

scenes from movie "Death of Doctor Island"

The Urth list — 14 messages, 8 voices, 27 Apr 2011

<https://urth.darkrealm.vip/thread/urth/5998>

Exported from an unofficial mirror of a public mailing list. Copyright in each message remains with the person who wrote it. Email addresses are obscured as `user at host`, the form the original archive published. This file was rebuilt from parsed fields rather than retained headers, so it is faithful in content but not byte-exact.

Roy C. Lackey — 27 Apr 2011, 17:36

I can't see it myself on my dial-up, but Mantis thought this would be of interest to the List.

-Roy

There is a video on YouTube called "Dramatic Bits and Pieces" (4.5 minutes)

that is a compilation of scenes featuring this actor. From 1:08 to the end at 4:28 it is from the movie "Death of Doctor Island." It is the bulk of the video, and it is neat to catch a glimpse.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ACBtn5RXIf0>

James Wynn — 28 Apr 2011, 16:18 · in reply to Roy C. Lackey

Did this movie ever make it out into the world?

On 4/27/2011 12:36 PM, Roy C. Lackey wrote:

I can't see it myself on my dial-up, but Mantis thought this would be of interest to the List.

-Roy

There is a video on YouTube called "Dramatic Bits and Pieces" (4.5 minutes)

that is a compilation of scenes featuring this actor. From 1:08 to the end at 4:28 it is from the movie "Death of Doctor Island." It is the bulk of the video, and it is neat to catch a glimpse.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ACBtn5RXIf0>

Stuart Hamm — 28 Apr 2011, 16:22 · in reply to James Wynn

Never Did...when it was first done filming they were asking for financial help and I kicked in a wee wee bit.... for which I was to get a few still frames...but I don;t think they ever got it done...

???????? ? ?

?(415) 786-3624

STUHAMM.COM

FACEBOOK/STUART.HAMM

? ??

--- On Thu, 4/28/11, James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:

From: James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com>

Subject: Re: (urth) Fw: scenes from movie "Death of Doctor Island" To: "The Urth Mailing List"

<urth at lists.urth.net> Date: Thursday, April 28, 2011, 9:18 AM

Did this movie ever make it out into the world?

On 4/27/2011 12:36 PM, Roy C. Lackey wrote:

I can't see it myself on my dial-up, but Mantis thought this would be of interest to the List.

-Roy

There is a video on YouTube called "Dramatic Bits and Pieces" (4.5 minutes)

that is a compilation of scenes featuring this actor. From 1:08 to the end at 4:28 it is from the movie "Death of Doctor Island." It is the bulk of the video, and it is neat to catch a glimpse.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ACBtn5RXIf0>

Urth Mailing List

To post, write urth at urth.net

Subscription/information: <http://www.urth.net>

James Wynn — 28 Apr 2011, 22:33 · in reply to Stuart Hamm

Interesting. You'd think they could at least package it for the Scyfy channel or IFC. Maybe the owners are holding on to it until one of the actors wins an Oscar. Or maybe a bank owns it and is waiting for payment.

On 4/28/2011 11:22 AM, Stuart Hamm wrote:

Never Did...when it was first done filming they were asking for financial help and I kicked in a wee wee bit.... for which I was to get a few still frames...but I don;t think they ever got it done...

From: James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com>

Did this movie ever make it out into the world?

On 4/27/2011 12:36 PM, Roy C. Lackey wrote:

> I can't see it myself on my dial-up, but Mantis thought this would be of
> interest to the List.

>

> -Roy

> -----

>

>> There is a video on YouTube called "Dramatic Bits and Pieces" (4.5 minutes)

> that is a compilation of scenes featuring this actor. From 1:08 to the end

> at 4:28 it is from the movie "Death of Doctor Island." It is the bulk of the

> video, and it is neat to catch a glimpse.

> <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ACBtn5RXIf0>

> _____

Jeff Wilson — 28 Apr 2011, 23:02 · in reply to James Wynn

Interesting. You'd think they could at least package it for the Scyfy channel or IFC. Maybe the owners are holding on to it until one of the

actors wins an Oscar. Or maybe a bank owns it and is waiting for payment.

Based on the last updates at the website, I believe that the postproduction was never completed partly because of the extreme expense of the CGI and other manipulations.

