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Since 2003 Sherwood pictures has produced four movies that have returned extraordinary profits. Flywheel (2003) grossed $37,000 after being made for $20,000, Facing The Giants (2006) grossed $10,178,335 after being made for $100,000, Fireproof (2008) grossed $33,473,297 after being made for $500,000, and to date Courageous (2011) has grossed $34,311,609 after being made for $2,000,000. These type of returns at the box office are almost completely unheard of from most of the movies made in Hollywood these days. Having one movie that is as profitable as any one of these might be considered a fluke, but after having four success stories of this magnitude, there must be a method that can be observed to achieve such success. Almost predictably, the approach Sherwood takes to making movies is not the same as the approach as most Hollywood studios take. Though similarities exist, Sherwood takes a unique approach to making movies that focuses more on message than profit margin.
Introduction

When the pastoral staff at Sherwood Baptist Church in Albany, Georgia discovered that church was becoming less of a cultural influence and that movies and entertainment were becoming a greater cultural influence, they decided to take action (Catt, 2007). Four films (three of which saw theatrical releases) later they can be considered one of the most successful independent movie production companies in recent history. In a world where most movies made in Hollywood do not turn a profit, Sherwood Pictures has not only turned a profit, but has done so in an impressive manner. Between their three major films, Sherwood has generated more than $78 million in box office sales alone. Compared to the competition from Hollywood, this is an amazing feat that deserves significant attention. To understand the significance of the success of these movies, one would need to put their earnings into context.

Sherwood’s first major film Facing the Giants (2006) is an inspirational movie about a football coach who decides to put his trust in God for his career and his life. Made on a tight budget of $100,000, Facing the Giants went on to earn a reported $10,178,331 at the box office. In similar fashion, Sherwood’s 2008 endeavor Fireproof, was made with a slightly larger budget of $500,000 and made $33,456,317 at the box office. After the success of these two movies Sherwood was able to increase their budget to $2,000,000 for the latest project Courageous (2011). As Sherwood’s brand and popularity grew, so did their profits. Courageous has been Sherwood’s most successful movie yet, in terms of movie made at the box office. The gross total of revenue from movie theaters was $34,522,221 (Box Office Mojo, 2011).

In terms of dollars made from ticket sales Sherwood’s movies do not compete with those of Hollywood. However, in terms profits made after costs are figured in, Hollywood pales in comparison.
A basic calculation of return of investment (gross revenue minus costs all divided by the cost) tells the true story of Sherwood Pictures’ triumph. The top ten grossing movies of 2006 had an average return of investment of 83.05%, meaning that for every one dollar spent 83 cents was made in profit. In 2008 and 2011 the return of investment on the top ten grossing movies was 103.61% and 83.36% respectively. This again means that for each dollar spent making a movie in 2008, $1.03 was earned in profit and in 2011, $0.83 was the average profit. In each of those years Christian movie production company, Sherwood Pictures, released their first three movies that opened in movie theaters. *Facing the Giants* (2006), *Fireproof* (2008) and, *Courageous* (2011) all saw significantly more success. The smallest return on investment percentage seen by Sherwood Pictures was on *Courageous* which resulted was 1626.11%, which translates into $16.26 profit for every dollar spent in production. For every dollar spent in production of *Fireproof* in 2008, $65.91 was made in profit (6591.26% return on investment). This leaves *Facing the Giants* as the greatest success to date for Sherwood Pictures which returned $100.78 in profit for every dollar spent in production (10078.33% return on investment) (Box Office Mojo, 2011).

The skeptic might say that the return on investment statistics are skewed by the lower budgets of the movies. However, the fact still remains that Sherwood is doing what Hollywood cannot seem to do. They are making movies with a very small budget (relatively) that are making millions of dollars. What makes this feat all the more impressive is that Sherwood Pictures is relatively new to the movie making business. Sherwood first venture in the movie making realm was in 2002 on their first project *Flywheel*. So how can Sherwood compete with not only established independent production companies but the big six Hollywood studios? What does Sherwood Pictures do differently from Hollywood that makes them so much more successful? To understand how Sherwood’s success it is essential to understand first how a typical Hollywood movie is made. Once a basis of the movie making process is established, the intricacies of Sherwood’s movie making process will be able to be understood. With
this fundamental understanding of movie making discussed, a discussion of competitive strategy in any industry will be essential to understand how Sherwood is seeing success.

**Hollywood Process**

The first thing to understand about Hollywood is that it exists and operates to make a profit. This might seem like a blatantly obvious statement that is understood without say, but it needs to be said and understood as the primary reason for Hollywood’s existence. As noble as any of the Big Six Hollywood movie studios’ (Paramount Pictures, Warner Bros. Pictures, Columbia Pictures, Walt Disney Pictures/Touchstone Pictures, Universal Pictures, and 20th Century Fox) mission statements may be, they all exist as private, for profit entities. This simple observation serves as the basis for all operations of the companies. Being a private business seeking profit does not imply any sort of moral disposition, it just indicates the purpose for producing films. When operating as a for profit business the only stakeholders that the studios have to answer to are those that have the same interest in mind, money. Those stakeholders have different roles and perform different tasks, but the commercial success is the main motivator in their actions. Some of the different stakeholders that are involved in particular movies are financiers, merchandisers, licensors, actors, directors, producers, and agents to name a few. With all of these different parties looking to get their share of the profits it would seem that the only influencer in decision making is how to make more money however, there is a standard of professionalism that must be upheld in order to make the most money in the long run.

According to Edward Epstein in his book *The Big Picture* Hollywood is a community and in that community, “If studios executives made only films that maximized the amount of money in their clearinghouses, they would do so at the serious risk of losing their standing in that community and, with it, their connection to the people, events, honors, and opportunities that brought them to Hollywood in the first place (Epstein, The Big Picture, 2005).” So there are rules to the money making game of film
production. In order to attract the proper players in their game each studio must keep their standing and reputation in the Hollywood community by creating a product that is not only commercially successful, but also respectable in the eyes of the Hollywood community. The politics of the Hollywood community are real, but in the end they are just the channels by which a studio can position itself to make more money. With Hollywood’s goal spelled out, the next thing to understand is how that money is made. Taking a detailed look at the movie making process will reveal what goes into the movie making process and how that movie eventually turns into profit.

