=== screen capturing

me screen capturing my writing.. hopefully to keep me on track

basically, this is a screen capture of my writing process.

the purpose is to keep me conscientious of what i'm doing. and to improve productivity

# === Fun

First, you must have fun. How do you have fun with writing? You can't just think, "Oh! I'm having so much fun writing!". At least it doesn't work like that for me. Instead, I want to have fun with the various subparts of writing fiction. These subparts are: description, characterization, and situation.

Stephen King said writing is (especially description) telepathy. You are giving a mental concept across the world through time. Description is telepathy. Characterization-characters is an advanced form of telepathy. Then there is situational-idea telepathy:

Situational telepathy derives from the oftentimes interaction of multiple telepathized objects and a knowledge of possible end-results and an intended emotional response to these end results (that hopefully you had while you wrote it).

Then there is mysteries-idea telepathy.

In all of this, the reader’s emotional response to all telepathy is vital.

This is what I think could be fun. The idea that I can telepathize across vast distances to another person. The "fun" is in being able to affect that person. Now, there are other parts of writing such as prose (lukeman) and editing but I don't find it that much fun...

The best way to know how my telepathy will impact other people is how it'll impact me. I am the first reader. Then, there is parth and chelsea (my alpha readers). Then, the world.

Reading is being telepathized. it is fun, too?

---

I’m afraid I don’t enjoy anything but playing games. But then, do most writers enjoy it? Probably not. I think there is a small few who call themselves a writer (but are they enjoying it) or are they more attached to the identity? I think they’re more attached to the identity. So am I.

Is fun about end results or the manner in which you play it? the end result that i desire is respect (in rtw- it's winning battles. in writing - it's having someone say wow that was awesome. in stocks - its having someone say , wow you're making a lot of money) . it also helps if you love playing games (rtw). but what is it about games that you enjoy? is it the sense that you can make decisions (compared to other people) on something that doesn't have extrinsic rewards (money, respect)? why don't you think of writing and all its decision making as a game? (your choice of writing prompt, your choice of characters and situations and mysteries). rtw, it's the decisions that are fun.. trying to attain a goal.... can't u haf that when writing situations (fighitng for it, being timed) about a character in danger? (only thru discovery).. or having fun from creating characters .. most of the fun is through the decision making (creating vast worlds that are above average)

I think, to love writing is to love the (calm) mood. You’re loving the composition mood. Liking this mood will prevent you from loving the gaming excitement mood.

## Fun is through good results.

Writing is tricky because you don’t have results until way after the piece, so you have to imagine the results while you’re writing it

YES, that is an AWESOME description and now my reader has this description in his head

YES, that is AWESOME character, now my reader is thinking about this character constantly. He/she is a msytery and is just cool to the reader

YES, that is an AWESOME situation, now my reader is really into the story because of not knowing what will happen (and he wants some favorable things to happen)

YES, that is an awesome mystery and my reader is so curious about it

YES, that is just awesome wonder

Added along with this, (I think it’s important for you) is the feeling that this isn’t essential, but it’s still good to achieve these goals.

## Other ways of fun

But, there are people who are in love with the process. How do you fall in love with the process? I don’t know! I guess you have to find out.

You have to be in love with it so much, that you want to do it all the time.

You want to be at the point where you want to fill up pages with it. Now, you have unlimited pages. (JUST FILL IT! DON’T WORRY ABOUT NOT PERFECT QUALITY)

What makes your writing good? Thinking and playing. More playing.

Segmentation, and everything else.

Remember, your ability to do strong segmentation (character, mystery, danger, ambition) is a little weak with your head, so just do cheap segmentation. The story is about character/mystery/danger/ambition generation

Not just character, but interesting character through mystery segmentation

Sometimes, you can do character through danger. Or character through ambition segmentation. Or just plain having characters have dialogue or do things, a pure character segmentation

When you do multi viewpoint, is it easier to do segmentation?

Your value as a writer is how well you do segmentation… how well you generate segments.

---

You used to love it because it’s high status, but now..?

