

PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT • OCTOBER 2026 • CONSOLIDATED REVIEW V7

591 DAYS

TRANQUILITY BAY — STEVEN'S STORY

He was living one story. The outside world was recording another.

At thirteen, Steven Ortmann was sent to Tranquility Bay in Jamaica. More than two decades later, the papers he kept become the starting point for a documentary that places his life inside beside the reporting, disputes and official records developing outside.

PROPOSED FORMAT

Three episodes of approximately 45–55 minutes.

A 90–110-minute feature remains an intentional alternative.

PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

A story-led development package, not a finished film, sales representation agreement or cleared shooting script. No studio, producer, director, witness or counsel is represented as attached.

591 Days is a working title. January 7, 2002–August 20, 2003 equals 591 days inclusive. The departure date requires reconciliation with an August 28 account. Selected originals were visually reviewed; the complete archive has not been authenticated.

THE PROJECT

One life. Two timelines.

The documentary is not a catalogue of allegations. It is the story of a man reopening the record of the boy he was—and discovering how much of the outside record developed during the same period.

Steven provides the emotional center: a thirteen-year-old sent to Jamaica, the effort to understand and survive a program, and the adult's decision to examine what he retained. His physical papers give the camera something concrete to follow. A date, a phrase, a family update and a program form can each open a scene. The wider history enters only when it changes the audience's understanding of that dated human experience. [P01–P09]

The private record is not flattened into one tone. Some pages express love, hope and a wish to progress. Steven's later recollection may make those same pages difficult to read. We do not solve that tension by declaring every positive sentence false, nor by treating a hopeful letter as proof that conditions were acceptable. The film lets him explain—and permits other evidence to complicate his explanation.

The outside story has its own documentary chronology. A program publication, contemporaneous journalism, a federal procedural ruling and a later official designation are distinct source types. Complaints, quoted recollections and legal allegations retain their status. The proposed investigation asks what was communicated, who received it and what action can be documented. It does not begin by promising a conspiracy. [S01; S04–S09]

Why another film on this subject?

The Program already presents a survivor-led investigation connected to institutional records at Ivy Ridge. That is a close comparison, not something to overlook. Our distinction must be narrower than “a survivor with an archive”: Steven's bounded 2002–03 Jamaica chronology, the changing meanings of his own correspondence, and a present-day inquiry into contemporaneous outside scrutiny. This is a proposed editorial distinction, not a claim that no previous film has covered Tranquility Bay. [M07]

What a development partner is being asked to do

Help turn a sourced, personal project into a filmable treatment: attach the right director and producer, scope archive and legal work, secure voluntary access, and test the strongest scenes in a short proof of concept. The first request is a serious development conversation—not a blind full-series purchase or an unsupported price tag.

SERIES ARCHITECTURE

Three movements, not three repetitions.

PART 01 / SENT AWAY

How does a child learn that getting home depends on becoming a different version of himself?

Steven opens the record today. His recollection of the trip sits beside early family letters. We learn how levels, adult interpretations and reports of progress shaped the hoped-for route home. Earlier separations provide context while leaving room for different family memories.

End turn: An encouraging progress report reaches home. The audience has learned to ask what a report can—and cannot—show.

PART 02 / THE WORDS THAT LEFT

What happens when the record of progress and the memory of survival do not sound the same?

August 2002 writing anticipates change. Family messages and seminar work reveal competing understandings of responsibility. An April 2003 article appears under Steven's name. The film asks how these words were produced, received and remembered. A crisis at a separate affiliated program widens the frame.

End turn: The story expands from one student's papers to the routes by which a network moved children and information.

PART 03 / BEYOND THE GATES

What can the adult establish about what others knew—and what does leaving actually resolve?

Contemporary journalism, disputes and reported approaches to officials become leads for today's investigation. Steven seeks the underlying records and examines the meaning of leaving. His present choices bring the story back to authorship: which pages to share, what remains disputed and how to tell the story now.