At the beginning of the creation of every movie ever made, there was someone that came up with the idea for that movie. The idea for a movie can come from any imaginable source and from any person inside or outside of the industry. The vast majority of movies that are created come from people that have some sort of standing within the entertainment industry such as a writer, producer, director, etc. While typically highly improbable, the possibility of an industry outsider getting his idea made into a movie is real enough to give a persistent man hope. This scenario was actually the case for the 1993 inspirational sports move, *Rudy*.

After having just finished a similar inspiring sports movie based in Indiana, the writer and director combination of Angelo Pizzo and David Anspaugh were presented with a pitch for a movie based on the events of the life Daniel “Rudy” Ruetigger. When Ruetigger was finally able to speak with Pizzo, Pizzo was quoted saying “Well, it's a good story, but you know, Rudy, I really don't want to do another Indiana sports story and, frankly, I hate Notre Dame” (Dufresne, 1993). After a long process of convincing several different parties to hear him out, Ruetugger was finally able to convince the correct people to turn the events of his life into a story, despite the reluctance of Angelo Pizzo. This sort of uncommissioned work is atypical inside Hollywood, but the story of how *Rudy* went from one man’s life
to a movie that has been viewed by millions of people around the world is proof that it is possible to get an idea turned into a movie from outside of Hollywood (Pizzo & Anspaugh, 2011).

The most common of scenarios is one in which an individual with standing in Hollywood makes a verbal pitch to a studio executive. For the amount of pitches that are given every day, a very small amount of them are ever actually given approval to be made into a movie. There are multiple reasons that a movie does not get made into a movie. Among the most significant reasons that movies do not get made are the lack of resources to make every movie and the marketability of the movie. Studio executives are looking for movies that “are likely to attract, or repel, equity partners, co-financers, merchandisers, video chain stores foreign pay TV outlets, toy licenses, and other major contributors to their clearinghouses” (Epstein, The Big Picture, 2005). These different stakeholders are the ones that will pay for the movie to be made and pay for the rights to the movie, which are a large part of the profit that a studio takes in on a movie.

After an idea for a movie is accepted by the studio, the work is then turned over to independent producers. These producers are usually only nominally independent, as the studios provide the production companies with office space and monetary resources to cover the costs of putting together the proper team to help the idea become a script. For a typical movie from one of the Big Six studios all of the expenses that are incurred during the development stage of the movie are paid for by the studio via the production company and producer. The first step of development for an idea is turning it into a script. This is the first and arguably the most important step in the process because without a script there is nothing but an idea floating around. Because the writing of the script is so important, the process of finalizing a script can be quite extensive. The writers of a script are usually people with other jobs that are writing as freelance work. When these writers are commissioned and sign a contract to write a script they will mostly likely be paid in stages. They will receive some money up front when they
sign the contract, some more for each draft of the script, and then a final sum for the finished product. Scripts are typically revised and rewritten several times in order to improve its chances of being “green lighted”. Green lighting is the common name of the process that a movie goes through to be approved for production. It is not uncommon for a writer to be released from the project and a new writer to be assigned to the project in this stage. Additionally, it is not uncommon for a project to be abandoned during this phase. Abandoned projects can be sold to other studios or completely discarded (Epstein, The Big Picture, 2005).

As the script continues to develop more individuals begin to take interest in it and gain the power to have influence over it. For instance, one of the first parties a producer recruits to the project as the script is being written is the director. The higher the quality of the script the higher the quality of a director the producer will be able to recruit. Once the director signs on with the film he is granted a degree of creative control of the script. Directors almost always have this power acknowledged in their contract for the movie, this allow the director to leverage his strengths in the movie making process. At this point the script has become relatively fixed and will not typically be sent back for a complete or major rewrite. After the director has signed on to the movie, the producer will typically begin negotiation with some big name stars. As with the director, getting a star to agree to the project often requires allowing them a degree of creative control over the script. Not every actor is awarded this privilege however some stars are deemed essential to the concept of the movie, such as Arnold Schwarzenegger for Terminator 3: Rise of the Machines (2003). Getting a star to sign on to the film is a significant step in the movie making process because it significantly increases the chances that the project will be green lighted for production.

The decision for the studio to green light a movie for production is largest decision that is typically made during the entire movie making process because of all that the studio can stand to lose if
the movie is abandoned before completion. Because of this financial risk the producer must prepare the best project if he hopes to get the project green lighted. In fact, the decision is so crucial that a Paramount executive estimated that in 2003, nine out of ten projects were not green lighted (Epstein, The Big Picture, 2005). The studio will not make a decision until it can get commitments from enough players to reduce the risk. However, if a studio waits too long to green light the picture actors and directors might leave the project to pursue another. The decision making process usually involves extensive meetings with studio executives about cost analysis and performance projections. The cost of shooting the movie is usually a pretty easy calculation, however the much more difficult projection is the cost of marketing the movie (Epstein, The Big Picture, 2005). All of the costs that are calculated before the project is approved are referred to as “above the line” costs. These costs include compensation for actors, directors, producers, and writers. The “below the line costs” are those that are associated with post green light matters, such as production, postproduction, insurance, and any other related expense.

It is during this time the studios will typically contract with other merchandisers to advertise the movie on their product. It is quite popular to see these types of partnerships with fast food restaurants. The restaurants will feature advertisements on their cups and in their kids meals for the upcoming movie. Securing these contracts are a large part of the getting a project green lighted because of how beneficial they are for the studios’. In essence, the studio gets paid to advertise their movies’ with these restaurants, toy makers, soft drink companies, game makers, and other merchandisers. The selling of the licensing rights to these outside companies often account for a large portion of the final profit for the movie studios’.

This type of funding for movies is typically great for action movies that have features that are marketable (heroes, cars, big name stars, etc.) but not every move can have a great action figure so studios need to find other ways to fund their projects. A large part of most Hollywood funding comes
from outside investors that are looking to be associated with the Hollywood lifestyle. These investors are often entitled to a percentage of the profits, that is assuming the movie turns a profit. Other outside investors invest in movies to take advantage of foreign tax loopholes.

Independent movie studios often receive a significant share of their funding from equity partners. Equity partners are private investors that invest in the movie in exchange for some power to influence casting, marketing, and production decisions. Because independent movie studios do not have a distribution arm, meaning that there is no guarantee that they will be seen in movie theaters, they rely heavily on foreign pre-sales of the movie. The trick to securing these foreign pre-sales is that foreign distributors are rarely agree to distribute a movie that does not have a big name star to attract an audience or an American distributor. So without money to pay stars to secure the foreign money to make the movie, independent studios often have to rely on the willingness of actors to take a pay cut in their movie. Because pre-sales do not provide any cash for the production independents the studios often have to borrow money from banks to fund the actual production of the money (Epstein, The Hollywood Economist, 2010).

