienced writers amongst all respondents. Two of these writers list screenwriting as their primary income, while the third has worked in the education sector and states that the format he works on most is short films. From one point of view then, it makes sense that these most experienced writers are less effusive about their own voices, having worked with them over decades and also being experienced in production sectors where the focus is on getting the job done, rather than on individual expression. The corollary of this observation then, may be that not all projects require a strong personal voice. As most writers know, while attaining voice is generally thought of as a goal worth striving for, voice can also be seen as a defect or distraction in some production formats. It may be that a further questionnaire on voice could usefully include questions which relate format or types...
30. Point of View

There is a characteristic point of view I often adopt in my writing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>52%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Point of view in the sense intended here is similar to the concept of worldview, suggesting that a writer has a certain perspective – including being positioned through demographics, and having social, moral and/or political beliefs – which relate to who they are as an individual, and which come out as themes, concerns and messages, or stories, in their writing projects. This question was intended to gauge the awareness writers have of these themes or motifs, as a first step towards recognising a general stance or set of stances they take towards the world as displayed in their writings. At the same time it is useful to note of course, that not all writers are able to write original works which follow their own passions. Many more work on projects already designed and proscribed by a chain of writers and producers in commercial formats.

This research proposes generally that personal voice exists in all work written by a writer. However, it is expected that personal voice will be diluted, even to the point of being unrecognisable in some sorts of writing, particularly where the idea is not an original one from the writer themselves, and where storylines, characters, etc. have already been set. Batty and Waldeback (Batty, 2008) however, do use the example of Jonathon Harvey, whom they claim is one writer whose voice can be recognised even when writing for the soap opera Coronation Street ((Batty, 2008)p163-4).

As shown in the results above, the concept of point of view is accepted by a small majority of writers, though the answers amongst the Other category tend towards
supporting it as well, being “perhaps” (Ref 23), and “Yes, I’m not sure” (Ref 21). This question introduces the more important one below, which asks writers to identify what their characteristic stances are.

Those who answered in the affirmative for this question directly correlate with those who gave a description in question 31. Therefore, 9 respondents did not give an answer. Of the 14 who did, many could describe some aspect of their most common stories, messages or themes.

31. Please describe:

(e.g. championing the underdog; revenge is sweet; survival of the fittest; life is cruel..)

“It’s hard to determine” (Ref 21).

In collating the information offered in the 14 responses to this question of ‘Point of View’, I grouped the responses based on common elements. Again, these groupings originated from the responses themselves and my interpretation of them, and were not predetermined. The commonalities which emerged cohered under eight different headings, or identifiable areas where writers noted recurrent motifs. There were in: Themes (Storylines); Messages (Premise); Situations; Characters; Point of View (POV) (Stance); Humour; Tone (Stance); Personhood. As may be noted, some of these heading names refer to ideas which may be found in the work itself (eg. Themes (Storylines), Messages (Premise)), while some refer to distinct craft elements (eg. Situations, Characters), while others refer more to characteristics of the writer which are displayed in the work (eg. Point of View (Stance), Humour etc.). The distinctions between some categories and their responses however, are quite subtle. I summarise the responses in each of these groupings briefly at the end of this section. As in the earlier questions, I have repeated responses where applicable, and have bolded the relevant phrases for that heading.
J. **Themes (Storylines)**

“Aha, ok, Hmm, these are Themes.

Recurring themes and motifs certainly do pop up across a lot of my work. eg Atheism, Humanism, rationalism, etc.

My work doesn’t always champion underdogs. Sometimes it totally does. Depends on the story I’m telling and why.

Revenge is always sweet, right? It’s a reliable dramatic device. (See the top 20 RoI films, they’re all revenge stories. So is Hamlet, Harry Potter, Spiderman, The Bible, etc.)

Survival of the fittest. Hmm. Hard not to see that as applying to every story ever (ie define fittest, and for what?)

Life is cruel. Hmm. Wow, Hard to argue otherwise, eg Life is a certain deathtrap. Or, watch a David Attenborough doco about African savannah. But ‘cruel’ is a value judgment anyway; the Universe is totally indifferent is a better way to frame it I think. (Kubrick’s idea not mine. But I agree.)

I guess this means no, there is no characteristic ‘thematic’ POV I often adopt. (If there is I can’t see it. Someone else needs to read all my work and answer that. Like that’s gonna happen. I’ve written a ridiculous amount. Even I don’t have time to go back and read half of it.)” (Ref 2).

“I suppose you could describe it as championing the underdog meets life is cruel” (Ref 15).

“I know the wounded person is the one who is the greatest teacher” (Ref 17).

“Generally it’s about some f@%k-up coming good in some way, on their own
terms. Somewhat similar to championing the underdog” (Ref 18).

“championing the underdog; compassion” (Ref 19)

K. Message (Premise)
“Standing up for what you believe in, being yourself, not letting other people’s opinions interfere, etc”(Ref 6).

“championing the underdog; compassion” (Ref 19)

L. Situations
“Injustice suffered, awkward social situations, misunderstandings in personal and social or professional relationships” (Ref 11).

“Goodness wins but (someones) longing won’t get fulfillment” (Ref 7).

“I tend towards an individual upending a community (‘The Englishman Who Went Up A Hill But Came Down A Mountain’), or an individual whose change redefines him or herself and the community around them (‘Temple Grandin’). I think it derives from firstly being one of six kids, and from growing up in a small community where we all knew each other. It’s rare for me to think of isolated people. People are always in context. I’m also not good at writing simple heroes or villains. My heroes always have flaws, my villains always have a redeeming feature” (Ref 14).

“Not sure about the term ‘point of view’ but I know that in short story writing I often seem to want to help my character(s) to solve a problem. This comes from being interested in what makes people ‘tick’. I quite often bring in psychological and/or philosophical aspects” (Ref 23).

M. POV (Stance)
“almost always a female point of view - and within this, I would always take a comedic line - sprinkled with plenty of self-deprecation, self-examination with some
emotional and spiritual searching thrown in for good measure!” (Ref 12).

“A strong belief in what is right” (Ref 13).

“championing the underdog; compassion” (Ref 19)

“Not sure about the term ‘point of view’ but I know that in short story writing I often seem to want to help my character(s) to solve a problem. This comes from being interested in what makes people ‘tick’. I quite often bring in psychological and/or philosophical aspects” (Ref 23).

N. Humour
“almost always a female point of view - and within this, I would always take a comedic line - sprinkled with plenty of self-deprecation, self-examination with some emotional and spiritual searching thrown in for good measure!” (Ref 12).

O. Tone (Stance)
“almost always a female point of view - and within this, I would always take a comedic line - sprinkled with plenty of self-deprecation, self-examination with some emotional and spiritual searching thrown in for good measure!” (Ref 12).

“wry” (Ref 20)

P. Characters
“almost always a female point of view - and within this, I would always take a comedic line - sprinkled with plenty of self-deprecation, self-examination with some emotional and spiritual searching thrown in for good measure!” (Ref 12).

“I tend towards an individual upending a community ('The Englishman Who Went Up A Hill But Came Down A Mountain'), or an individual whose change redefines him or herself and the community around them ('Temple Grandin'). I think it derives from firstly being one of six kids, and from growing up in a small community where we all
knew each other. It's rare for me to think of isolated people. People are always in context. I'm also not good at writing simple heroes or villains. My heroes always have flaws, my villains always have a redeeming feature" (Ref 14).