End turn: The ending is an accountable record and an adult exercising choice—not a promised prosecution, confession or perfect reconciliation.

Feature alternative

A 90–110-minute feature can use the same three movements. Combine chapters according to access and scene strength. All scenes remain proposals for development.

PART 1 / SENT AWAY

Chapters 01–02

01 The person holding the binder

Present day

The opening is an act of choice. A child once described by adults and institutions is now the person deciding how the record will be examined. He selects one dated letter. We see a source reference and the difference between the physical object, his recollection and the question he brings to it today. The archive is not presented as self-explanatory or infallible. It is the means of starting a conversation that can be challenged. This opening also gives the film an active present-tense investigation, rather than an illustrated deposition.

Proposed scene: Steven sets an actual binder on a table. The camera stays with his hands as he decides where to begin. We hear present-day room sound, not invented sounds of confinement.

Question: What did he preserve, and why is he willing to reopen it now?

Evidence: P01; P05; proposed original filming | Film only after Steven chooses the pages. This scene has not been shot. Keep signatures and third-party details out of frame unless cleared.

02 Before the island

Childhood to January 2002

Steven's own account places earlier camps and schooling before Jamaica. These experiences establish the stakes of another separation: not just a new institution, but another interruption in belonging and trust. He can discuss his own difficult choices as well as decisions made by adults. Relatives who participate may remember events differently. Their absence would not authorize the film to supply motives on their behalf. The chapter remains proportionate; it explains the child who arrived without turning the series into an unsupported reconstruction of his whole family history.

Proposed scene: Interview intercut with permitted family photographs and a simple, evidence-qualified personal chronology. No invented arguments or recreated family dialogue.

Question: What did each person believe this placement was supposed to accomplish?

Evidence: P09; Steven's account; school/admission records sought | Intimate family allegations and named relatives remain private until separately approved. Confirm institutions and dates before external distribution.

PART 1 / SENT AWAY

Chapters 03–04

03 The trip that changed its meaning

January 2002

According to Steven, he understood the journey as a trip, not a placement he could not choose to leave. We distinguish that memory from what his family may have arranged beforehand. A letter marked January 10 refers to the adults' return and frames movement through levels as a route home. The film allows the optimism of that message and Steven's account of arrival to coexist. The tension comes from incompatible expectations, not from an invented scene of kidnapping. His working admission date is January 7; its documentary confirmation remains a development task.

Proposed scene: Steven narrates the journey in his own recorded words. A restrained date card replaces a reenacted child at the gate. The first family letter enters the frame.

Question: When did the trip become something he could not decide to end?

Evidence: P02; P09; admission and transport documents sought | No historical route map or transfer chain presented as established without his records. Do not use another survivor's transport story as Steven's.

04 The first weekly update

January 15, 2002

The early family record gives the film a precise information pathway. A letter marked January 15 describes a weekly update with Miss Clarke, references reflections and explains how a DIS-form message could be relayed. What sounds like reassuring administrative detail also identifies the intermediary between child and home. The chapter asks what parents could assess from this channel, and what remained outside its scope. It does not conclude that all updates were fabricated or that all positive feelings were coerced. Its dramatic force is in the practical question of whose account reached whom.

Proposed scene: two columns on screen. One shows the date on the actual family letter; the other shows what the parent understood about progress. Steven explains what the week meant to him.

Question: Who could describe his experience directly, and who interpreted it?

Evidence: P03; S04; period communication procedures sought | Paraphrase the family letter in first-contact materials. Original-page publication and interviews need separate permission.

PART 2 / THE WORDS THAT LEFT

Chapters 05–06

05 Tomorrow the program changes

August 1–5, 2002

The first letter links hope to an approaching system change. Three days later, Steven writes that the program changes tomorrow and that he is both excited and scared. This is a strong scene because the uncertainty belongs to the child's own writing, not to a modern narrator. What did a reset promise? What could be lost? His records of levels, consequences and seminars can make the mechanics comprehensible without reproducing humiliating procedures for spectacle. Present-day testimony gives the words emotional context; the pages themselves remain visible enough to resist an overly convenient interpretation.