After the movie has secured enough funding or projected funding it the studio will give it the green light to start production. Once the green light has been given, the production company then begins to assemble the team that performs all of the roles that have already not been filled. These roles are those of supporting actors, artists, technicians, caterers, costume designers, makeup artists, drivers, personal assistants, set designers, construction worker, and many more. Perhaps the most difficult part of this part of the movie making process is contract the different crews, workers, and designers to work months before they are actually needed. Also during this time the production company is developing its shooting schedule and the locations for the filming. For scenes that are to be shot in a studio, sets need to be designed and created. Scenes shot on location require the studio to negotiate with the property
owners of the locations that they want to shoot. Determining the locations and filming schedule involves coordinating actors’ schedules as well as the cost to film at certain locations. This stage of pre-production usually takes an average of four months (Epstein, The Big Picture, 2005).

After all of these support workers are hired and the shooting schedule is determined, the casting process begins to take place. Usually the main star or two of the movie has already been determined and signed to a contract, so the casting process is designed to find all of the supporting roles. A casting director is hired to find the best people for the roles that need to be filled. The most important things that are considered are during casting are on screen chemistry and visual appeal. Simply, the actor must look like the character that he is portraying and must be able to relate well with the other actors.

Once all of the pieces are in place the actual filming, also known as principal photography begins. The filming of a movie requires everyone that was hired during pre-production to work in a quick and efficient manner because the daily costs of filming are so high. Running over schedule often results in running over budget as well. In the event that a movie begins to run over budget, a producer is usually assigned to make sure things stay on schedule and under budget. The director has to work in partnership with the director of photography and sound engineer, all of which have the power to call for another take of the recording if something does not fit their idealized version of the scene. The scenes in a movie are never shot in sequential order, but are shot in the order of convenience based on set, location, and actors’ availability.

After the filming is completed the production company will subcontract an outside company to add in any computer generated graphics that are needed and re-record any dialogue that could not be properly recorded during production. Another step that is completed at this time is the composition of the musical score for the movie. This essential part of the movie is performed by a composer that views
the rough cut of the movie and composes music to fit the emotion being portrayed in the scenes. The remaining step to completing the movie may be the most important of all the steps in production, editing. The editor of the movie arranges all of the scenes and pieces scenes into the long continuous movie that audiences in theaters see. This process is closely monitored by the director to ensure that the editor maintains the vision that the director had in his mind. In the case of a conflict between the vision of the editor and the director, it is not uncommon to see a “director’s cut” of the movie come out on DVD in addition to the original version. After the editor and director have finished editing the movie it is submitted to the studio for approval. Once approved the studio decides when and how to distribute the movie to the public (Epstein, The Big Picture, 2005).

After the movie is completed the studio then begins marketing the film. In a time where nearly every household owns at least one TV, getting people to go out and pay to see a movie can be quite difficult. It is estimated that under 6% of the population of the United States goes to a theater to see a movie in an average week (Epstein, The Hollywood Economist, 2010). Because people do not go to movie theaters regularly to see whatever is playing, like they did when movie theaters were newer (the 1940’s) studios now have to create a new audience for every movie that they make. To create a new audience for each movie the studio must determine what the potential audience for that movie will be based on what the content of the movie is. Once potential audience is determined the marketing campaign begins. The marketing campaign will begin as soon as the project gets the green light even though the movie is yet to be filmed. The marketing of the movie will use channels such as paid television advertisements, news stories, magazine covers, and the merchandisers that the studio sells the rights to (e.g. fast food restaurants). The most significant of these channels is television advertisements because of the mass amounts of people that they reach. In 2009 Time Warner Company spent $1.8 billion in advertising, $727 million of that total was spent through their studio Warner Bros. on movie advertisement (Christ, 2010). During the marketing campaign the studio enlist the help of the
National Research Group to find out the awareness level of their upcoming movies (Epstein, The Big Picture, 2005). Movies made by one of the major six Hollywood studios go directly to the movie theater chains with which the studio has signed contracts. Independent movies however, do not have the automatic distribution agreement thus their marketing campaign is longer and arguably far more important. As mentioned earlier independent movies often rely on well known stars for publicity and entrance into movie festivals. It is at these movie festivals that independent studios hope to convince a distributor that their movie is worth the money it will take to distribute the movie. Once an independent movie is picked up by a distributor it begins a marketing campaign similar to those of major studio movies. Two weeks before the movie opens the studios ramp up their marketing campaigns to spike the awareness of the movie right before it opens. A effective marketing campaign can provide a good opening weekend, but an opening weekend is all that a marketing campaign can provide.

No matter how much money is put into a marketing campaign, box office success is never guaranteed it can only be speculated. Hollywood may be able to form a more educated guess for some movies such as much anticipated sequels, but for the most part, the success of the movie depends on the audience’s preference. For all of the resources that Hollywood puts into marketing, their results at the box office are moderate at best when compared to Sherwood Pictures. There exist some pretty significant differences between the Sherwood Pictures process and the typical Hollywood process, but Sherwood did not reinvent the wheel. Many of their physical methods reflect those of Hollywood and yet Sherwood Pictures has an impeccable track record of successful movies. That leaves the question of, “how do they do it?” The first step to understanding what makes Sherwood different from Hollywood is most likely the biggest.
Sherwood Process
The motivation to make movies for Sherwood could not be further from Hollywood’s motivation. As mentioned previously mentioned, Hollywood is in the business of making money by making movies. Sherwood Pictures is first a ministry of a church then a production company, and they view themselves as precisely that. After reading the results of a survey in 2002 that stated that television, movies, and internet were the top factor of influence in our culture, Sherwood Baptist Church decided to use these channels of influence to spread the message of God (Bellamy, 2009). Sherwood Pictures started as a ministry of Sherwood Baptist Church in Albany, Georgia and still remains one even after the success of their films. Alex Kendrick, an associate pastor as Sherwood Baptist Church and writer, director, actor, and producer of all of Sherwood’s movies has said that, “For us, the ministry comes before any type of business” (Kendrick, 2011). Because they are a ministry their entire crew work as volunteers including the Kendrick brothers whose salary comes from their pastoral positions at the church. Head pastor at Sherwood Baptist Church, Michael Catt, describes the purpose of Sherwood as, “Our goal from day one has been to make family-friendly movies that build on the Judeo-Christian ethic and communicate the gospel with compromise” (Catt, 2007). Sherwood’s mission is pretty clear, they do not care about the money, they care about changed lives.