## My understanding of fun from david weber

can you write something for people without moral responsibility (that you're good at?)

responsible decision makers unfortunately are more sympathetic. in order for you to achieve an unresponsible decision maker, you have to make him still sympathetic

use your best to persuade. understand distinctions. yet your basic job is still to entertain... ENTERTAIN, so give good situations! so have fun! write what you like! therefore, even if you are trading, you will still have fun! very easy to forget that when you're writing for work.

how to let the reader and u have fun: give them a situation where it'd be fun for them (strange and exciting viewpoint), the typical problem sympathy plot (danger), give them a lover (character). back when people sat and listened to storytellers, they listened for the human story , and also the excitement (danger), situations that they feel excited (want to be in or can think they'd be in), and characters

how to let yourself have fun : yes, you know the end and sorta what will happen, yet you still write to figure out what will happen to the character. you're still in the story at the present. the end is sorta known, but you don't really emphasize on it.

now, with this fun priority, you can totally utilize your own moral irrespnosibility and the that of others. you have your niche

# === the purpose of Telepathy

Most of the time, the telepathy will have blank effect on the reader. a blank telepathy is no good. It must do something, even if its later purpose is hidden. The reader must feel some emotion due to the telepathy. It is better to have a character that is either very liked by one half and hated by the other half than it is to have no impact whatsoever.

# === Be glad you live in an age of telepathy

You should be glad that you live in an age of great telepathic capability. The internet allows words and stories to be easily sent. No other time is there an equal. In past, you had to be in mass print inorder to Telepathize.

# === Training your telepathic powers

Description : practice imagining your own unique worlds and settings filled with items. practice telling them to other people. practice thinking of what type of emotional reaction these things can have

Characters : practice imagining characters. practice thinking what emotional reaction these things can have.

Situations and emotional reactions

Can you telepathize emotional reactions? no, it is innate. it can only be created as a reaction to telepathized objects and situations. However, it can be guided...

# === Whose theories should I follow and where should I follow them?

So... now that we've broken it down to description, characterization, and situation (many situations create a structure called plot structure); how will we attack each?

Well, in the past months, I've studied various authors, all of which are full time published authors. Each concentrate on some aspect of writing. I will list said authors now:

main tenets of:

Scott Meredith - plot

Noah Lukeman - prose, description

John Brown - plot, characterization

Brandon Sanderson - description, characterization, plot, revision

Stephen King - description/prose, characterization, situation, dialogue, revision, work habit, beta readers

George RR Martin - SEGMENTATION, viewpoint want to be, characterization, dialogue, work habits, orweilian description

# === Prose / Grammer

## Adverbs and Passive Voice

adverbs, passive-active verbs

active makes it so it isn't like someone is telling you about it because it hides the tell part - passive is blatant

active puts focus on what the subject is doing, whereas passive puts focus on what is done on the subject

## First Building Blocks

PARAGRAPH (culmination of 1st and 2nd level toolbox)

You will build a paragraph

at a time, constructing these of your vocabulary and

your knowledge of grammar and basic style. As long as you

stay level-on-the-level and shave even every door, you can build

whatever you like—whole mansions, if you have the energy.

## Sanderson’s orweilian

orweillian prose - making the story translucent (and not distracting) so you can see the story through the projector

stained glass prose - the glass modifies the view of the story; colorful language

# ===Description, setting

First and foremost, readers must understand the structure of the physical setting. Maybe not the colors, or the people, but how big, wide, shaped is the room?

It's amazing how readers are able to simulatenously read and create the setting in their minds.

It’s vital to create a physical setting immediately. not just with one line (what if the reader doen’t focus on that one line), but with continous bombardment. Not doing so will result in too much abstract concepts that don’t anchor with an actual physical setting. Abstract (even characterization) is just not good because people can’t imagine a physical setting for the movie set.

The actual physical setting is the foreground which all the other higher level concepts are built around. It’s just how humans think. Everything (including the higher level abstractions) is anchored in a physical setting.

So, brandon sanderson’s emphasize on writing concrete description is not true. What is true is that : you must write in such way that the reader has a concrete setting in mind. The description you write doesn’t have to be concrete, it just has to result in a concrete image.

## ==Stephen King

How would stephen king describe a setting? He'd do it in an authoritative and powerful way.

How? first, he would get the reader to focus on the importance of it. Probably by mentioning how it was important to certain "people".

Then, he would describe it. He would also fill it with easily imaginable characters.

The end result is that the place becomes very poignant in the reader's mind. His main purpose tho, is to get the reader to create the setting in his mind. The reader would imagine it himself.