Proposed scene: Steven compares two original pages, dated August 1 and August 4. A typographic calendar moves toward August 5, marked as the anticipated date—not yet a verified rollout.

Question: What did “progress” mean to the person being measured?

Evidence: P04; P05; S01; S11 as a separately unverified lead | The letters support anticipation of August 5. They do not independently establish what policy was implemented, or who designed it.

06 The calls and the silence

2002–03; some documents undated

This chapter explores the gap between contact and freedom to communicate. The archive contains both affectionate messages and a parent's report about reducing calls unless progress occurred. The latter is undated and sensitive; it belongs initially in the private research file. Steven's experience of monitored contact must be presented as his account and tested against the specific records available. The film should make room for parents' fears, institutional assurances, loyalty and uncertainty without treating any one motive as established. The central relationship is more complex than a simple opposition between a truthful child and a malicious adult.

Proposed scene: Steven and a participating relative are interviewed separately. Only then are their recollections compared with dated correspondence. No surprise confrontation.

Question: What did each person believe the other was allowed to say?

Evidence: P03; P06; P07; S04; original handbook sought | P06 and P07 stay out of the public website and cold deck. Date the documents, confirm authorship, invite relevant responses and obtain consent.

PART 2 / THE WORDS THAT LEFT

Chapters 07–08

07 Published under his name

April 2003

The program publication gives the story its sharpest public/private hinge. An article appears under Steven's name while he is still there. The question is not automatically whether it was false. What did he mean when he wrote it? What did he hope to achieve? Did he retain an original? The issue's editing notice is relevant but does not establish alteration of this submission. The scene allows pride, strategy, fear, genuine improvement and later reassessment to be explored without choosing the answer in advance. The child's voice should not be erased merely because it complicates the adult's interpretation.

Proposed scene: a clear on-screen source label identifies the surviving newsletter. Steven reads the article privately first, then chooses what to discuss on camera.

Question: Who authored the public version, and how does Steven understand it now?

Evidence: S01; P04–P05 for the preceding personal context | Do not advertise a proven coerced testimonial or edited confession. Text, layout and underlying contribution require distinct clearance review.

08 The crisis somewhere else

May 2003

Contemporary coverage of Dundee Ranch introduces the wider network through a concrete event during Steven's stay. This is not an invitation to import every allegation from another country into his story. The active present-day task is narrower: determine which students transferred, when they arrived and whether any knew Steven. The arrival of someone from another institution could bring a different perspective into the film, but that scene depends on voluntary access and verified dates. Without it, the series can still explain the documented transfer reporting without imagining a cohort conversation.

Proposed scene: a spare geographic diagram places Costa Rica and Jamaica apart. News dates and the names of distinct institutions make jurisdiction clear.

Question: Did a crisis outside Jamaica change the people and information inside?

Evidence: S06; S08; admission records and consenting witnesses sought | No exact transfer count treated as established. No anonymous former minor identified by inference. Costa Rican findings stay jurisdiction-specific.

PART 3 / BEYOND THE GATES

Chapters 09–10

09 June outside

June 2003

Independent reporters were publishing while Steven remained inside. The episode turns public awareness into a personal question: did any of that information reach him? The published record includes divergent views, not a single chorus. Today, a journalist may help establish how reporting was gathered and what unpublished material survives. The scene works even if a reporter declines: the dated published record is still real. Raw photographs and an NPR recording described in the advocacy dossier are acquisition leads, not promised archival sequences.

Proposed scene: Steven reads dated headlines now. A clean split screen holds the date of an article beside the personal chronology rather than reconstructing what he supposedly knew then.