Each of Sherwood’s movies has had a specific theme and a message that they have wanted to make clear. Flywheel was about trusting God and having integrity in the workplace, Facing the Giants was about doing the best a person can do and praising God regardless of wins or losses, Fireproof was about putting, “the focus back on marriage as God intended, just taking biblical principles and applying them to marriage today” (Bellamy, 2009), and the point of Courageous according to Stephen Kendrick, brother of Alex Kendrick and co-writer, producer, and director, was “Our hope is, that this movie will result in kids of the next generation growing up knowing the love of their earthly father and in so doing discovering about the love of their Heavenly Father” (Kendrick S., 2012). Just as Hollywood’s process
reflects their desire to make money, so does Sherwood’s process reflect their desire to share the love of God through film making.

Because the mission of Sherwood is different than that of Hollywood, so is the first step of their movie making process, “the idea”. As mentioned previously ideas for movies can come from just about anywhere for Hollywood movies, for Sherwood Pictures they come from one man, Alex Kendrick. Sherwood’s first movie *Flywheel* was solely the idea of Kendrick. When Alex Kendrick first began discussing movie making with his fellow pastors Sherwood Baptist Church, they were open to the idea of making a movie, so they asked for a script. The pitch that Kendrick made was not for an idea for a movie, but for making a movie in general. For each of the subsequent movies, the ideas only came from Alex Kendrick and his brother Stephen. The brothers also took a completely different approach for their sources of ideas. Instead of looking at external sources, books, movie remakes, news stories, etc. the Kendricks looked at internal sources. For each of the movies the Kendricks thought of an idea and then prayed about it. They spend numerous hours in prayer seeking God’s favor and asking if the movie is a part of who God is calling them to be (Kendrick S., 2012). Once an idea gains some traction with the brothers, they seek the counsel of other pastors at the church to ask their advice on whether they think the movie will work or not. When an idea starts to solidify, they make sure that there is unity among all of the team that the story is right, what they are saying is right, and it fits the ministry that they are a part of (Catt, 2007) (Kendrick A., 2011).

Taking this approach to movie making, Sherwood does not have an over abundance of ideas to sift through in an effort to find one that might work. The Kendrick brothers are practically the only people that have the creative influence over the story that so many others have in Hollywood. Because of the focused mission of Sherwood Pictures as a ministry and not a business, the ideas for movies actually fairly limited. Alex Kendrick himself said “... You don’t see space movies and spy movies. From
us, you see movies that are really aimed at the common man with common issues” (Kendrick A., 2011). With this in mind, the Kendrick brothers take a realistic approach to their brainstorming process.

The script writing process for Sherwood takes a far more concise approach than that of Hollywood. The scripts for the movies are exclusively written by Stephen and Alex and serve as almost the only factor in the decision of green lighting the movie. By allowing only the Kendricks’ this authority of the idea and script, they avoid much of the conflict and time wasted on having numerous parties with the ability to demand a rewrite of the script. Even though the Kendricks were entrusted with the responsibility of writing the script, they chose to remain under the authority of the church as did everyone else involved. This gave the church final say, but the church trusted its members to serve in a manner that would parallel their own. Just as this sole propriety of the script saves time, it also prevents the purpose and message the movie from drifting from its original intent. The pay structure of script writing is far different at Sherwood than it is in Hollywood. Where Hollywood writers get paid a sum of money up front and then an additional sum for each rewrite and a final bonus for completion, the Kendricks’ receive no money for writing the script. They are paid as ministers of the church and do not receive any sort of bonus for their script writing. Because the ideas and the subsequent scripts for those ideas only come one at time the green lighting process is much simpler for Sherwood.

When Hollywood is asking, “Which movie should we make?” Sherwood is asking, “Should we make this movie?” Giving the green light in Hollywood comes with a very significant financial commitment from the studio, thus there are numerous little details that need to be planned out and in place before approval is given. At Sherwood the green light is almost a foregone conclusion from the beginning of the process. The green lighting decision for Sherwood consists of getting an idea, praying about that idea, seeking advice from the people that will eventually give the green light, writing a script and preparing the budget. When all of these things are in place the Sherwood Pictures then gets the
green light from the church and the movie production begins. Sherwood does not desire to seek out a big name star to attract distributors to their movies. Sherwood was set on making their movies and trusting that God will provide a distributor for the movie. As for the rest of the pieces that Hollywood crews have to arrange before getting a green light (lighting crews, make-up, set designers, director, etc.) Sherwood relies on volunteers to fill these positions.

One of the biggest differences between the Sherwood and Hollywood is the work force. In Hollywood everyone that is involved with the movie gets paid in some way and if he does not it is probably because he was not able to negotiate his contract properly. At Sherwood Pictures Alex and Stephen Kendrick actually get paid as associate pastors of Sherwood Baptist Church, positions in which movie making are just a part of the job description. Almost everyone else that is involved with Sherwood Pictures is a volunteer. Actors, designers, producers, and crews, are all volunteers. Even the sets, locations, and food for the catering are donated or created free of charge. For instance, a local factory plant manager allowed Sherwood to film a scene inside of his factory for Courageous. In Hollywood filming a scene in a factory would require renting out a facility or creating set to look like one, either route being far more expensive than having a factory donated for a couple of days. All of these individuals that generously donate their time, talents, and treasures believe in the mission of Sherwood Pictures. Pastor Catt described the volunteerism like this,

“Everyone who participated – actors, directors, technical crews, caterers, makeup artists, set designers, security teams – did so with a like mindset. Every detail was given over to the Lord, and each individual used his or her talents for God’s glory alone. Everyone who volunteered to help with the film signed an agreement stating they would not be compensated for their work but would view their service as a gift to God. They signed the agreement willingly and worked heartily as unto the Lord.” (Catt, 2007).
Having so many volunteers and individuals willing to donate their possessions is crucial to Sherwood’s operation. It might be conceivable that having so many volunteers doing jobs that trained professionals do in Hollywood would make the quality of Sherwood’s movies decline. However, this is not necessarily the case as many of the volunteers that Sherwood has are individuals that have worked in Hollywood before. Some of the productions that the volunteers of Sherwood Pictures have previously been involved in are *Friday Night Lights*, *The West Wing*, *Apollo 13*, *American Idol*, *Cops*, and *Sports Center*. Having a high quality movie on a low budget is a defining feature of Sherwood Pictures, but is also almost a requirement.