## DESCRIPTION (King)

I just can’t

describe it!” If you want to be a successful writer, you must be

able to describe it, and in a way that will cause your reader to

prickle with recognition. If you can do this, you will be paid

for your labors, and deservedly so. If you can’t, you’re going

to collect a lot of rejection slips and perhaps explore a career

in the fascinating world of telemarketing.

Thin description leaves the reader feeling bewildered and

nearsighted. Overdescription buries him or her in details and

images. The trick is to find a happy medium. It’s also important

to know what to describe and what can be left alone

while you get on with your main job, which is telling a story.

For me, good description usually consists of a few wellchosen

details that will stand for everything else. In most

cases, these details will be the first ones that come to mind.

Certainly they will do for a start. If you decide later on that

you’d like to change, add, or delete, you can do so—it’s what

rewrite was invented for. But I think you will find that, in

most cases, your first visualized details will be the truest and

best. You should remember (and your reading will prove it

over and over again should you begin to doubt) that it’s as

easy to overdescribe as to underdescribe. Probably easier.

As with all other aspects of the narrative art, you will

improve with practice, but practice will never make you perfect.

Why should it? What fun would that be? And the

harder you try to be clear and simple, the more you will learn

about the complexity of our American dialect. It be slippery,

precious; aye, it be very slippery, indeed. Practice the art,

always reminding yourself that your job is to say what you

see, and then to get on with your story.

## Description (Sanderson)

big fat chunk to describe a setting or a big fat chunk for infodump is really bad. it can be done but almost never should be done. scott meredith: it stops the forward motion of the plot (solution: break it down)

Description: (editors are looking for this 1st big thing that will move you past the first page)

- shorter description, the better. (shorter holds reader attention. the longer, the more boring and difficult for the reader)(more energy consuming)

-concrete

- do more than one thing

- should use 5 senses more

- description and info dumps by itself is boring (unless they're concrete and short) (long sentences are more boring - and so are long paragraphs), try to split it up into chunks

- action (problem solving and problem recognition related to plot, is not boring) (or can long blocky paragraphs of this be boring still?)

### Learning curve

- to do your learning curve yet maintain reader interest, it's vital to do shorter description and less blocky (redistributing the learning curve later)(Dole out information only as it becomes necessary. Shorten and chop up large descriptions, and distribute it throughout as a couple of lines here and there instead of one big block of text.)

- maybe the reason why a large percentage of my readers fall off so quickly is because of the learning curve which they can't understand because they don't have the knowledge

-usually, the lower the learning curve, the better

- to better do this, assume the reader has child eyes

- yet at the same time, scifi/fantasy readers want to learn more

### Pyramid of abstraction (editors are looking for concrete- 2nd big thing)

-concreteness makes it focused on physical setting and details, which are essential like a movie. Abstract removes it and becomes more difficult and less anchored into the physical setting

-concrete details are very good. why? because they say more, in a better way than a massive infodump (and it works even better if you split it throughout the chapter)

-if possible, use words that bring tone, character (viewpoint character), concreteness, setting (world infodumps) inferences. increasing concrete correlates with character,tone,setting,conflict ?? (it really does. to get more tone,seting,character, it needs more concreteness (a specific object). and the effect is that you have a more impactful thing in your mind.

- the more concrete words you use, the more your reader becomes in tune with your character, to which you can start adding abstract words which will appear as character viewpoint

- however, in order to do concrete, you'll be forced to use more words (try to do it without using more words)

- senses besides sight make it more concrete

- concrete sentences are more heavy lifting. they do more (I think it’s because it takes less energy to read a concrete sentence than it is to read an abstract sentence). if you put them in as heavy lifting sentences (which are interesting in themselves) in little chunks rather than a big long description (without concrete words), it is much better.

- if you mix the infodump with the concrete, rather than a big infodump, then it is much more engaging

- it’s really true. Describing a physical setting pulls the reader in more, because anything abstract makes it difficult to imagine the stuff (unless it’s a viewpoint). You need to show the reader your world, which means you have to show the physical world, rather than ideas

### Summary

Summerize what you need to do: big chunks are bad. use small chunks well distributed with big heavy lifting concrete sentences that are short.with acknowledgement of learning curve. Concreteness is easy to read and more revealing of the physical world of your story (and this is good). Multipurposeness (5 senses, inferences to tone, mood, setting, character) does a lot of the characterization and setting detailing for you and this is good (this should be easy with stephen king’s honest viewpoint).