Question: What could an outsider see, and what could a child know about the outside scrutiny?

Evidence: S04; S05; S02–S03 as source metadata; S08 as a lead | Publication date is not necessarily visit date. Multiple syndicated copies are not independent corroboration. Respect confidential reporter sources.

10 Who was responsible?

2002–03 record, examined today

The investigation resists a satisfying but premature conclusion that everybody knew and nobody acted. It asks smaller questions that records can answer: who received a complaint, what authority did the office have, what visit was conducted, and what response followed? The May 2003 federal ruling anchors a real contemporaneous legal dispute while reminding the viewer that pleadings are not verdicts. The Cayman connection is approached through the verified 2004 instrument and a search for its predecessor—not through a mislabeled PDF. Jurisdiction and record custody become dramatic obstacles, not excuses to insinuate guilt.

Proposed scene: a researcher and counsel work through separate institutional files—Jamaican education/child welfare, U.S. consular services, and court records. Each box shows its source and what is missing.

Question: What information reached which authority, and what action can actually be documented?

Evidence: S07; S08; S09; records-request register | Right of reply for specific adverse claims; no conspiracy inference from timing alone. No statement that a requested record exists today unless located.

PART 3 / BEYOND THE GATES

Chapters 11–12

11 Leaving was not the ending

August 2003 and afterward

The working title counts 591 days inclusively from January 7, 2002 to August 20, 2003. An old post attributed to Steven gives August 28. The film should not stage uncertainty for drama, but its development file must resolve it honestly. In Steven's account, further schooling and separation followed Jamaica. A letter written inside already imagines an academy as a next destination; it cannot prove later enrollment. The emotional question is what leaving changed and what it did not. Adulthood is not a victory montage imposed on a history that remains difficult.

Proposed scene: Steven searches for the departure record, then speaks about what followed. The chronology shows a working date rather than hiding the discrepancy.

Question: What does release mean when the next chapter is another placement?

Evidence: P05; P09; S10 as an unverified authorship/date lead; travel and school records sought | 591 Days remains a working title. Medical diagnoses and causal claims need consent and appropriate evidence; no forced recovery narrative.

12 The record he chooses to make

Present day

The ending belongs to the adult, not to an unseen buyer, institution or investigator. It can include a voluntary reunion, a newly recovered record or an official response if those occur, but none is required or scripted as inevitable. The film's achievable resolution is a documented account in which Steven is no longer only the subject of other people's descriptions. Some memories may remain disputed. Some participants may decline. The audience should leave understanding both what the evidence supports and why the unanswered questions matter.

Proposed scene: the same table as the opening. Steven decides which record to share and what he will keep private. A final source card distinguishes established findings from questions still open.

Question: What can he now say in his own voice—and on his own terms?

Evidence: P01–P09; checked public record; actual development outcomes | No promised confession, prosecution, compensation, reconciliation or final access. Update the treatment as real events happen.

VISUAL & SOUND DIRECTION

Let the real object lead.

Design language: deep green-black, warm paper, disciplined typography and a narrow gold line separating the two chronologies. This review uses typographic exhibits and source labels instead of simulated historical evidence. The production should privilege actual paper, actual voices and accurately dated photography.

Archive grammar: identify the item and date; hear the participant’s account; introduce corroboration or a meaningful contradiction; then widen to the outside record. Use zoom only to make a line readable. Never turn a document into a decorative texture that obscures its actual words.

Sound: present-day paper movement, actual interview room tone and location sound recorded legitimately. No synthetic screams, recreated restraint audio or child voice clone. Reenactment, if eventually justified, must be separately approved, transparently labeled and never offered as recovered evidence.