Because Sherwood Pictures operates as ministry of Sherwood Baptist Church their operating budget is supplied by donations. In fact, the first two movies were funded completely by church and supporter donations. More surprising than the fact that the movies were funded by donations, is the fact that the church “never asked for a dime.” “We simply shared the need and the opportunity” (Catt, 2007). After the success of *Facing the Giants* at the box office ($10,178,331) and its DVD sales (2.3 million sold in 57 countries) Sherwood was able to use some of the profits to fund their next project *Fireproof*. Likewise they were able to fund the next project *Courageous* with the proceeds from *Fireproof*. Each time Sherwood made a movie they have had the means to increase their budget and make a better movie the next time. However, even Sherwood’s most expensive budget ($2,000,000 for *Courageous*) would be considered a shoestring budget in Hollywood. Keeping the costs as low as possible for Sherwood is very important. They are able to do this in a number of ways. First, as mentioned before almost the entire Sherwood Pictures team is working as volunteers. Having a volunteer workforce is beneficial in more than one way. Not having to compensate the staff saves quite a bit of money for Sherwood, but there are other benefits from having volunteers too. Because the volunteers all have full time jobs elsewhere, Sherwood does not have to provide insurance for them as Hollywood does nor does Sherwood have to have a team of attorneys to deal with the abundance of
paperwork it requires to contract all of the employees. Shooting the movie at different locations around the world often costs Hollywood studios a large sum of money, Sherwood saves money by shooting all of their movies right where they are in Albany, Georgia. By basing their model on volunteerism and doing things simple, Sherwood can keep their budget low in order to lock in the approval of the green light.

After getting the official green light Sherwood Pictures begins their production of the movies. Because of the money that they have made off of their previous movies, Sherwood has been able to improve the technical aspects of their newer movies every time. The first Sherwood movie, *Flywheel*, was shot with a low quality camera by industry standards. In fact several studios that released Christian films had been given a copy and loved it, but turned it down because it was too low quality. When preparing for the next movie Alex Kendrick was able to borrow a High Definition camera from someone that had seen the first film and wanted to help with the next one (Catt, 2007). After the success of *Fireproof* Sherwood was able to get a High Definition camera known as the Red One. Red One can shoot the movie with the quality of a 35mm camera that Hollywood uses, but does so in a digital format which is cheaper (Kendrick A., The Making of Courageous, 2011). Daily production for Sherwood is quite different as well. Sherwood Pictures began every morning on the set with a Bible Devotion and a group prayer to build unity and to ask for God’s blessing. Doing this made sure everyone was on the same page with what they were doing as a ministry. Often many of the volunteers that were helping with the production would come by the set on their lunch break or after work to do their part in helping production (Kendrick S., 2012).

Casting for Sherwood is very selective and unique compared to that of Hollywood. For Sherwood’s first two movies the entire cast was made up of volunteers, mostly church members. All of the potential actors that made it to the final round of auditions were then questioned about their
spiritual lives to ensure that everyone that was going to in the movie was on the same page and that everyone had pure motives for wanting to be in the movie. The church staff questioned the actors if they had anything in their lives that could potentially prevent God’s blessing from being on the film. Some of the actors stepped down from the part after realizing that they had personal issues that they needed to take care of before they could take part in this ministry (Catt, 2007). After Sherwood has filled the roles that they can with their church congregation they then open the doors to a broader audience and look at the resumes and headshots that have been sent to them. These outside resumes and headshots come from individuals that are interested in acting, agents for actors, and even conferences that representatives from Sherwood Pictures attend. When the doors are opened up for actors outside of the church, those in charge of casting make sure that anyone that will be in the movie agrees with the message that is being conveyed in the movie. For instance, all of the actors in Courageous believed that the role of father in a family was crucial and the men are the leaders of the household responsible for providing, protecting, and loving the rest of the family. Director Alex Kendrick views all of the actors as ambassadors of the film and message, thus everyone needs to be on the same page (Kendrick A., 2011). Sherwood was actually able to secure a “star” for their movie Fireproof. Popular sitcom actor of the 1980’s and fellow Christian, Kirk Cameron was an asset that drew a small amount of attention to the 2008 release. Cameron, while known in Hollywood, would be considered far from a star, but he was a big name for Sherwood Pictures. Bringing in Cameron for some legitimacy in the film world did cost Sherwood some money, but not in the traditional way. Cameron, like the rest of the actors, worked as a volunteer, but accepted a donation to his charity Camp Firefly (Fireproof, 2012). Most of the main characters in Sherwood’s movies are played by the same actors in multiple movies. Among these repeat actors are Alex Kendrick and Ken Bevel.

One interesting aspect of Sherwood’s movie making process is the role or roles of Alex Kendrick. Kendrick takes on the roles of writer, director, producer, and actor. Having a person with this many
different roles in Hollywood is not common or even plausible outside of independent movies. In Hollywood all of these different roles would be played by different people and sometimes by more than one person. However, even being in control of all of these different roles does not make Kendrick the highest authority of Sherwood Pictures. Because Sherwood Pictures operates as a ministry of Sherwood Baptist Church, Kendrick remains under the authority of the other pastors at the church.

The postproduction part of making a movie for Sherwood is less complex than that of Hollywood. Because Sherwood strives to make simple movies, there is no need for computer generated effects that cost Hollywood so much time and money. The original musical score for Sherwood’s movies is composed by the Senior Associate Worship Pastor at Sherwood Baptist Church Mark Willard. For Sherwood’s first movie the soundtrack was composed almost exclusively by electronic keyboard without much orchestration. The soundtrack for Facing the Giants was a little more complex than that of the first movie, but it was still composed all on computer using sequencing software and digital instruments. It was until Sherwood’s third attempt at movie making that they were able to draw closer to the model that Hollywood uses. The score for Fireproof was recorded with a live orchestra of 35 members. Even with the increased complexity of the recording process and the increased cinematic theme Mark Willard was still in charge of composing the score. The music composition and recording for Courageous are very similar to those of Fireproof with the exception of a larger orchestra. Because Sherwood does not have a recording studio or an orchestra readily at hand, they travel to Nashville, Tennessee to record at Ocean Way Recording. For Facing the Giants Sherwood wanted to use a song for the popular Christian band, Third Day. When they contacted Provident Label Group to inquire about the song they sent an unfinished copy of the movie for Provident to view. After viewing the movie Provident agreed to let Sherwood use the song by Third Day (Catt, 2007). This partnership continued after that movie into the next movies, which feature songs for both Third Day and Casting Crowns, both bands associated with Provident. However, the most important part of contacting Provident was not the permission to use
one of their songs, but their willingness to help with the distribution of the movie once Sherwood finished making it.