Shorter phrases requires less energy and thus if it does the same effect, it is more vibrant in the reader’s mind (quicker to get in there). More powerful.

So:

1. Non chunky
2. Short, powerful phrases
3. Concreteness
4. multipurposeness

### Fight Scenes

don't talk about fight scenes; show

blow by blow in books are not as fun

clarity is key - show the most,; most concrete; active; must show who got hurt, who didn't, who lived; no metaphors; who is where? blocking - 1 character just follow, and then let him see where everyone else is with one sentence. a fight sequence must follow one character - you want the character feeling confused , but not the reader

what fiction fight scenes can do

character's thoughts and emotions. feel like the character is doing. make the thoughts be more shows, during actions. (direct thoughts, rather than he thought - which is a character telling)

more flexibility on pacing. zoom in an hour of a minute

unlimited special effects (big guns; concrete sentences) use vocation metaphors

if u do this:

an experience of a mental state while they are in danger, rather than blow by blow

### you must describe

if the reader doesn’t understand the description or misunderstands, its better than no description. So describe

# === Characterization

## === CHARACTERS (grrm)

it truly is the characters that make us attract towards them. the problems gives immediately attraction when we're there, but the characters do it in the long term.

in this case, i'm going back to agot because i just like that little girl!

the longer the time , the more you have to build character (to build attachment in reader's head - natural attachment, such as sex sympathy, or others, are strong). use the time

do not underestimate the sympathy for little opposite sex protagonists with "nonopposite" sex strengths. they are.. different... thus powerful

gmmr identifies with people of nojealousy who are actually very good to characters (actually they are plots)

characterization needs to be done quickly, too, you need to find a ingenius way. thru their actions

why does arya and drago have so many hits? because their survival skills are intense. in precity times, they are the most capable of survival. our evolutionary likeness of them is intense because we are all nomads. women like drago (even men like drago). men like arya. drago is a sexual beast (actually see him fucking), so women like him

characters that can help you are the most attractive. value: ability to do things: intelligence, skills (proactivity: goal getting ability. )- sexual value: health and the previously mentioned values - ability to develop attachment to you, love capacity

you just cannot develope these types of characters in a space society.. the further you go from a precity society, the harder to create evolutionary attractive characters

it doesn’t have to be sex tho, it can be various personalities (liar, bad, good, honest, their own unique sexual strategy)

### === WHAT TYPE OF AMBITIONS? WHAT WANTS AND GOALS? WHAT DO CHARACTERS WANT AND WHAT DO READERS LIKE TO SEE?

i think the BIGGEST thing i learned from grrm is his focus on intersexual relations. i think he has come to the conclusion that everyone has a sexual strategy and it heavily involves a mate, so his stories/characters are focused on it, or maybe it's the most interesting - maybe it's the most interesting because it's what most people are interested too, because it exists in most people (all our thinking and wellbeing is connected to mating... so it really does make sense. when i masturbate, i become much less effective. thus it can be said that all the development prior is for sex).. it gives great goals tho..

sex, protection of children, alignment to a king (for sex and your own wellbeing), work

equally strong is the desire to be of use. and the desire for respect. people want that, and they will try to identify themselves into the viewpoints with those who have it in fiction. a forced becomming through desire for respect

summary: desire for love (love), desire for wellbeing of offspring (nurture), loyalty to a greater power and friendship, desire to be respected (for protection and wellbeing), desire to be of use and efficacy (work)

viewpoints that can attain this desire are ones coveted by readers to want to be (viewpoint-as-experiencers)

all i can say for the requirements for a viewpoint as-experiencer is that there are some basic desires and there are some sex specific desires, and of course, there are desires are stronger in some sexes. for instance, women want to be in the to-be-loved viewpointer more than men. men like the battle action viewpointer

central to all of this is the desire for achievement... of getting something positive... once gotten, in some people it can be thought of over and over again in a narcisistic way. selfpleasure. all of it is thought of in a pleasureable way based on desires fulfilled. so can we say its all a desire for pleasure?

i don't think it can be thought of as just pleasure. achieving these goals can feel pleasurable, but do we say - we're going for trying to achieve pleasure at its basic instinct? yes, but are we trying to achieve pleasure through pleasure? No

### ===On writing about sex:

Life is very full of sex, or should be. As much as I admire Tolkien — and I do, he was a giant of fantasy and a giant of literature, and I think he wrote a great book that will be read for many years — you do have to wonder where all those Hobbits came from, since you can't imagine Hobbits having sex, can you? Well, sex is an important part of who we are. It drives us, it motivates us, it makes us do sometimes very noble things and it makes us do sometimes incredibly stupid things. Leave it out, and you've got an incomplete world.