“I know the wounded person is the one who is the greatest teacher” (Ref 17).

Q. Personhood
“I tend towards an individual upending a community ('The Englishman Who Went Up A Hill But Came Down A Mountain'), or an individual whose change redefines him or herself and the community around them ('Temple Grandin'). I think it derives from firstly being one of six kids, and from growing up in a small community where we all knew each other. It's rare for me to think of isolated people. People are always in context. I'm also not good at writing simple heroes or villains. My heroes always have flaws, my villains always have a redeeming feature” (Ref 14).

“Not sure about the term 'point of view' but I know that in short story writing I often seem to want to help my character(s) to solve a problem. This comes from being interested in what makes people 'tick'. I quite often bring in psychological and/or philosophical aspects” (Ref 23).

Summary of Points of View

J. Themes (Storylines):
There were five responses which were brought together under this heading, and it was the largest grouping of responses. Not surprisingly, perhaps, most of the responses echoed the themes proposed in the question, particularly “championing the underdog”, making it unclear whether this was really the most common theme amongst writers, or the one writers were reminded of by the question. Still, championing the underdog was recognised by 4 of the 5 respondents as a theme they had used. In one case the respondent modified this theme to “championing the underdog meets life is cruel” (Ref 15). One respondent reported using the theme “the wounded person is the one who is the greatest teacher” (Ref 17), while another respondent reported writing about “some f@%k-up coming good in some way, on their own terms” (Ref 18), which they recognised as “somewhat similar to
championing the underdog” (Ref 18). One respondent considered philosophical positions, such as “atheism, humanism, rationalism, etc” as occurring like themes in their work (Ref 2). This respondent also seemed to agree that he uses the other themes suggested in the question in his work (“revenge is sweet”, “survival of the fittest”, and “life is cruel”), but admitted to writing such volumes of work that he could not identify a single characteristic point of view (Ref 2).

One of the questions raised by this grouping which has no answer at this point is the cultural weighting of themes. The question arises because of the ready acceptance of these respondents to the suggested theme of “championing the underdog”. Along with the ‘tall poppy’ syndrome, as an Australian “championing the underdog” is a phrase and a concept which I have been familiar with for as long as I can remember, and it’s true, I find myself more sympathetic with losers rather than winners. This has been noted of Australian stories and Australian heroes by others (Aronson 2000; Vogler 2007). Linda Aronson notes that “even in Australian cinema, which is culturally very close to its North American counterpart, the norm (in non-comedy) is to present heroes who are noble failures. This cultural difference is interestingly pinpointed in the different national responses to Shine. While Americans saw the film as a story about winning, Australians say it as a profoundly moving film about noble failure and deeply compromised success” (Aronson, 2000 #269) p30). Christopher Vogler notes of Australian heroes that “the most admirable hero is one who denies his heroic role as long as possible and who, like Mad Max, avoids taking responsibility for anyone but himself” (Vogler, 2007 #384)pxx). Are there cultural reasons then, that 4 out of 5 respondents identify using the theme of “championing the underdog”? And is this the echo of a characteristic of an Australian national voice? This cannot be answered here, but will be discussed further in Part IV of this thesis.

K. Message (Premise):

There were 2 responses grouped here, both of which are clear moral statements (“Standing up for what you believe in, being yourself, not letting other people's opinions interfere, etc” (Ref 6), and “championing the underdog; compassion” (Ref 19). These differ from themes only in the matter of degree of information they offer about the story which might be spun from these threads.
L. Situations:

Four responses suggested Situations which writers find recur in their work. The responses tend to imply an awkward situation which needs addressing, or suggest situations which may be a small part of a larger story. In three of the four cases, the story which surrounds the situation is not made clear, though the respondents generally express what they see as the core idea with clarity.

M. POV (Stance):

This grouping identifies something about the writer’s relationship to the wider world as displayed through their writing. This relates to the question of stance as discussed earlier in this thesis (see Part I v Implied Author), and is also described as ‘worldview’ in this report (see question 30.). Responses were added under this grouping based on the attitude the writer has seemed to take to their reader/s or audience. This attitude however, is as much to do with how the writer portrays herself, as with what she seeks to say through her response. For example, one respondent notes that she almost always uses “a female point of view - and within this, ... a comedic line - sprinkled with plenty of self-deprecation, self-examination with some emotional and spiritual searching thrown in for good measure!” (Ref 12). This response suggests a tone the writer may use (“comedic”, “self-deprecation”), but it also suggests that the writer is interested in certain types of questions (“self-examination”, “emotional and spiritual searching”), and may seek to answer these through the playing out of the drama. This in itself gives us more detailed information about what sort of work this writer may write, and could be a characteristic of her works in general, leading us to identify her voice from others.

The other responses also suggest a certain moral tone (“a strong belief in what is right” (Ref 13), and “compassion” (Ref 19)) or an area of enquiry (“psychological and/or philosophical aspects” (Ref 23) which are important to the writer, and so give us an idea of what they value, suggesting something about the stories they will write.
N. Humour:

There was only one response grouped under Humour. This was the response noted above (Ref 12), in POV (Stance). Humour is important in voice because, of all ways that humans arrive at conclusions about each other, one of the most open and scrutinizable is through sense of humour. Humour tells us much about the person who uses it, through the values displayed in a joke (moral information), through the type of joke (childish, cynical, sophisticated...), and through the mode of joking (a riddle, a “knock knock” joke, a pun, an anecdote with punch-line; told as a performance, or thrown in with casual conversation, ...). As well as displaying character in these ways, humour also shows ‘a mind at work’. Donald proposes that humans “can be aware of other minds”, and Rebecca Luce-Kapler and her fellow researchers (Luce-Kapler et al 2011), state that consciousness depends upon intersubjectivity (Luce-Kapler, 2011 #329) p164), which “makes possible our fascination with other people’s lives – fictional or real – and creates the potential for empathy (Thompson 2001)” ((Luce-Kapler, 2011 #329) p164). Humour then, is an important way in which other humans can judge what type of human being, and what type of mind, they are interacting with.

Another reason why humour is important is that laughter is most often not instigated through the conscious mind, but is a bodily response from the autonomic nervous system – like sneezing – which happens without conscious thought. The best laughter is a genuine response to delight and surprise, and in this it seems more ‘trustworthy’ than other human responses given and received. It also carries with it positive affirmation from one human mind to another, since one mind is gratified at the appreciation it feels it has received, while the other mind is grateful to have been given the gift of delight and surprise, leading to laughter.

O. Tone (Stance):

Of the two responses which suggested Tone (Stance), one was the response mentioned in M. POV (Stance), which describes taking a “comedic line [and] including self-deprecation, self-examination with some emotional and spiritual searching thrown in in for good measure!” (Ref 12). The other was a single word “wry” (Ref 20).

Tone, like humour, is capable of carrying a great deal of information about the relationships surrounding a writer, their work, and their anticipated audience. It is
interesting that tone is not mentioned more often under the question of point of view, meaning ‘worldview of the writer’. I think this must be due to the confusion created by this particular usage of ‘point of view’, since I would expect writers in general to be very aware of tone as a way of describing the power of their work. It is also true though, that tone is one of the most difficult concepts to describe. Tone may also not be as easy for a writer to pinpoint in their own work, as it is for a reader to see and experience. Tone may also have greater range across multiple works, so that writers feel it is too varied to act as an indicator of their personal voice.