90-second proof-of-concept plan

Time	Proposed image / sound	Purpose
0–12 sec	Steven opens the real binder in a present-day, consented shoot.	Establish subject and agency.
12–28 sec	The August 4 date and a short chosen line; Steven reads it himself.	Introduce the child’s actual words. [P05]
28–42 sec	Two simple date tracks: private page / contemporary public source.	Make the narrative structure immediately clear.
42–58 sec	Newsletter title/byline citation, not a fabricated full-page facsimile.	Introduce the public/private question. [S01]
58–73 sec	Present-day research: a source checked, an unanswered request named.	Show an active inquiry without staging a breakthrough.
73–90 sec	Steven in frame; title and development invitation.	End with a person and a film, not a dossier.

This is a storyboard, not a completed teaser. A real shoot, selected original assets, releases and music/archival permissions are still required.

CHARACTERS & ACCESS

A cast to earn, not a list to promise.

Steven is the only participant whose willingness is expressed through this project. All other names are interview or records leads. The private register contains 89 individual or grouped entries; that number is not a count of verified survivors, independent witnesses or secured interviews.

Function in the film	Priority leads	First objective
Peer experience	Oliver Bucolo; Colin Johnstone; Patrick Quinn; Jill Himmelfarb; Winston Wilkinson	Confirm dates and whether they knew Steven; invite differing views. [S04]
Parents / original material	Lisa Todd; Julie Wilkinson; Christine Smith; newsletter-contributor families	Preserved correspondence, photographs and their own recollection. [S01; S04]
Program / editorial records	Mrs. Clarke; Steve Powell; Mr. Henry; Source editorial custodian	Precise roles, records and response to specific evidence. [P03; S01]
Independent reporting	Tim Weiner; Decca Aitkenhead; Petre Williams; Tim Rogers	Source provenance and non-confidential archive availability. [S02–S06]
Government / archive leads	Bruce Kraft; Ian Brownlee; Winston Bowen; Cayman/Jamaican custodians	Official-side records; historical office/tenure confirmation. [S08–S09]

Participant care

Use a clear, voluntary invitation; explain the likely audience and sensitive subjects; allow a support person and breaks. Do not surprise participants with a painful image. Do not reconstruct anonymous former minors' identities. No promise of final-cut control or therapeutic benefit should be made unless it is actually agreed and appropriate.

Fair challenge

Invite specific responses from people or organizations facing material adverse claims, with the relevant claim accurately described. Distinguish inability to locate a witness from refusal to respond. A declined interview does not establish guilt. Corrections and disagreements should remain in the evidence register, not be edited away because they complicate the pitch.

DEVELOPMENT, NOT A SALE PROMISE

The next six weeks—proposed, not scheduled.

Phase	Work	Decision gate
Weeks 1–2	Original-file preservation, preservation log, key-date audit; entertainment/media counsel scope.	What can be shared, and what is still missing?
Weeks 2–3	Limited, consent-first approaches to core participants and archive custodians.	Is there enough meaningful access for a series?
Weeks 3–4	Priority records requests and a genuine present-day binder/interview shoot.	Can the strongest chapter be demonstrated on screen?
Weeks 4–5	Edit a short proof of concept; separate verified copy from allegations and leads.	Does the film work without promised missing footage?
Weeks 5–6	Refine feature/series treatment and producer-authored budget; invited meetings.	Proceed, narrow to a feature, or pause for an essential record.

What survives without the “big discovery”

The series already has a personal documentary mechanism: Steven reads his own record and examines the outside chronology. A consular report, raw tape or new witness could materially improve it, but the story must not depend on receiving a smoking gun. If key access does not develop, the feature alternative may be the stronger format.

Rights and compensation

Physical possession of material is not equivalent to ownership of its copyright. Steven can discuss participation and the materials he may control, but cannot grant ownership of public events, third-party journalism or other people's cooperation. Counsel should review the actual chain of title and any prior releases. [L01]

No project valuation or expected personal payment is supported by an offer in this file. Earlier numerical scenarios should be treated as speculative. A producing or consulting role needs genuine responsibilities; memoir and scripted rights should be examined separately rather than casually bundled into an all-media grant.