### === GRRM's style of attractive characterization and viewpoint want-to-be

i've learned that there are two types of sympathetic characters. viewpoint/experiencer characters and attractive characters.

a "viewpoint"/experiencer character's situation creates for the reader a desire to be that character. how is this desire cultivated? because the character is in a position to reach an evolutionary cultivated goal that the reader also likes (because the reader is an evolutionary person with a strategy) ie: some men want to a battle strategist, some women want to be a princess and loved by many men, some men want to have sex (touchy, male readers might be jealous of this man), some men want to be well respected for his inputs and efforts

an attractive character is one which the reader feels has attractive qualities. (ie: a male who fights very well. a woman that is especially beautiful. a male that is very dominant.) how this attractiveness is created can be from simple fluke or luck or an actual intention from the character's evolutionary strategy. (ie: he wants to be dominant to attract females. a young princess wants to be in control so a certain knight will like her)

notes: 1) a person that can reach evolutionary goals can be attractive to the opposite sex or even the same sex

2) throughout both processes, the evolutionary strategy is important. in the attractive character, an evolutionary strategy will make him more realistic (he's not just like that for no reason, but because he wants to). in the "viewpoint" character, the reader's evolutionary strategy makes him want to be the viewpoint character... to experience the good things that are happening to him/her

3) a character can become both an experiencer character (for one sex) and a attractive character (typically for the opposite sex)

4) in this light, it is often best to have a viewpoint character who sees attractive characters (an opposite mate)

5) attractive characters don't have to be sexually attractive. but sex attraction is a big thing in a reader's evolutionary strategy. likewise viewpoint-experiencers don't have to be reaching goals that are specific to a certain sex. (for instance, i want to be arya when she impresses other people... it's a certain feminineness about me)

6) women like to see men with wealth, social dominance, social intuition, humor, health, skills to reach them, strength. men like to see health, (for me, skills, intelligence), well bred genealougy (has socially important male relatives) and social standing,

### === I noticed all of GRRM’s male characters

all the handsome ones are really sadists! and cruel! except some like robb and jon... well there has to be some cruel characters or else there wouldn't be conflict

he likes these fatherish types of people, and good sons. but he doesn't like just sexy beasts mankillers (women like that).

then again, he couldn't have given the glorious lover to one of the nemisises, he had to give it to house stark

\*\* why do i keep thinking about these sexual stuff? cause i'm so sex centric, so i should write about sexual acts, too? i only think of it when i trade tho. maybe it's when my mind is most active... so an active mind reveals hidden sexual desires?

he has a distinct hatred of a normal super sexy guy. he just won't make one, probably because he himself is fat.

## CHARACTERIZATION (KING)

For me, what happens to characters as a story progresses

depends solely on what I discover about them as I go along—

how they grow, in other words.

i don't really know much about character. i just think of straight up people like me, who think they're funny

It’s also important to remember that no one is “the bad

guy” or “the best friend” or “the whore with a heart of gold”

in real life; in real life we each of us regard ourselves as the

main character, the protagonist, the big cheese; the camera is

on us, baby. If you can bring this attitude into your fiction, you may not find it easier to create brilliant characters, but it

will be harder for you to create the sort of one-dimensional

dopes that populate so much pop fiction. (they also have to coleate (most of the time) with grrm’s evolutionary sexual theory) --- happy digging

There is also a

wonderful third element: pure blue-sky imagination. This is

the part which allowed me to be a psychotic nurse for a little

while when I was writing Misery. And being Annie was not,

by and large, hard at all. In fact, it was sort of fun. I think

being Paul was harder. He was sane, I’m sane, no four days at

Disneyland there.