P. Characters

Three responses suggested something about character or characterisation as applicable to recurring patterns in the writer’s work. One respondent (Ref 12) noted using a female point of view. Another respondent noted that he is “not good at writing simple heroes or villains. My heroes always have flaws, my villains always have a redeeming feature” (Ref 14). A third respondent noted that “the wounded person is the one who is the greatest teacher” (Ref 17), from which I understand that this respondent uses a wounded person across many of their works.

Q. Personhood:

This group was formed because of the level of self-knowledge, or the presumption of self-understanding in the responses. Two responses were brought together here because both respondents were able to identify recurring patterns, but then see the origins of those patterns within their own life experience and background. One respondent reported that their theme (storyline) “an individual upending a community” (Ref 14) comes from “being one of six kids, and from growing up in a small community where we all knew each other. It’s rare for me to think of isolated people. People are always in context” (Ref 14). The other respondent reported that “I often seem to want to help my character(s) to solve a problem. This comes from being interested in what makes people ‘tick’” (Ref 23).

The above responses seem to relate equitably with the question posed at 30 regarding writers having a characteristic Point of View which is displayed by recurring
elements in their writing. Only 52% of respondents agreed that they did have a characteristic point of view. While slightly more (14 respondents) did describe recurring elements, the responses here are so varied in what is identified as a recurring element and/or a point of view, it is hard to make any definitive statement about whether point of view is a useful concept when it comes to identifying significant elements which could help to describe or characterise a writer’s voice. As noted above, this may be due to confusion over the term ‘point of view’, which is also described as ‘worldview’, but is first introduced as ‘themes’ around which a story may be built.

32. This point of view is related to:

Choose one or more

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My personality</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My belief systems</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My psychological make-up</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My life experiences</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My hobbies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My family of origin - situation and issues</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations of life</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire for change</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This question seeks to discover where individual writers believe their point of view described in the previous section comes from. The number of responses (65) shows that most respondents chose multiple answers from the list. Four respondents didn’t answer this question.

The three responses which were given under ‘Other’ were “all of these apply, but as I
say the POV changes with each project anyway. People call my stuff ‘edgy’. (What the hell does that even mean, anyway?” (Ref 2); “I’m not sure [if my point of view is related to these things]” (Ref 21); and “[my point of view is related to] what I find funny” (Ref 24).

The most popular responses (“my life experiences”, and “observations of life” 13 respondents each) are closely followed by “my personality” (12 respondents). This, and the other higher scoring responses (“my belief systems”; “my psychological make-up”; and “my family of origin – situation and issues”), attest to the importance of ‘personhood’ in influencing a point of view writers might take.

33.Voice

This point of view is related to my personal voice

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This question sought to test whether writers believed that their point of view was related to their writing voice. This question tests the hypothesis that writer’s voice is a direct product of a writer’s personhood (shown through a strong connection between question 31. Point of View, question 32.where that point of view comes from, and a majority ‘Yes’ response shown here, agreeing that point of view is related to personal voice). However, this could only be argued when individual writers identified strong points of view in their writing, which they associated strongly with the categories under question 32. This was not shown, because the points of view identified were too varied, and because so many categories were chosen in question 32. This question therefore, only affirms that writers believe that their point of view is related to their personal voice.
34. Genre

This point of view is associated with genre for me.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, this answer relates more to what writers believe, than to what can be shown through an analysis of these responses. Clearly, more writers believe that point of view and genre are not associated, though one third of writers still do believe that they are associated.

35. Choose which best describes how genre relates to your voice:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I prefer to write in a specific genre/s and this aids my voice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I write across all genres and styles; my voice adapts to each</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When constrained to a genre my voice becomes weak</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is clear above, most writers take many genres and styles within their stride (71%). Responses under ‘Other’ are: “My voice never feels authentic in any genre” (Ref 19); “I think there is an unconscious switch from one genre to another but I believe my voice adapts without my being conscious of effort” (Ref 23); and “My skill lies in the realms of comedy, but to keep from becoming bored I often blend that genre with another” (Ref 24). Three respondents did feel that writing in their favoured genre aided their voice.

36. Defining Craft Areas

These questions ask you to rate craft areas which display your voice most strongly. Choose the most accurate rating.
36a. Genre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong association with voice</th>
<th>7 37%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak association with voice</td>
<td>5 26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant to voice</td>
<td>7 37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Above, an equal number of writers believe that genre has a strong association with voice, and that it is irrelevant to voice. The number who believe that genre has a weak association with voice is only slightly fewer, suggesting that writers are divided about strength and relevance of genre to voice.

36b. Storyworld

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong association with voice</th>
<th>14 78%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak association with voice</td>
<td>2 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant to voice</td>
<td>2 11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many more writers believe that the storyworld chosen has a strong association with voice, than believe it is a weak association or that it is irrelevant. This suggests that Storyworld is an important feature of individual writers’ voices when the writers are working on projects which they have originated or chosen through passion or interest.

36c. Dramatic Situation/s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong association with voice</th>
<th>17 81%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak association with voice</td>
<td>1  5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant to voice</td>
<td>3 14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, many more writers believe that the dramatic situations they write have a strong association with voice, than a weak association or are irrelevant to voice. This
suggests that the dramatic situations writers choose to place their characters in says something important about that writer’s voice.

36.d Structural Choices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong association with voice</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>55%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak association with voice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant to voice</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here a small majority of respondents believe that structural choices reflect or have a strong association with voice. Almost a third of respondents believe that structural choices are irrelevant to voice, and around 15% of respondents consider that structural choices have a weak association with voice.

36e. Characters and Characterisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong association with voice</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak association with voice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant to voice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All writers who answered this question believe that characters and characterisation has a strong association with voice.

36f. Language ~ Descriptive paragraphs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong association with voice</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>71%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weak association with voice</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant to voice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost two thirds of writers who responded to this question believe that the
language used in the descriptive paragraphs (Big Print) of screenplays has a strong association with voice. Slightly fewer than one third of respondents believe that the language used in the descriptive paragraphs has a weak association with voice. No respondents believe that it is irrelevant to voice.

36g. Language ~ Dialogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association with Voice</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two thirds of respondents believe that language as displayed in the dialogue has a strong association with voice. Nearly one fifth of respondents believe that the language in dialogue has a weak association with voice. But one respondent believes it is irrelevant to voice.

36h. Style ~ Tone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association with Voice</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All respondents to this question believe that the style and tone of a screenplay has a strong association with voice.

36i. Pace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association with Voice</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fifty percent of respondents to this question believe that pace has a strong association with voice, in comparison to 35% who believe that it has a weak association to voice, and 15% who believe it is irrelevant to voice.

36j. Rhythm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association with Voice</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>11 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>6 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifty five percent of respondents to this question believe that rhythm has a strong association with voice, while 30% believe that it has a weak association with voice. 15% believe it is irrelevant to voice.

36k. Sense of Humour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association with Voice</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>17 (85%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>3 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eighty five percent believe that sense of humour has a strong association with voice, in comparison to 15% who believe it has a weak association with voice. No respondents believe it is irrelevant to voice.
36l. Theme/Premise/message

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong association with voice</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak association with voice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant to voice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just over two thirds of respondents believe that the Theme/Premise/Message has a strong association with voice, while 14% and 10% respectively, believe that they have a weak association or are irrelevant. However, this question refers more specifically to projects which have been originated by the writers, or where writers hold some power in deciding upon the themes/premise/message which is illustrated by the drama.