SOURCE NOTES

Personal evidence locator key

P01 Personal archive: first-pass source selection — 2002-03 / inventory 2026

Selected pages visually reviewed. Tranquility_Bay_Source_Selection_v1.pdf, cover; source file file_0000000023f08230886a79fd494056c1

Original records and locators are retained in the separate private master archive. This treatment does not grant publication rights.

P02 Family letter, date marked January 10, 2002 — 2002-01-10

Page visually reviewed. TB-B05-P001; original 09112026071427.pdf p1; selection p6

Original records and locators are retained in the separate private master archive. This treatment does not grant publication rights.

P03 Family letter, date marked January 15, 2002 — 2002-01-15

Page visually reviewed. TB-B03-P043; original 09112026071235.pdf p43; selection p4

Original records and locators are retained in the separate private master archive. This treatment does not grant publication rights.

P04 Letter dated August 1, 2002 and continuation — 2002-08-01

Pages visually reviewed. TB-B07-P085-P086; original 09112026071628.pdf pp85-86; selection pp7-8

Original records and locators are retained in the separate private master archive. This treatment does not grant publication rights.

P05 Letter dated August 4, 2002 and continuation — 2002-08-04

Pages visually reviewed. TB-B07-P083-P084; original 09112026071628.pdf pp83-84; selection pp9-10

Original records and locators are retained in the separate private master archive. This treatment does not grant publication rights.

P06 Undated parent email and continuation — Undated

Pages visually reviewed. TB-B03-P001-P002; selection pp2-3

Original records and locators are retained in the separate private master archive. This treatment does not grant publication rights.

P07 Undated parent letter, page 2 of 2 — Undated

Page visually reviewed. TB-B03-P039; selection p5

Original records and locators are retained in the separate private master archive. This treatment does not grant publication rights.

P08 Resource Realizations seminar worksheet — Copyright 2001

Page visually reviewed. TB-B01-P003; selection p11; page footer Discovery 5

Original records and locators are retained in the separate private master archive. This treatment does not grant publication rights.

P09 Existing development treatment and image intake review — 2026

Text reviewed. 591_Days_Series_Treatment_V5.pdf; 591_Days_Historical_Image_Intake_Review.pdf; index.html v3

Original records and locators are retained in the separate private master archive. This treatment does not grant publication rights.

SOURCE NOTES

Public-source anchors

S01 The Source Online, Vol. 6 No. 4 — 2003-04

Text and relevant page visually reviewed. Printed p19; article: Missed Opportunities of 2002

[Open source](#)

S02 The Last Resort — part one, Decca Aitkenhead — 2003-06-29

Public page checked. Publication date is not an exact visit date

[Open source](#)

S03 The Last Resort — part two, Decca Aitkenhead — 2003-06-29

Public page checked. Part two

[Open source](#)

S04 Tranquility Bay not so tranquil, Tim Weiner / NYT News Service — 2003-06-18

Public page checked. Deseret reprint; original reporting circulated June 2003

[Open source](#)

S05 Jamaica no problem, says Tranquility Bay, Petre Williams — 2003-06-07

Public page checked. Jamaica Observer

[Open source](#)

S06 Dundee Ranch crisis reporting, Tim Rogers / The Tico Times — 2003-05-23

Contemporary reproduction checked. Reproduced contemporary article

[Open source](#)

S07 WWASPS v. PURE, ruling on counterclaims — 2003-05-02

Opinion text checked. Judge Paul G. Cassell; opinion text, not automated case summary

[Open source](#)

S08 ISAC Tranquility Bay Report, revised — 2003-08-25

Selected text checked. 154-page PDF; printed pp33–34, 64–68, 112–113 relevant

[Open source](#)

S09 Youth Rehabilitation Schools Notice, 2004 — 2004-06-01

Original instrument visually checked. Made June 1, 2004; gazetted June 28, 2004

[Open source](#)

SOURCE NOTES

Market and rights references

M01 Netflix: How ideas are pitched — Checked October 2026

Official page checked. Netflix Help Center

[Open source](#)

M02 HBO production FAQs — Checked October 2026

Official page checked. Production Questions

[Open source](#)

M03 Story Syndicate — Checked October 2026

Official page checked. Company statement and contact policy

[Open source](#)

M04 Concordia Studio nonfiction division — Checked October 2026

Official page checked. Official contact checked October 20, 2026. No unsolicited materials; invited introduction only.