**My job (and yours, if**

**you decide this is a viable approach to storytelling) is to make**

**sure these fictional folks behave in ways that will both help**

**the story (situation, good characterization) and seem reasonable to us, given what we know**

**about them (and what we know about real life, of course).**

honest characters are more sympathetic and interestings

Summary: this truthfulness should be able to make real and interest the reader whereas less plotting decreases danger interest. We’ve covered some basic aspects of good storytelling, all of

which return to the same core ideas: that practice is invaluable

(and should feel good, really not like practice at all) and

that honesty is indispensable. Skills in description, dialogue,

and character development all boil down to seeing or hearing

clearly and then transcribing what you see or hear with equal

clarity

## =Combining GRRm and King

Original version: Combination of grrm and king in characterization is that once you have created an attractive character or a viewpoint want-to-be character, you must let them honestly become what they are (through ur honest knowledge of what they are) while keeping the situation interesting and themselves interesting (by editing objects – including them, but it’s a bit hard after you’ve already created them). King would say that these characters can be more sympathetic as runtime passes due to their own unique honest runtime, and you as the writer should try to make that happen by letting them run and letting them (and you) discover more (unravel) about themselves and through editing.

In other words: you honestly let your grrm sexuality theory parrallel characters run. This running using stephen king’s honesty lets become more real to the reader. You edit characters and things around them to sustain the situational interest and character interest (grrm’s sexuality theory). You also honest run the character according to grrm’s sexuality theory.

New version: Combination of grrm and king is: you are honest to the character and you honestly dig up personalities of the character (how? Using your own personality when you roleplay him – when you use your own personality, it can be quite a mess. Use their personality), and digging up new fresh characterizations and situations that will feel right when you know it is right according to your knowledge of grrm’s evolutionary/sexual interest theory (what makes attractive characters and what makes want-to-be characters) and situational interest. You’ll know it’s right when it satisfies this theory and if It feels in your heart that it is truly honest/connecting/looks-right with what the character is before.

You must think: your new char is a cardboard, so keep digging. “Who are you?”

---

Grrm’s emphasize on sex means that honestly thinking about characters means revealing their sexual dimensions with sexual strategies. (sex is a large prevalent in our lives, so it’s probably right to think that to be honest means thinking of their sex lives.)

Original version: Grrm’s emphasize on sex means that honest characters are sexual characters with sexual strategies. (sex is a large prevalent in our lives, so it’s probably right to think that to be honest means thinking of their sex lives.)

At first, the character is always a cardboard. But with honest thinking about the character, you will intuitively fill the character up and she’ll become something real to you. (king)

You use honesty to play him out knowing what she is and you use honesty to discover other personalities about her that you don’t know yet but which you are digging to find out. (king) You will know who she really is in your digging because that’s what she is. (how do you determine that’s what she is?) You’ll know when you dig up right – it feels interesting to the story. – INTENSE CHARACTERIZATION

This all must rest well with grrm’s sexuality theory.

## John Brown’s Interesting characters

1. Power

2. Ability

3. Extraordinariness

4. Beauty

5. Wish-fulfillment

6. Humor

7. Danger

8. Secrets

9. Surprise

10. Cast variety

## Sanderson’s Characters

Sympathetic characters (editors are looking for this 3rd big thing)

===

1. like us/ similar to us

2. Superman

characters can rank according to this scale and then change towards the right

Everyman ------->>>>>>> Superman

3. Expert at abilities

4. underdog

5. others like them

6. proactive - easy to do if you remember it. DON'T FORGET IT (why do ppl like proactive? because it denotes capability. high capability denotes that the person has value and can evolutionarily help the reader (provided he's nice too))

7. quirks

8. nice

9. depth - giving character an unique view on life. you want to do this without a big boring paragraph

u can haf a "parts that are low but it can change (type of story)" as long as other parts make her sympathetic

### SHOW, DON'T TELL

show, don't tell (information. you have to do this all the time.) showing pulls us into the story. telling pushes us out by giving us information that looks artificial

showing is more in-story , things are more real to them, the are more onboard because it feels more real

Remember the pyramid of abstraction: concrete details will keep you reader in the world of the story while abstract ones will push them out of it.

in a novel, you can have much more precision by showing (which takes longer)

we jsut have a nastural understanding of other ppl like thru dreams . girls kissing u while u fuck them

### CHARACTERS HAVE LIFE BEYOND THE PLOT - DEPTH

doing so, makes them less flat and fake. non-main characters that have concerns that has nothing to do with plot or main character is good. main character that has dreams and hopes (+random interests) before this big bad terrible plot derailed them is good. if the dreams and hopes intertwined (lead) to the big bad plot, great!