36m. Use of music, special effects, sound..

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong association with voice</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak association with voice</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant to voice</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At least half the respondents to this question believe that music, special effects, and sound have a strong association with the voice of the writer, whereas 24% of respondents each believe that these have a weak association with voice, or are irrelevant. This again presumes that the writer is working in a format where suggestions or proscription of these filmmaking elements is accepted.

36n. Motifs, repetitive elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong association with voice</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak association with voice</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrelevant to voice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sixty percent of respondents to this question believe that motifs and other repetitive elements have a strong association with voice, and 30% believes that these elements have a weak association to voice. 10% believe that they are irrelevant to voice.

37. Storyworld

There are common elements in the storyworlds I create:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>90%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ninety percent of respondents report that there are common elements in the storyworlds they create in their writing, while 10 % report that there are not.

38. Tell us what patterns you have observed.

Of the 18 respondents who answered ‘Yes’ above, 12 reported seeing patterns in their work. While respondents were very lucid when describing these patterns, I was surprised with these answers, which focused equally on worlds, themes, character and tone. I have divided the responses based on these four headings, which again, arose from the responses rather than being predetermined.

Worlds:

“usually I create worlds that I am familiar with - but within those familiar confines, I allow myself to explore less familiar narratives and characters” (Ref 12)

“There is a pattern of making the worlds recognisable and down to earth. Suburban or urban rather than magical or heightened. I try to bring magic in through dreams or other avenues” (ref 15).

“Everyday people in the everyday world doing everyday things... but ramped up for
comedic affect” (ref 18).

“The flow of my story is placed in the grubby, sick hands of an unreliable narrator. I try to insert music that isn’t usually used in other works. Also, I tend to include at least one encounter with a cult for some reason” (Ref 24).

Summary of Worlds:

Within the four responses grouped under Worlds, three of these described using worlds that were “familiar” or “everyday”, but each respondent reports contrasting these familiar worlds with something else such as: “less familiar narratives and characters” (Ref 12); “bringing magic in through dreams or other avenues” (Ref 15); or “ramping up for comedic effect” (Ref 18). The fourth reported putting the drama into the hands of an unreliable narrator (Ref 24), which in itself causes an interesting relationship to storyworld, because when a narrator is deceptive, other characters and audience members can be thrown off balance, so that their perception of what is normal is skewed. In this way the storyworld can be familiar, but as in a cubist painting, the impression is fractured and disorienting. This respondent also reports including “at least one encounter with a cult” (Ref 24), which again, offers a strong contrast to what may be considered a “normal” life or storyworld.

Themes:

“Humour. Challenging authority. Questioning everything (eg examining underlying assumptions). For example: a recurrent motif (esp for comedy) - Most folks have no clue what they are doing but just make it up, as they go along. Ie Life is a comedy of errors. etc” (Ref 2 M)

“Identity issues; characters going through a drastic change in identity/personality, or another character observing a drastic change in another character (no idea where that has come from). Also, acceptance into social groups, issues around a sense of belonging” (Ref 11).

“Hero’s journey. Transformation of story and character. Sense of hope coming out of
tragedy” (Ref 17).

“I’m not sure if this could be called a pattern, but I find a child’s perspective a very interesting one, and tend to describe the adult world through the eyes of a child” (Ref 21).

Summary of Themes:

As in previous sections, the writers who responded to this questionnaire have been able to identify strong themes in their own works. In the four responses grouped under ‘themes’, four different themes emerge. One respondent challenges authority and questions underlying assumptions (Ref 2). Another focuses on identity issues, particularly a difficult shift in identity (Ref 11). A third reports using transformation as a theme, and also a “sense of hope coming out of tragedy” (Ref 17), and still another describes the “adult world through the eyes of a child” (Ref 21).

Character:

“protagonist on a journey of self-discovery” (ref 5)

“I isolate characters” (Ref 7)

“Identity issues; characters going through a drastic change in identity/personality, or another character observing a drastic change in another character (no idea where that has come from). Also, acceptance into social groups, issues around a sense of belonging” (Ref 11).

“Hero’s journey. Transformation of story and character. Sense of hope coming out of tragedy” (Ref 17).

“I’m not sure if this could be called a pattern, but I find a child's perspective a very interesting one, and tend to describe the adult world through the eyes of a child” (Ref 21).
“Referring first of all to the table above, I didn't find I could relate this to my voice as it was principally about screen writing.

common elements: sympathy for characters; finding both good and bad elements in the way characters behave” (Ref 23).

“The flow of my story is placed in the grubby, sick hands of an unreliable narrator. I try to insert music that isn’t usually used in other works. Also, I tend to include at least one encounter with a cult for some reason” (Ref 24).

Summary of Character:

Of the seven responses grouped under ‘character’, two respondents suggest using characters (heroes) on a journey of self-discovery (Ref 5) and transformation (Ref 17). These two responses may refer to the same type of story, but may also not, if the self-discovery does not lead to transformation. Both however, suggest a strong central character whose story is focused on the character journey. Other responses give less information about the type of story the character is placed in, and yet propose interesting dramatic potential. One respondent mentions “isolating characters” (Ref 7). Another writes of “characters going through a drastic change in identity/personality, or another character observing a drastic change in another character” (Ref 11). A further respondent mentions using a “child’s perspective” (Ref 21), which suggests that one of the significant characters will be a child, or child-like in some way. Yet another respondent mentions an unreliable narrator (Ref 24). Choosing an unreliable narrator has interesting implications for character, insofar as such a character is generally deceiving other character/s, and/or the audience at the same time. This sort of story therefore, can be highly character-focused, and though the storyworld may be rooted in everyday life, this world can become a nightmare of deceptions, unsettling an audiences’ confidence in the everyday world they live in.

Tone:

“Humour. Challenging authority. Questioning everything (eg examining underlying assumptions). For example: a recurrent motif (esp for comedy) - Most folks have no
clue what they are doing but just make it up, as they go along. ie Life is a comedy of errors. etc” (Ref 2 M)

“A desire to expose what is wrong with the world” (Ref 13).

“Everyday people in the everyday world doing everyday things... but ramped up for comedic affect” (ref 18).

Summary of Tone:

Of the three comments which were grouped under ‘tone’, two mention humour (Ref 2 and Ref 18), while the third mentions a moral tone, seeking to show what is wrong with the world (Ref 13). In terms of storyworlds, tone can be applied to almost any world, and so humour puts no limitations on storyworld.

Considering the question of storyworld in general can lead to a question of genre, since many of the genres are strongly associated with a certain storyworld: the western with the American wild west is a most common example. Storyworld is also a budget consideration for any writer who seeks to write original projects and have them produced. Certain storyworlds (and their associated genres) are thought to be ‘expensive’ because of the budget required to support the art direction of such films. While Hollywood is known worldwide for its slick, high budget genre films, other smaller industries become known for more idiosyncratic, personal films. Such is the case in Australia, where genre films are relatively under-represented within our almanac of feature films (Ref?). This may be the reason why the respondents above mention everyday worlds more often than other storyworlds, though as can be seen, these respondents have found new perspectives on ordinary worlds.
39. Dramatic Situations

There are common elements in the dramatic situations I place my characters in.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>68%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. Tell us what patterns you have observed.