Being an independent production company sets Sherwood in a different class than Hollywood studios, but they are not alone in this endeavor as many independent films are distributed every year. However, even Sherwood’s approach to finding partners to distribute their movies is different than that of independent movie studios. Most independent production companies rely on a star that took a pay cut to carry their movie and attract distribution partners. Sherwood got its start in distribution by taking a more grass roots approach. Their first movie played in one local movie theater that agreed to play their movie after someone from Sherwood went directly to the theater to talk with the manager. Sherwood was able to actually secure a DVD distribution deal through 20th Century Fox for *Facing the Giants* before they were able to find someone that would agree to release the movie in theaters. It was at this point that Sherwood was able to secure a partnership with Provident, which lead to *Facing the Giants* opening on 441 screens. Because of their proven success Sherwood was able to get a distribution partnership with Samuel Goldwyn for their next film *Fireproof* (*What Christians Watch*, 2009). For each following movie the amount of screens that opened up on increased. *Fireproof* opened in 905 theaters, and *Courageous* opened in 1,161 theaters thanks to Sherwood’s partnership with Provident as well as Sony Pictures unit AFFIRM Films which they secured after the success of *Facing the Giants*. These partnerships do not keep Sherwood from entering their films into independent contest like other independent films, they have won numerous awards in Christian film festivals and even received the distinction of having *Fireproof* being the highest grossing independent movie of 2008.

The marketing for Sherwood’s movies has largely been taken up by Christian television and radio networks (*Catt, 2007*). This falls right in line with the strategy of marketing to a target audience. “We made the decision up front that our first audience is the believer”, said Stephen Kendrick. By
focusing their marketing efforts on Christians Sherwood is benefitting from word of mouth publicity that can be spread in church groups. While focusing on telling Christians about their movies is Sherwood’s first focus, it is not their only focus. Representatives from Sherwood Pictures have been able to promote their movies through outlets such as CNN Headline News, The Los Angeles Times, The Atlanta Journal Constitution, and Good Morning America (Catt, 2007). A large portion of this publicity came from the shock of *Facing the Giants* getting a PG rating from the Motion Picture Association of America. Many secular media outlets were interested by a religious movie getting a PG rating.

**Competitive Strategy**

Knowing what how Sherwood differs from Hollywood is interesting, but it doesn’t necessarily explain or elaborate on why Sherwood is successful in movie making in a market where so many others are not. In order to try to understand Sherwood Pictures’ success in the movie making industry one must understand how any given firm competes within its industry and then apply those concepts to the Sherwood in their industry. Understanding how a firm competes in a given industry was definitively explained in an article titled “How Competitive Forces Shape Strategy” in the Harvard Business Review in 1979. The article is widely regarded as one of the fundamental writings on the subject and is still relevant and applicable to companies trying to develop a strategy to compete in today’s business world.

In his article Porter describes five “forces” that influence the amount of competition in an industry as well as the grounds upon which companies compete. Those five forces are: the threat of new entrants, the bargaining power of customers, the bargaining power of suppliers, the threat of substitute products or services, and the jockeying among current contestants. According to Porter how these forces innately shape an industry and how companies develop a strategy to leverage their strengths concerning the forces determines the success of the company in that industry. Basically the profitability of a company depends on the competition in that industry. Theoretically, in a perfectly
competitive industry the opportunity for long term profitability is relatively low because a company will continually have to compete against new companies because of low barriers to entrance and there is no restraint on jockeying for position in the industry. On the contrary to the perfectly competitive industry is the industry where the forces are weak and the opportunity for long term profitability is higher. Whatever the climate is in a given industry, it is up to each company in that industry to develop their own strategy in order to survive and hopefully thrive (Porter, 1979).

**Threat of Entry**

The first of the forces that Porter describes is the threat of new entrants into an industry. New entrants to an industry can be understood as new companies trying to compete for market share. The ability for a new company to enter into an industry depends on the strength of the six barriers that prevent entrance. The first barrier to entrance is the requirement of a company to begin business at a large scale or accept a cost disadvantage. Economies of scale is a fairly significant barrier in the movie making industry, although the cost disadvantage is not devastating for those firms that cannot enter into the market in a large scale. The “Big Six” movie studios obviously compete on a large scale basis with each other, but they also face competition from independent movies that are made with much smaller operations at the box office. The large movie studios have the distinct advantage of being able to fund more movies and bigger marketing campaigns, but independents still possess enough market share to be able to compete, for instance Lionsgate Entertainment Corporation or Sherwood Pictures. Both of these independent production companies have been able to make a significant profit competing with the big studios. However, just because some companies have seen success despite being at a disadvantage, the same scenario is not the for all that try to compete with the large firms. These two companies have just been able to leverage their other strengths to compensate for the lack of ability to produce movies and market them at the same scale. As Porter notes, the barrier of economies of scale can also act as a hurdle to securing distribution. This notion that is briefly mentioned by Porter is a very
large concern for independent movie companies. An independent production company can make a brilliant film is interesting to many different demographics, but if it not distributed then no one will see it and the production company will make no money. If independents cannot afford to market their films in a way that grants them legitimacy and gains attention from distributors, then distribution companies will not partner with them to distribute their movies.