Matthew Keeley — 29 Apr 2011, 00:24 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

On Thu, Apr 28, 2011 at 7:02 PM, Jeff Wilson <jwilson at io.com> wrote

Based on the last updates at the website, I believe that the postproduction was never completed partly because of the extreme expense of the CGI and other manipulations.

The copious nudity would also help keep it from any TV channels. And the resolution isn't quite crowd-pleasing.

-Matt

Gerry Quinn — 29 Apr 2011, 01:37 · in reply to Matthew Keeley

----- Original Message -----

From: Matthew Keeley

To: The Urth Mailing List

Sent: Friday, April 29, 2011 1:24 AM

Subject: Re: (urth) Fw: scenes from movie "Death of Doctor Island"

On Thu, Apr 28, 2011 at 7:02 PM, Jeff Wilson <jwilson at io.com> wrote

Based on the last updates at the website, I believe that the postproduction was never completed partly because of the extreme expense of the CGI and other manipulations.

The copious nudity would also help keep it from any TV channels. And the resolution isn't quite crowd-pleasing.

I think I just saw stills or silent clips before, when it was discussed last year. In the bit from this clip, they seem to be putting some story background in Ignacio's mouth - probably a reasonable strategy.

I don't know what the deal with the CGI is. It seems to me that this story could be done just fine without too much in the way of expensive effects. The bit where spacetime comes to a point could be changed to something less drastic without hurting the story. Dr. Island's voice is just audio effects. Then you just need a crab-like robot (shoot a simple version coming out of the sea, then a static version moving it's arms - or use CGI for this). The nuclear welder is just a standard welder or torch of some kind, overexposed. All the rest is just folks talking!

- Gerry Quinn

Ryan Dunn — 29 Apr 2011, 02:04 · in reply to Gerry Quinn

I think Gerry just signed himself up as VFX Supervisor for the film!!

Love it.

:)

...ryan

On Apr 28, 2011, at 6:37 PM, Gerry Quinn wrote:

----- Original Message -----

From: Matthew Keeley

To: The Urth Mailing List

Sent: Friday, April 29, 2011 1:24 AM

Subject: Re: (urth) Fw: scenes from movie "Death of Doctor Island"

On Thu, Apr 28, 2011 at 7:02 PM, Jeff Wilson <jwilson at io.com> wrote

Based on the last updates at the website, I believe that the postproduction was never completed partly because of the extreme expense of the CGI and other manipulations.

The copious nudity would also help keep it from any TV channels. And the resolution isn't quite crowd-pleasing.

I think I just saw stills or silent clips before, when it was discussed last year. In the bit from this clip, they seem to be putting some story background in Ignacio's mouth - probably a reasonable strategy.

I don't know what the deal with the CGI is. It seems to me that this story could be done just fine without too much in the way of expensive effects. The bit where spacetime comes to a point could be changed to something less drastic without hurting the story. Dr. Island's voice is just audio effects. Then you just need a crab-like robot (shoot a simple version coming out of the sea, then a static version moving it's arms - or use CGI for this). The nuclear welder is just a standard welder or torch of some kind, overexposed. All the rest is just folks talking!

- Gerry Quinn

Jeff Wilson — 29 Apr 2011, 02:13 · in reply to Gerry Quinn

I don't know what the deal with the CGI is. It seems to me that this story could be done just fine without too much in the way of expensive effects.

Inferring from the producers' bios, I would say it's likely that the CGI is the whole reason for doing the film, like a star vehicle is for showing off the star. They thing in their favor is that the tech advances and commoditizes so the longer it gets held up the cheaper it will become to finish.

Gerry Quinn — 29 Apr 2011, 07:45 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

From: "Jeff Wilson" <jwilson at io.com>

I don't know what the deal with the CGI is. It seems to me that this story could be done just fine without too much in the way of expensive effects.

Inferring from the producers' bios, I would say it's likely that the CGI is the whole reason for doing the film, like a star vehicle is for showing off the star. They thing in their favor is that the tech advances and commoditizes so the longer it gets held up the cheaper it will become to finish.

But the actors will be too old to finish it!