“I am unable to answer this for the writing I do. This does not apply generally to poetry for me although I can think of some situations where I am protesting in poetry. The patterns for short stories and to some extent to book reviewing are: very much what I have answered earlier re psychological elements” (Ref 23).

There were ten respondents to this question, of the 13 who said ‘Yes’ above. Again, responses included descriptions of dramatic situations, but also included responses which referred to themes, tone and character. See below for the summary of each category of response.

Dramatic Situation

“I almost never place my characters in "dramatic" situations” (Ref 24).

“Some hates somebody a lot. (passionately)

Somebody loves somebody a lot. (passionately)

And somebody wants something very badly - and is having a lot of trouble getting it” (Ref 2).

“Screen writing always involves familiar situations. In my novels, I would say behaving honourably when to do so is risky, is a common pattern. Love, always, but not necessarily romantic love” (Ref 3).
“the dramatic situations usually all have a strong comedy element to them” (Ref 12)

“There is an obstacle that is normally faceless, associated with authority or societal rules. It can come from some economic or legal restriction. The characters are generally struggling with an inner problem simultaneously” (Ref 15).

“Having to come up against society’s norms and blocks. Having to fight extremism on all sides in quest for truth” (Ref 17).

“Dump them into a big pile of shit and see if they can get out of it.
Basically, make all their worst fears come true” (Ref 18).

While seven respondents reported these dramatic situations, the responses rarely suggest specific circumstances in which the dramatic situation occurred (where, between whom, what was at stake?). For this reason it is hard to group these responses into any meaningful pattern for the purposes of this report. This suggests that when developing a framework for voice, the term ‘dramatic situation’ is less useful unless it is tied to a more concrete set of circumstances which are also explained. The idea behind asking these questions is to ascertain what elements within screenwriting craft are useful when seeking to characterise an individual writer’s voice, that is, what patterns emerge from each writer’s oeuvre. While I believe that the respondents have identified strong patterns which are reflected in these responses, as someone who is not familiar with their works, I have discovered that I cannot decipher the situations and say anything useful about them without also knowing details of place, actions of characters, goals, and beats in relation to the story as a whole.

Theme

“Screen writing always involves familiar situations. In my novels, I would say behaving honourably when to do so is risky, is a common pattern. Love, always, but not necessarily romantic love” (Ref 3).
“That few people are all good or all bad” (Ref 13).

“Unlikely reluctant leaders.

People pulling a community together - or having to fight a community or community standards.

A person coming to the realization that what they have is enough” (Ref 14).

Three responses are grouped under ‘theme’ in this question: “Love, always, but not necessarily romantic love” (Ref 3); “That few people are all good or all bad” (Ref 13), and “Unlikely reluctant leaders. People pulling a community together - or having to fight a community or community standards. A person coming to the realization that what they have is enough” (Ref 14). Amongst these themes are common threads with other responses in other questions. Love; community and the tensions which can result between an individual and the community to which she belongs; and need or desire for something which may or may not be achievable or worthy of achieving, are all themes which recur in stories across the globe. These of course, are played out against an infinite number of backgrounds, and yet these themes would seem to be identifiable by writers within their work, and here are also identified as patterns within their works. This shows me that themes are important in characterising a writer’s voice, though it is useful to remember that in this case only three respondents out of 13 gave responses which included themes.

Tone

“the dramatic situations usually all have a strong comedy element to them” (Ref 12)

One response was grouped under ‘tone’, and it mentions a “strong comedy element” (Ref 12). It is worth noting that comedy and moral values are the two types of responses which have generally been reported by respondents and noted as tone by myself. It would be a mistake however, to limit tone to these two. Instead, it is useful to unpack tone, as was done in Part I v of this thesis, to its component parts.
Tone generally can be described as ‘degree of severity’ or seriousness, in that it can be friendly; admonishing; stern; loving, or a wide array of other options. It can also take in levels and type of humour: light; cynical; sarcastic; comic, etc. Tone generally implies some degree of authorial distance: formal or informal; distanced or intimate; aggressive and confrontational; or friendly and cooperative. But tone is also made up of vocabulary, which can be plain or austere, formal, regal, suitable for a child, or anything in between; and grammar, which can also be described. All this means that tone is not an easy thing to pinpoint, nor to describe.

Humour is one of the most easily recognised qualities of tone, which I think makes it the most commonly noted. Value statements are also easily recognisable, and within this report I have noted them as a ‘moral tone’. However, the subtlety of the many shades of tone possible, mean that readers (and writers, in this case), have to go to a lot more work if they are to define other tones that are not comic or moral. And each screenplay will be written in a very specific tone by its writer, the tone which best reflects the story and its meaning.

In seeking to create a framework of elements which can aid in characterising screenwriter’s voice, I believe that tone is an important element. However, the difficulty (and time) involved in scrutinizing screenplays in order to more specifically define their tone makes it a problematic category. Perhaps tone could better be plotted on a grid or continuum, rather than described in words. However, luckily this is a problem for another chapter.

Character

“There is an obstacle that is normally faceless, associated with authority or societal rules. It can come from some economic or legal restriction. The characters are generally struggling with an inner problem simultaneously” (Ref 15).

One response mentioned characters under ‘dramatic situation’, and again, it is difficult to draw any conclusions with regard to the situation or the character who is struggling without knowing more about the story/ies in which this scenario happens.
Report on Screenwriter’s Questionnaire

The dramatic situation implied here could be a strong characteristic of this writer’s voice if we were able to understand this comment in light of the total oeuvre of this writer.

41. Storytelling modes

Is your voice related to a particular structural pattern? (Choose one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Pattern</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single protagonist; hero’s journey narrative</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-protagonist / group protagonist narrative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual narratives interwoven</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not associated with a specific structure; works across many</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Not associated with a specific structure; works across many, I've tried about every pattern there is, I think?” (Ref 2)

“Single protagonist narrative. Not always hero’s journey” (Ref 18).

Here, almost half the respondents (48%) report working across many different structural forms. The second largest category is the ‘single protagonist; hero’s journey narrative’ structure (33%), and one respondent reports to using multi-protagonist narratives or dual narrative structures. One respondent reported using a single protagonist structure which was not a hero’s journey narrative (Ref 18). In general this set of responses suggest that screenwriters employ a range of structural patterns in their works (Ref 2 and others).

It is worth noticing that respondents did not choose multiple categories here, suggesting that they were happy with choosing only one category, though again, the majority reported using many types of structural patterns, and could use this category to report several structural patterns.
42. It is most often true that my:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue carries story beats</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action carries story beats</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Either, dependent upon story/genre</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both within the same screenplay</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here seventy four percent of respondents use either or both action and dialogue to carry story beats within their screenplays. Thus, story beats, which are related to genre and to structure, would seem to be unreliable within this forum, as a way of defining the individual characteristics of a screenwriter’s voice. However, on a writer by writer basis and looking at all works within an oeuvre, I believe that patterns within use of story beats, may be useful in characterising individual screenwriter’s methods for structuring their screenplays.

Perhaps most interesting here, is that five respondents report using either dialogue or action only, to carry story beats. This cannot be examined further however, without looking at individual screenplays.