The second barrier to entry that Porter describes is known as product differentiation. Simply put, new entrants to an industry must be able to convince the buyers to purchase their product instead of the product that they typically purchase. This barrier is exceptionally high in industries such as the soft drink industry and the over-the-counter drug industry. Focusing on advertising and customer service are often the best strategies to combating consumer brand loyalty. Of the barriers to entrance into the movie industry this one is among the more important to consider. Brand loyalty to a movie studio would not seem like an overt reality, but indirectly its effects are observable. For example consider the Spiderman movie franchise. All of the recent and upcoming Spiderman movies (Spiderman (2002), Spiderman 2 (2004), Spiderman 3 (2007), The Amazing Spiderman (2012), and The Amazing Spiderman 2 (2014) ) are distributed by Columbia Pictures, a subsidiary of Sony Pictures Entertainment (one the Big Six Hollywood studios). Spiderman has become a brand of movies, each of which movies already has an audience before it is made. When each Spiderman sequel is released its audience will be loyal to go seen it instead of spending their money on another movie. This creates a brand loyalty for Spiderman which in turn creates brand loyalty for Sony Pictures Entertainment through Columbia Pictures. This type of loyalty is what makes sequels and remakes so popular at the box office and so lucrative for studios to produce. Brand loyalty conversely makes original stories harder to sell and more difficult to for independent studios to gain distribution. Independent production companies often to not have the financial resources to purchase the rights to remake a movie or make a sequel in a current
series; thus leaving them to create original or at least unused ideas for making movies (Wilson) (Porter, 1979).

This barrier to entrance into the movie making industry can easier be understood by looking at it as a wager. Big Studios with more financial resources can afford to make a safer bet by making remakes and sequels, but independents have to take the riskier bet by trying to sell an idea that does not already have an audience. Big Studios have to pay more to make a movie that has brand loyalty, but their profit will not be as high. Independent companies will create more original movies at the risk of it being unsuccessful, but stand to make a higher profit because of the lower production costs.

The third barrier to entry that poses a significant hurdle worthy of consideration for production companies is capital requirements. Professional quality movies are not cheap to make even when they low budget. Starting a production company typically requires startup capital to cover the costs of cameras, lights, microphones, actors, sets, locations, transportation, and promotional materials to name a few things. Even Sherwood Pictures budget of $100,000 is consider a very low budget in terms of typical movies. If production companies do not have a parent company sponsoring and funding them, and have to fund themselves entirely, this might be one of the most difficult barriers to pass. In the movie industry these costs are not one time costs either, each movie will have these high capital requirements. For many independent production companies these costs can be covered by borrowing money from a bank, but this strategy comes with the inherent risk of needing a successful movie to repay those loans.

The third barrier to entrance into an industry is the access to distribution channels. This barrier is of the utmost importance for potential entrants into the movie industry. Every production company needs to have access to distribution channels in order to be able survive in the industry. Major studio releases do not have to consider this step in their operation because they already have their distribution
clearly established, but this barrier is powerful enough to even remove production companies from competition if they do not find a distributor. Independent production companies have a fair chance at finding distribution, but getting a distribution is very competitive. The access to distribution channels for independent production companies often comes from film festivals which are pretty selective. For an independent production company to secure a distribution deal they often need to have success at film festivals or have a big name star acting in the movie for a significant pay cut (Epstein, The Hollywood Economist, 2010).

The next two barriers to entrance do not have as much influence on potential entrants to the movie industry. Cost disadvantages independent of size often take the form of proprietary technology, favorable locations, government subsidies, best raw material resources, assets purchased at a preinflation prices, or effects from the learning curve (Porter, 1979). Few of these factors even need to be considered by potential entrants into the movie industry. The last barrier to entrance is government policy concerning the entrance to an industry. This barrier is important in industries such as liquor retailing or trucking, but the movie industry (especially for independents) has very little government policy regulation.

**Supplier/Buyer Power**

The amount of power and influence the suppliers and buyers of an industry have are the second and third of Porter’s Five Forces. When the suppliers of an industry have significant influence over that industry they can reduce profitability to that industry by raising prices or reducing the quality of the goods that they supply. The customers of a given industry have significant power over an industry if they can drive prices down, demand higher quality, or play competitors off against each other at the expense of industry profits. According to Porter, “The power of each important supplier or buyer group
depends on a number of characteristics of its market situation and on the relative importance of its sales or purchases to the industry compared with its overall business” (Porter, 1979).

In the movie industry the buyers have more power than the suppliers. To be sure, the buyers of the movie industry are not only movie audiences, but also distributors for the film and eventual DVD, merchandisers that buy licensing rights, and foreign audiences. Audiences to movies have the ability to choose to pay to see different movies and play the movie studios against each other. Additionally the distributors of the film can play studios against one another with more power than the movie audiences because of their importance to independent studios.

To improve its position in a given industry a company should find out which of its suppliers and buyer have the least amount of power to adversely influence it. In the movie industry studios would be best served to cater toward the desires of the individuals that purchase movie tickets. These buyers have relatively low power to influence studios, and studios have the power to leverage them by creating a self sustaining audience. As mentioned earlier, if a studio can create a “brand” and sell that brand to the movie watchers, the watchers will then in turn desire more of that brand thus increasing the reliance of the distributors on the studios and reducing their power.

**Substitute Products**

The next force that determines the level of competition in an industry is the availability of substitute products. For the movie industry as a whole, this might be the most prevalent of Porter’s forces. With the invention and eventual proliferation of the television into the American home the attendance at movies in the theater has dropped off significantly (Epstein, The Hollywood Economist, 2010). In addition to television, numerous other forms of entertainment exist as substitutes to movies. Of these substitutes, the ones that require the most attention in terms of strategy are those that are subject to trends improving their price-performance trade off and those that are produced by industries
earning high profits (Porter, 1979). Outside of television, one of the upcoming substitutes that will need to given proper consideration are express rental DVD’s like, like those available from Red Box. Red Box is providing a largely similar form of entertainment, but at the sacrifice of ticket sales at the box office.

Jockeying for Position

The last of Porter’s forces is the propensity of companies to jockey for position in their industry. Jockeying for position often ends up in the form of price competition, product introduction, and advertising slugfests. The factors that lead to this jockeying for position and rivalry in the movie industry are: competitors being numerous and/or are equally in size and power, industry grow being slow, products lacking differentiation, high fixed costs, and diverse “personalities” of companies. Concerning product differentiation, there are a few companies that have been able to differentiate themselves from the rest of the pack, but on the whole, there is not much product differentiation in movies. The fixed costs of making a movie are pretty high, but with they are not absolute as Sherwood Pictures proved with their volunteer model. Independent production companies have to compete to secure distribution deals first and then once distribution is secured they compete at the box office with other films.