- Gerry Quinn

Jeff Wilson — 29 Apr 2011, 08:12 · in reply to Gerry Quinn

On 4/29/2011 2:45 AM, Gerry Quinn wrote:

From: "Jeff Wilson" <jwilson at io.com>

I don't know what the deal with the CGI is. It seems to me that this story could be done just fine without too much in the way of expensive effects.

Inferring from the producers' bios, I would say it's likely that the CGI is the whole reason for doing the film, like a star vehicle is for showing off the star. They thing in their favor is that the tech advances and commoditizes so the longer it gets held up the cheaper it will become to finish.

But the actors will be too old to finish it!

I believe all the principal photography is done, and I imagine they have HD closeups of their bodies in various positions sufficient to make meshes of them to cover any virtual re-shoots that turn out to be necessary. The young Arnold appeared in T4, after all.

Remember the model scanning in LOOKER? We're there.

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
Computational Intelligence Laboratory - Texas A&M Texarkana
< <http://www.tamut.edu/CIL> >

Son Of Witz — 29 Apr 2011, 19:56 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

For Gerry's take to work, it would have had to been imagined like that from the beginning. With footage shot like "yeah, we'll comp that background in later" or, "react to this non-existent thing on set" there is only so much you can do without a post production budget.

Actually, I've long wondered how many movies will flounder at this stage the more they make movies on greenscreen sets. I've always figured people would start getting in waaaaaaay over their heads in regards to what they will actually be able to afford in post production.

~witz

On Apr 29, 2011, at 1:12 AM, Jeff Wilson wrote:

On 4/29/2011 2:45 AM, Gerry Quinn wrote:

From: "Jeff Wilson" <jwilson at io.com>

I don't know what the deal with the CGI is. It seems to me that this story could be done just fine without too much in the way of expensive effects.

Inferring from the producers' bios, I would say it's likely that the CGI is the whole reason for doing the film, like a star vehicle is for showing off the star. They thing in their favor is that the tech advances and commoditizes so the longer it gets held up the cheaper it will become to finish.

But the actors will be too old to finish it!

I believe all the principal photography is done, and I imagine they have HD closeups of their bodies in various positions sufficient to make meshes of them to cover any virtual re-shoots that turn out to be necessary. The young Arnold appeared in T4, after all.

Remember the model scanning in LOOKER? We're there.

--

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com

Computational Intelligence Laboratory - Texas A&M Texarkana

< <http://www.tamut.edu/CIL> >

Jeff Wilson — 29 Apr 2011, 22:45 · in reply to Son Of Witz

On 4/29/2011 2:56 PM, Son Of Witz wrote:

For Gerry's take to work, it would have had to been imagined like that from the beginning.

With footage shot like "yeah, we'll comp that background in later" or, "react to this non-existent thing on set" there is only so much you can do without a post production budget.

Actually, I've long wondered how many movies will flounder at this stage the more they make movies on greenscreen sets. I've always figured people would start getting in waaaaaaaay over their heads in regards to what they will actually be able to afford in post production.

More will, if only because the production part is getting cheaper, but plenty of films already fail in post, or never make it to post due to processing costs. One of the film channels shows a visit to the processing lab, where they have a ginormous warehouse with shelves crammed full of cans of developed film from movie projects that went bankrupt and were never redeemed.

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com

Computational Intelligence Laboratory - Texas A&M Texarkana

< <http://www.tamut.edu/CIL> >

Son Of Witz — 29 Apr 2011, 23:12 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

On Apr 29, 2011, at 3:45 PM, Jeff Wilson wrote:

On 4/29/2011 2:56 PM, Son Of Witz wrote:

For Gerry's take to work, it would have had to been imagined like that from the beginning.

With footage shot like "yeah, we'll comp that background in later" or, "react to this non-existent thing on set" there is only so much you can do without a post production budget.

Actually, I've long wondered how many movies will flounder at this stage the more they make movies on greenscreen sets. I've always figured people would start getting in waaaaaaaay over their heads in regards to what they will actually be able to afford in post production.

More will, if only because the production part is getting cheaper, but plenty of films already fail in post, or never make it to post due to processing costs. One of the film channels shows a visit to the processing lab, where they have a ginormous warehouse with shelves crammed full of cans of developed film from movie projects that went bankrupt and were never redeemed.

Ha. I figured it HAD to be like that. ouch.