43. Character and Characterisation

My main character tends to be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatively even number of each over all projects</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost half (45%) of respondents report using a relatively even number of men and women as their main characters. However, a further 35% report using mainly male main characters, in comparison to 20% who report using female main characters, suggesting that the overall number of female main characters will be significantly smaller than male main characters.
One of the labour issues identified within screenwriting (and other professions) is the disproportionate representation of men in comparison to women, who tend to be over-represented in non-professional occupations. It has also been noted that roles for women actors are fewer, and within this, main roles are even scarcer, meaning that young women have fewer role models to inspire them to achieve in all areas. It is also often assumed that female writers will write female characters, and male writers will write male characters, because that is what each knows. Against this background, it is interesting to compare the reported gender of main characters against the gender of the writer.

Within the 20 respondents to this question, 11 respondents (55%) were male, while 8 respondents (40%) were female. One respondent refrained from identifying themselves as male or female. Of these, eight respondents (40%) identified themselves as writing main characters of their own gender (five men wrote male main characters, while 3 women wrote female main characters). Of the remainder, six men (30%) reported writing an even number of male and female main characters, while three women (15%) reported writing an even number of male and female characters (suggesting 45% of respondents wrote a relatively even number of male and female main characters). Three women (15%) did not answer this question. Two women reported writing male main characters (10%), while one person who refrained from identifying their gender, reported writing female main characters.

Using a basic assumption of one character point (male or female) to one respondent, this suggests that the ratio of male main characters to female main characters is 12 male characters to 9 female characters (when the respondents, both male and female, who reported writing even numbers of male and female characters are each assigned 5 character points (rather than 4.5), since 9 ‘even number of’ main characters cannot be divided evenly between male and female).
**Report on Screenwriter’s Questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents by Gender (M or F)</th>
<th>Male Characters Written</th>
<th>Female Characters Written</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same gender char</td>
<td>8 (M &amp; F)</td>
<td>5 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even number of M/F</td>
<td>6 M</td>
<td>3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even number of M/F</td>
<td>3 F</td>
<td>2 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F writing M</td>
<td>2 F</td>
<td>2 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown writing F</td>
<td>1 (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Respondents</td>
<td>12 Male Characters</td>
<td>9 Female Characters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above calculation suggests that in order for there to be an equivalent number of male and female main characters written, it would be helpful to have a larger number of female writers, both because 40% of writers wrote their own gender characters, and also because a greater number of female writers who wrote both genders would result in more women writers writing more male or female characters. This is obviously a crude calculation, and yet it does help to explain why there are more male than female main characters. This calculation is also skewed, because the respondents to this questionnaire included an even number of men and women. Given that that would not necessarily be the case when looking at the total number of screenwriters working in a professional capacity, it can easily be seen that an adequate number of female role models for young women will be a long time coming.

However, gender is only one crude way to describe patterns in character in screenplays.

**44. I have noticed patterns in the type of characters I use:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Almost two thirds of respondents (71%) report noticing patterns in the type of characters they use, while nearly 30% suggest there is no pattern (or that they have not noticed a pattern). These patterns are described below.

45. Describe:

“cant' be precise about this…” (Ref 5).

Patterns in Characters used:

“They're often a blend of people I know. eg Like the Mike Leigh thing sort of (very vaguely). Sometimes also, the (or, a) main character has a lot of ‘me’ in them (eg bio-socio-culturally similar). Sometimes though - not at all” (Ref 2).

“Characters in transition between stages of life. Growing up, growing old. Navigating the new stage” (Ref 4).

“Tend to have an oddity that makes them stand up for what they believe in and not care what people think (or not let it be a negative); tend to be strong people but internally quite conflicted and suffering” (Ref 6)

“sometimes I think (fear!) that all my characters are in fact, various facets of my own personality!” (Ref 12)

“They are funny but not especially successful. They are intelligent but not especially so. They aspire to leading a comfortable, normal life as they see it but are thwarted by society and their own inaction” (Ref 15).

“Innocent, isolated, unexpectedly strong” (Ref 16).

“Complex. Outside conventional stereotypes. Having to find meaning out if tragedy” (Ref 17).
“- Never what they seem.
- Honest in that they’re real people, which means they lie their arses off.
- Un-PC but not for the sake of it.
- Over-qualified f@%k ups” (Ref 18).

“Flawed” (Ref 20).

“My characters usually have no endearing features about them. I tend to write about the scum of the Earth; people who commit the worst of acts. This is all in a comedic tone of course” (Ref 24).

Summary

Ten respondents described the patterns they have observed in the characters they write. As is clear above, there are few overlaps in the answers given, making it difficult to summarise. Two respondents suggested that their characters have elements of themselves in them (Ref 2 and Ref 12). A further two respondents suggested that their characters were strong (Ref 6 and Ref 16). Only one respondent mentioned flawed characters (20), though other responses suggest ‘flawedness’ too, as in: “Tend to have an oddity that makes them stand up for what they believe in and not care what people think (or not let it be a negative); tend to be strong people but internally quite conflicted and suffering” (Ref 6); and also “they are funny but not especially successful. They are intelligent but not especially so. They aspire to leading a comfortable, normal life as they see it but are thwarted by society and their own inaction” (Ref 15).

Two of the responses suggest characters who are distinctly drawn and yet not necessarily pleasant: “- Never what they seem. - Honest in that they’re real people, which means they lie their arses off. - Un-PC but not for the sake of it. - Over-qualified f@%k ups” (Ref 18); and “My characters usually have no endearing features about them. I tend to write about the scum of the Earth; people who commit the
worst of acts. This is all in a comedic tone of course” (Ref 24).

Further descriptions suggest internal conflict: “Innocent, isolated, unexpectedly strong” (Ref 16); “Complex. Outside conventional stereotypes. Having to find meaning out if tragedy” (Ref 17); and “Characters in transition between stages of life. Growing up, growing old. Navigating the new stage” (Ref 4).

This array of characters is interesting given the context of the large proportion of Australian, British and European respondents, since it is hard to imagine these as conventional ‘heroes’ in an American mainstream sense. Several of them sound more like anti-heroes, and the storylines which are suggested through these descriptions of a protagonist are interesting and idiosyncratic, much as though they are characters from arthouse films rather than from mainstream genre films.

46. Language ~ Descriptive passages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My descriptive paragraphs tend to be: (Choose one)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sparse, describing concrete elements and actions only</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concise, but conveying all necessary elements of action and emotion</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyrical, using poetic &amp; stylistic devices (metaphor, similes; humour, etc.) to describe emotion and action</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is clear above, the majority of screenwriters seek to convey all necessary action and emotion in their description (57%), while a further 33% of screenwriters go so far as to use poetic and stylistic devices to describe emotion and action.

These responses suggest that many of these respondents (90%) have moved beyond simple ‘stage directions’ in their descriptive (Big Print) paragraphs, and choose to add important detail to clarify action and emotional beats. This is in line with the movement away from the adage “less is more”, where screenwriters were exhorted to write the barest description even of important action, which was my early experience of screenwriting classes in Australia in the 1980s. This adage was connected to the concept of a screenplay being a ‘blueprint’ for others to take over
and make their own. This idea has been challenged in the intervening years, as screenwriters as a professional group have become more visible, and more vocal, and the screenplay more widely read. This movement may be seen as important too, as the screenplay challenges criteria of ‘literature’ in an effort to bring recognition to some of the best screenwriters and their screenplays.