Conclusion

The single most significant factor of Sherwood Pictures success in competing the movie making industry comes from the product differentiation that they have been able to establish. In the terms of Porter’s threats of entrance into an industry Sherwood has not only been able to hurdle the barrier of production differentiation, but they have been able to leverage it. When Hollywood movies are able to leverage brand loyalty, it often comes at the cost of having to pay for licensing rights to remake a movie or to make a sequel in an existing series. Doing this grants that particular studio an audience to a movie that has yet to be made. This can almost be considered “buying an audience” or as previously stated making a safe, albeit expensive, bet. The bet, of course, is that the audience that a studio anticipates
coming to a movie will come to the movie. In a time where all movie studios have to create their own audience, this is the surest way to be successful and turn a profit. While Sherwood is not remaking anything or making a sequel to a popular movie, they are benefitting from a type of brand loyalty with a pre-created audience whose demand is otherwise not being met. By making movies that openly statement and promote Christian values and beliefs Sherwood is supplying the demand of the Christian audience. To put this argument in business terms the brand is not a character, an actor, or a series, but a religion. Just as audiences that love Spiderman movies are going to indirectly show brand loyalty to Sony Pictures Entertainment through Columbia Pictures, audiences that love Jesus are going to show brand loyalty to Sherwood Pictures. This brand loyalty to Sherwood Pictures has also reduced the power that the distributors have over Sherwood. Because Sherwood has helped create a demand for more Christian movies, distributors are eager to make create partnerships to benefit from Sherwood’s success. That is exactly how Sherwood Pictures secured a distribution deal with Sony Pictures Entertainment. By meeting the creating a strong demand with the weaker buyer (the ticket buyers) the distributors began to see Sherwood Pictures as a company that they could greatly benefit from in partnership, thus Sony was now eager to distribute Sherwood’s movies.

Representatives from Sherwood Pictures are not hesitant to admit that they are making movies for Christians, “We made the decision up front that our first audience is the believer” (What Christians Watch, 2009). Making movies with Christians in mind makes sense from a brand loyalty viewpoint. Christian audiences are going to familiar with most of the stories and Biblical principles and parallels that are conveyed in the movies. Knowing this, and knowing what Sherwood Baptist Church knew about the church being less influential in American culture that movies and other forms of media and entertainment, the climate was perfect for a Christian production company to make movies. There is a strong Christian demand for movies, and the success for Sherwood proves it. The part that makes brand loyalty so significant for Sherwood though is that there is no cost to having a pre-created audience
because Christianity has been around longer than the movie industry. With no cost associated with a pre-created audience Sherwood Pictures stood to make a large profit without large cost, which is exactly what Sherwood did. The Christian audience has always been around, it has just not been tapped into in a successful way consistently. Because Sherwood has been so successful in all of their endeavors thus far, they are actually beginning to build create a brand name for themselves in the Christian movie market. This ensures that even in the event of more entrants into the Christian movie market Sherwood Pictures will still remain the standard. Hollywood’s attempt to tap into the Christian market can be seen through 20th Century Fox creating subsidiary FoxFaith and Disney distributing the first two Chronicles of Naria movies (Bond, 2011). However, assuming that making a Christian movie means automatic success is far from the truth.

As noted in an article in the Wall Street Journal though, Christians are seeking legitimacy and genuine Christian movies. Exemplified by the decline success for movies such as The Nativity (2006) and End of the Spear (2006) when the leading actress and actor for each movie were found to have lifestyles that did not uphold the morals of Christianity (What Christians Watch, 2009). This very reason is why Sherwood Pictures makes sure to only cast individuals who not only agree with the message that their movies are conveying, but are also living a life that models that message. Sherwood Pictures is a model of integrity for Christian film makers, thus they are creating a brand name for themselves at the same time that they have met the demand of the Christian movie audience.

Sherwood Pictures was also in a unique position to take advantage of the high capital requirements associated with competing in the movie industry. Because Sherwood Pictures is officially a ministry of Sherwood Baptist Church, they were able to keep start up costs low by using volunteers and donations. Most production companies have to have large sums of money to be able to even consider competing in the movie industry and are left with little choice other than borrowing money in
speculation that the movie made will turn a profit to sustain the company. Sherwood was able to raise their start up costs through church donations as well as keep their operating costs low by using volunteers. Because of this competitive advantage Sherwood was able to almost completely avoid this barrier to entrance.

The brand loyalty that Sherwood has been able to leverage has also helped them hurdle another major barrier that prevents many potential entrants to the movie industry from competing, access to distribution channels. It was Sherwood’s early success that grabbed Sony’s attention and convinced them that partnering with Sherwood Pictures would be a profitable decision. Instead of trying to compete with Sherwood Pictures by making more Christian themed movies, Sony decided that it would be more profitable just to support them by providing mass distribution and take a cut of the money. This partnership is best for both Sony and Sherwood because Hollywood has seen limited success in Christian movies (for reasons mentioned above) and Sherwood can obviously get their message out to more people with a powerful distributor like Sony. Obtaining this coveted distribution partnership with Sony again goes back to the success of their movies because of brand loyalty.

Porter maintains that a company is likely to reconsider entering into an industry if: the incumbents of that industry have substantial resources to fight back against new entrants, the incumbents are likely to reduce prices in order to maintain market share, or if industry growth is slow affecting its ability to absorb the new arrival and probably causing the financial performance of all parties to decline (Porter, 1979). Given these reasons why a company would reconsider entering an industry, Sherwood made the correct choice by entering. While the major movie studios have the financial resources to fight back against Sherwood from entering into the industry, it is not likely or necessary that they do. Sherwood Pictures being a small independent company does not pose a big enough threat to any of the studios to be concerned, especially when they will have to eventually rely
on a major studio to help distribute their films anyway. Any other independent production companies most likely do not have the resources to justify fighting back against Sherwood entering into the industry. The large studios do not have enough incentive to lower the cost of their films to theaters because they can rely on their expensive though effective marketing campaigns to propel them to box office success. Similar to the first reason that other independent production companies do not resist Sherwood Picture by lowering combating their entrance, other independent production companies cannot afford to lower their prices to maintain market share. The last reason for Sherwood to reconsider is non-applicable. The movie industry will survive and continue to thrive just as they do now with the entrance of a new independent production company. In short, Sherwood has the ability to enter into the industry and has no reason not to do so. Resistance to Sherwood’s entry is unlikely and unwise for independent production companies and not necessary for the major movie studios. When competing against the major six movie studios, Sherwood Pictures is truly taking on the role of David in the fight against Goliath.
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