[Open source](#)

M05 Jigsaw Productions — Checked October 2026

Official page / indexed description checked. Company homepage

[Open source](#)

M06 Campfire Studios — Checked October 2026

Official contact page checked. Official domain campfire.us, not similarly named businesses

[Open source](#)

M07 The Program: Cons, Cults and Kidnapping — Netflix Tudum — 2024-03-12

Official page checked. Roxanne Fequiere; commissioning demand is not established by a past release

[Open source](#)

L01 U.S. Copyright Office Circular 1 — Current publication

Official guidance checked. Copyright Basics, pp1–3,6

[Open source](#)

The complete register includes additional carry-forward leads that were not reverified in this revision. Source existence, historical accuracy, independence, access and publication permission are separate columns of diligence—not interchangeable labels.

V7 DEVELOPMENT UPDATE

The recovered record

Original materials now available

Eight original PDFs containing 322 scanned pages have been recovered, along with the selected original photographs and working materials. This resolves availability, not historical authentication. Selected pages have received close review; a complete transcription remains a development task.

Additional chronological anchors

A request dated November 10, 2002 records Steven at Level 2 and seeking Level 3 (P10, TB-B02-P001–P002). A family letter dated January 26, 2003 reports Level 4 (P11, TB-B06-P019). These help test the progression story without assuming exact approval dates.

A September 20, 2002 family letter asks about Jamaica flooding and power (P12, TB-B03-P035). It does not establish the remembered roof loss, identify a storm, or prove an outage at the facility.

Visual revision

V7 restores photographs supplied and identified as Tranquility Bay, with provenance still being established, and a facsimile of Steven's August 4 letter. Generated interiors, storyboards and graphs remain development references only. Invented handwriting and attributed quotations in older concepts are excluded from the current pitch.

Development route

The first ask is a producer conversation and a scoped counsel engagement. Lightbox publishes an ideas route. Story Syndicate, Concordia, Jigsaw and Campfire prohibit unsolicited material. The current outreach playbook records appropriate routes and drafts; no approaches have been sent.

COMPANION BOOK / OPTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

A life beyond the screen

The documentary follows a tightly bounded period and its present investigation. A companion memoir can give more space to childhood, family complexity and the years afterward. This is an outline for discussion, not a completed manuscript or a publishing commitment.

Proposed twelve-chapter outline

1. The binder today: deciding to open the record.
2. Before the island: earlier separations and school experiences.
3. The trip: Steven's understanding of the journey.
4. Learning the levels: what progress seemed to promise.
5. Letters home: reassurance, interpretation and what could be said.
6. August: anticipation of change.
7. The words under his name: revisiting the published article.
8. Outside the gates: what the adult later learns about contemporary scrutiny.
9. Leaving: establishing the actual departure record.
10. The next school: Army and Navy Academy and the transition that followed, subject to records.
11. Work and adulthood: Steven's account of rebuilding a life.
12. Choosing the record: what he shares and what remains his.

Interview method

Record Steven's language before drafting literary scenes. Mark remembered dialogue as recollection. Obtain dates from records where possible; keep uncertain dates visible. Family perspectives may disagree. No motive, diagnosis or resolution is supplied for another person.

Boundaries

The private architecture retains intimate childhood and health material. Its presence in the master archive is not approval for a book, a film or outreach. Steven can decide the scope of each interview and publication separately.