47. They are intended to: (Choose one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describe action only</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convey actions and character/story detail such as gestures, costume, mood, intent</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint a full picture in the reader’s mind while also being enjoyable to read (as literature might be)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many have argued that the screenplay as a form is hard for non-practitioners to read, because of its formatting. This is certainly true of the studios ‘shooting script’ format, and yet that is not the format of most screenplays at the hands of their screenwriters. The issue has been exacerbated by copyright ownership issues, which are particularly onerous in the American system, where the argument that the screenplay is a liminal work – neither literature nor yet a film – becomes the reasoning for copyright to be owned by the studio, rather than by the screenwriter/s who wrote the screenplay. As is shown above in the responses above, more respondents to this questionnaire write in order than their screenplays may be enjoyable to read (43%), while a smaller one third (33%) write to convey actions, character and story detail including gestures, costume, mood and intent, leaving an even smaller percent (24%) to describe action only.

48. Language ~ Dialogue

Choose the language you use in dialogue which may be considered part of your 'style' or 'voice'
Many respondents to this question use several of the categories of dialogue above. This is shown by the total of 43 responses from 20 respondents. The two largest categories are ‘slang’ and ‘pacey dialogue’, which 26% of respondents report using. Subtext is used by 14% of respondents; accents and different ways of speaking by 12%; and a further 16% of respondents added other descriptions of the dialogue they used, summarised below.

Comments

“Slang, Creatively used profanity” (Ref 24).

“Slang, Accents (different ways of speaking), Pacey dialogue, Heavy subtext, Wasn’t sure what "heavy subtext" means: Do you mean it takes a bit of work (for an audience) to really figure out the subtext, or, the opposite? i.e. that the subtext is close to the surface (i.e closer to "on the nose" dialog?). Anyway yeah there are *usually* always 2 levels in my dialog. Text, and subtext, and sometimes a 3rd ambiguity (2nd layer of subtext under the first later of subtext, like Kubrick does a lot)” (Ref 2)

“Lucid and conveying information without spelling it all out. I try to leave the reader some space for thought” (Ref 23).

“depending on character” (Ref 11)
“appropriate to character” (Ref 20)

“verbatim dialogue from research” (Ref 19).

Here two respondents report using slang (Ref 24 and Ref 2); two report using subtext while “leaving some space for thought” (Ref 23, and Ref2). One respondent reports using two layers of subtext (Ref 2). Two other respondents rightly note that the dialogue they write is appropriate to character (Ref 11 and Ref 20), and another respondent draws “verbatim dialogue from research” (Ref 19).

These responses are commonsensical, and yet such responses do not reflect the peculiar talent of writing believable yet interesting dialogue, which writers must learn. This may be an area for closer investigation in further surveys.

49. Patterns through other Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motifs (Visual, sound..)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance / movement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special effects</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time frame / playing with time</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of sound</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual language (shot sizes; camera angles, movement, etc)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, 17 respondents gave 41 responses here, meaning that many respondents chose multiple categories. The largest number of respondents (24%) reported using motifs in vision and sound. I understand this to indicate repetition of elements for some form of poetic effect (such as emphasis, irony, or other). The second most popular elements used in a patterned way were Music; Time/playing with time; and Sound (17% each). Some respondents also reported using Dance/movement; Special
effects (5% each); and Visual language, suggesting shot sizes, camera angles, movement etc. (2%). Twelve percent of respondents noted using other elements to create patterns in their writing. These are described below.

Comments

“Motifs (Visual, sound..), Music, Use of sound, Symbolic imagery but i guess this comes under #1 Visual Motifs anyway” (Ref 2)

“I use whatever tool is appropriate for the moment” (Ref 3).

“I live non-linear scripts” (ref 14)

“Time frame / playing with time, By time frame, I mean going forwards and moving back, sometimes alternately and sometimes with a different pace” (Ref 23).

Summary

The above comments see respondents report using symbolism (Ref 2); unspecified tools as “appropriate for the moment” (Ref 3); and time frame, or playing with time by moving backwards or forwards in time, and also varying the pace (Ref 23). Another respondent reports writing non-linear scripts (Ref 14), which may be interpreted as writing screenplays in which time is non-sequential (ie. playing with time), or could also be interpreted as indicating scripts for a non-linear medium or format, such as internet games where players choose how the drama unfolds from a series of options.

What is clear is that respondents do not appear limited by notions of traditional storytelling in a linear way, nor by the idea that the screenwriter knows nothing about the technicalities of production, and must stick to words and actions of the characters only. The respondents seem to have embraced all elements available to them in writing for audiovisual media.
50. Personal Conclusions

This final section invited respondents to add any comments they saw as relevant. Here, 11 respondents made comments which ranged over a variety of different topics. Below are the comments. Please skip to the end to read the summary.

Comments:

“Excellent Questionnaire, Thank you! Makes me think more about Voice. In all writing, i.e. What is it, where can I get more of it, etc.

I tend to find - writers take about 10 features (say?) to develop a clear voice that is "their own". Prior to that - it’s sort of like they’re copying (mixing) various other styles. But this is how most creativity works. (See Csikszentmihalyi, and ‘the ten year’ rule - in all creative domains, etc) Also, IMHO - not that many writers (say 10%) have a voice that is actually worth pointing out. We notice the standouts (writer-hyphenates like Woody Allen, Tarantino, Kubrick, or say directors like Coppola, Scorsese, Fincher, etc). The most striking voice in cinema from a writer today IMHO is Charlie Kaufman. Voice in screenwriting gets ‘lost’ (or: de-focussed? diluted?) a bit (or a lot) when the writer isn’t the director IMHO. William Goldman has a clear voice - but it’s really commercial. I love David Williamson’s voice in Australian cinema. Ironically the most Australian voice I find is ‘Wake In Fright’ (by a Canadian guy, right?) But again voice in prose (novels) and voice in cinema are very different. Due to the collaborative (and incredibly commercially-orientated - by necessity) nature of cinema, ie the expense of it. I find "voice" least of all in Games - as the Story is secondary to the gameplay. Feels like any old hack could have written most games. It’s interesting. Anyway thanks for making me think about all this Rose and hope the research goes utterly brilliantly. :)” (Ref 2).

“In my screenwriting, I need to acknowledge my voice, then edit it out.

In my novel writing, my voice is of no interest to me or my readers - character and plot is.

In my science journalism - voice helps personalise data to create a readable story.

In my blogging and writers advice column, I play with the readers understanding of the writer’s voice (particularly in the advice column)” (Ref 3).
“An interesting survey in research terms, but I don't feel it taught me anything I wasn't aware of personally” (ref 4).

“It became clearer how closely voice is related to the writer's own personality and experiences” (Ref 11).

“very interesting exercise - gently thought-provoking questions too - made me take a fresh look at my writing craft and think "hey, not bad - I DO write some good shit!" - 'cos so often the writer's voice can be drowned out by the Director's ego, sorry I mean voice! ..p.s. kudos to Rose Ferrell for devising such an interesting questionnaire just for Writers!!!!"(Ref 12).

“I just write because I like doing it” (Ref 13).

“My first love was painting. With painting you accept that what's important is process: You make marks, erase them, work over them. The point is to paint - if your process is strong the painting will be strong: One has to give up the notion of product. With painting it takes time, every damn day, to get to the point where you get out of your own way, stop having 'an ideal finished painting in your head' and just make marks. All that applies to screenwriting. I accept that a few hours a day will be 'just getting into it' - that means uninspired hard-slog writing, but then I get into flow and it becomes easy. I write every day, at least 8 hrs a day. It's tough but to again (mis)quote Ms Parker, I hate doing it, but I love it when it's done” (Ref 14).

“I think a writers work and voice are a necessary link. Otherwise the work would be boring. You have to be passionate about what you do and feel that you must do the work regardless of the outcome” (Ref 17).

“Very interesting. I hadn’t thought of structure (like playing with time) and motifs as representative of voice. I guess overall, my voice would come through as telling and
structuring a 'compassionate' story relating to genre (tragedy) versus say, a cynical voice that might come through in a different genre, say comedy. Your survey made me realise how genre affects my voice.” (Ref 19).

“This has been useful to me as I have become more aware that my voice is something unique to me in my writing. This may sound naive but I don't mean it to sound like that. I think one's voice is recognisable in writing and I believe that is why I dislike some writers' work and find so much richness in the ones whose writing appeals.

As for script writing and film-making, you have pointed out to me that the reason I enjoy some films more than others is because of the way it has been made and also because of the voice coming through from the scriptwriter if she/he/ is intelligent and skilled in their craft” (Ref 23).

“This survey has made me interested in trying new things in the world of screenwriting.” (Ref 24)

Summary of Comments:

Of the 11 comments, four respondents commented that completing the questionnaire increased their interest and awareness of voice within their writing (Ref 2, Ref 11, Ref 12, Ref 23 and Ref 24). One respondent was encouraged to try new strategies in their writing (Ref 24), while another reported that “It became clearer how closely voice is related to the writer's own personality and experiences” (Ref 11). Another respondent found that “I hadn't thought of structure (like playing with time) and motifs as representative of voice” (Ref 19).

Researcher-writer respondent (Ref 2) noted that “writers take about 10 features (say?) to develop a clear voice that is "their own". Prior to that - it's sort of like they're copying (mixing) various other styles. But this is how most creativity works. (See Csikszentmihalyi, and 'the ten year' rule - in all creative domains, etc)” (Ref 2). This comment supports the concept developed in other parts of this thesis with regards to the connections between imitation, innovation and invention as a continuum which reflects the ongoing development of a personal screenwriter's voice.
A comment by respondent 12 pointed out one of the primary characteristics of writing as a profession, that is, the loneliness of such work. His comment that the questionnaire “made me take a fresh look at my writing craft and think "hey, not bad - I DO write some good shit!” (Ref 12) touches on a common circumstance amongst writers, that is, the isolations within which much of the work is done. The separation between conception and execution spoken of by Steven Maras ((Maras, 2009 #299) means that writers can lack positive reinforcement of what they do on a daily basis. Coming together with others can often become focused on issues of what to change, which can easily seem to outweigh praise for what the writer has achieved.

With regards to describing voice, one respondent noted “I guess overall, my voice would come through as telling and structuring a 'compassionate' story relating to genre (tragedy) versus say, a cynical voice that might come through in a different genre, say comedy” (Ref 19). Noticing voice is one of the most difficult things to achieve, particularly in screenwriting (see discussion of ‘listening’ in Part I v, and Bakhtin’s dialogism in relation to screenwriting, also in Part I v), but when trying to identify voice, one of the tricks is to do what this respondent has done: to imagine the same piece written by someone else or just differently. The subtleties of one voice stand out more clearly when it is compared to another.

It is interesting that though (or perhaps because) voice can be so subtle and multifaceted, describing it is often left to the single ‘stand-out’ characteristics, which can sound bland. And yet to others who recognise the same voice, the description often sounds accurate and meaningful. An example of this is the term ‘commercial’ in Respondent 2’s description here: “William Goldman has a clear voice - but it’s really commercial” ... and “ironically the most Australian voice I find is ‘Wake In Fright’ (by a Canadian guy, right?)” (Ref 2). Amongst screenwriters, this same respondent noted Charlie Kaufman’s voice as “the most striking voice in cinema”, but generally was of the opinion that “not that many writers (say 10%) have a voice that is actually worth pointing out. We notice the standouts..”(Ref 2). Respondent 23 noted “I enjoy some films more than others ... because of the voice coming through from the scriptwriter if she/he/ is intelligent and skilled in their craft” (Ref 23), while Respondent (Ref 2)
commented that “voice in screenwriting gets ‘lost’ (or: de-focussed? diluted?) a bit (or a lot) when the writer isn’t the director IMHO” (Ref 2). This was put more bluntly by another respondent, who stated “so often the writer’s voice can be drowned out by the Director’s ego, sorry I mean voice!” (Ref 12).

Several comments related to the power of voice to elicit a response within them. One respondent commented “I dislike some writers' work and find so much richness in the ones whose writing appeals” (Ref 23). Another considered that a writer’s work needed to be connected to their voice, “otherwise the work would be boring” (Ref 17). This respondent noted the need “to be passionate about what you do and feel that you must do the work regardless of the outcome” (Ref 17).

Not all respondents considered voice a good thing in their screenwriting. One respondent who writes across several formats stated: “In my screenwriting, I need to acknowledge my voice, then edit it out” (Ref 3). This may be because this respondent reports that the main format that he writes for is television serials. This respondent considered that within his novel writing too, his voice was “of no interest to me or my readers - character and plot is” (Ref 3). This poses an interesting question of genre within novels, since for certain novelists, such as William Faulkner, the voice which others identify with Faulkner’s works becomes a reason for readers to return again and again to that writer (See my discussion of Faulkner’s voice in Stephen Ross’ book *Fiction's Inexhaustible Voice: Speech and Writing in Faulkner* (Ross, 1989 #373), where Ross identifies Faulkner’s voice very strongly with the power of his novels (in Part I v)). It is possible however, that certain types of novels are not read for the voice of the writer, but for the story or other reason. This respondent did find voice helpful in his science journalism however, where he considers that “voice helps personalise data to create a readable story” (Ref 3).

He also writes a blog and writers advice column, where he “plays with the readers understanding of the writer’s voice (particularly in the advice column)” (Ref 3), though he doesn’t mention whether he considers his voice important to his readers in these formats.
Respondent (Ref 2) noted generally that voice in prose and voice in cinema are very different “due to the collaborative (and incredibly commercially-orientated - by necessity) nature of cinema, ie the expense of it” (Ref 2), and that he found voice “least of all in Games - as the Story is secondary to the gameplay.. Feels like any old hack could have written most games.” (Ref 2).

A further interesting comment was regarding the process of writing. Respondent (Ref 14) noted that “my first love was painting. With painting you accept that what's important is process: You make marks, erase them, work over them. The point is to paint - if your process is strong the painting will be strong: One has to give up the notion of product. With painting it takes time, every damn day, to get to the point where you get out of your own way, stop having 'an ideal finished painting in your head' and just make marks. All that applies to screenwriting. I accept that a few hours a day will be 'just getting into it' - that means uninspired hard-slog writing, but then I get into flow and it becomes easy. I write every day, at least 8 hrs a day. It's tough but to again (mis)quote Ms Parker, I hate doing it, but I love it when it’s done” (Ref 14). While it is not reflected generally in comments throughout this questionnaire, the process of writing, and how a writer approaches their work, is a further area which could also have some bearing on how voice comes about or how quickly a writer ‘gets into’ their voice. But this question will have to wait for another questionnaire.

In general, the responses given in this questionnaire have reaffirmed many of the perspectives on voice which are embedded in this larger research work, though it is true, that the questionnaire can be thought of as being compiled from the opinions of comparatively ‘like-minded’ respondents, for who would complete a questionnaire on voice if they did not believe in it as a phenomenon or experience it in their work?
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