Inner light:

it is so humanizing, and passionate about different things, and conflict about different things that ppl love it.

YA loves romantic relationships - they are just discovering it, it's cool

i think i digged girls that don't like me. that's attractive. or just a coincidence, you dig every girl

problems are good, but the anxiety can be a bit (overdampening) for me. i might run away from that.

## Combining grrm, king, brown, and sanderson

Grrm’s sexual strategy theory and king’s honesty theory sorta make sanderson’s deph requirement obsolete. Sanderson’s show, don’t tell is still very powerful. However, grrm’s sexual strategy and sexual attraction characters sort of blend well with sanderson’s proactivity and other attributes (deneries)

When trying to create characters, think of three things:

1)honesty/realism (the character’s evolutionary strategy ie: sex/love work appreciation , respect, desire for happiness),

2)attractive characterization (what the character needs to be to gain attraction sympathy , often this is tied to evolutionary attraction. Even proactivity is an evolutionary concept. We tend to like characters who can get what they want, especially opposite sex (resourcefulness and power). We like same sex if they can help us),

3) want-to-be characterization (what the characters needs to be to gain experiencer viewpoint alignment).

A truth: when you look at young people, you realize that they are thinking about sex and that’s all they’re thinking about (especially men). When you create a female character, you must keep this in mind , like Eia (even after she dies). If men aren’t thinking about sex, they could be thinking about a guy. But only if the guy is a kind nice and capable guy

Look at me, I’m always thinking about sex. The only time I’m not thinking about sex is after I masturbate.

Also, I think about being “helpful to society” being respected, when my sex drive is hardest. So is even the elderly males. And so are the females I bet.

## Your own runtime construct of a character

### Superego,id

Do people really have two minds? One with more primitive desires, and the other focuses with maintain societal mores and inhibition? This makes it possible to create characters and how they deal with various proportions (that may vary per character) of the two minds.

The primitive mind can vary not just in intensity but in types of emotions. Some primitives are more fearful.

### Logical, emotional capacities and information

People and what inner/surface personality they are currently showing (which pretty much means the set of decisions they are currently making) depend on 3 things: logical and emotional capacities of their brain AND information. Just by altering the information intake of their current setting (and the information stored within their brain – ie: memory), you can surface a different temporary personality with the same emotional and logical capacities.

When you are roleplaying a character (writing a character – since you must roleplay and pretend to be that character in order to write their viewpoint), what you want to do is not only vary the informational intake and memory of the character, but also their logical and emotional capacities otherwise all of your characters would be acting with the same l and e but just with different information. This is very difficult to do for a character that has different (especially greater) logical and emotional capacities than you. It is easier to do for a character that has less.

For instance, it’s hard to do when you want to be a woman with female emotional capacities (especially attraction triggers – such as the female emotional response to a man of wealth). This means you have to have something that you do not have. The emotional capacity is not greater but different.

There is also the instance where an emotional capacity is far greater than you. Such as the empathy for other people.

Certain types of people can do things better because they don’t have certain capacities, such as the sociopath-train-fat-guy scenario.

# === Dialogue

it must follow the segmentation rule. each time someone speaks, the reader must wonder what will be said after. it doesn't have to be an exact mystery, but the general feeling that something interesting is about to happen must be there.

a typical segmentation:

"Tell me, is that you said when you killed Robert the bruce?"

...answers (recreates a new mystery)

## DIALOGUE: (king)

dialogue, which brings characters to life

through their speech.

Well-crafted dialogue will indicate if a character is smart

or dumb (Mistuh Butts isn’t necessarily a moron just because

he can’t say appetite; we must listen to him awhile longer

before making up our minds on that score), honest or dishonest,

amusing or an old sobersides. Good dialogue, such as

that written by George V. Higgins, Peter Straub, or Graham

Greene, is a delight to read; bad dialogue is deadly.

Your skills in this area can be improved, but, as a

great man once said (actually it was Clint Eastwood), “A

man’s got to know his limitations.”

i suck with dialogue. i can't tell the difference between those two. maybe subtlety in the second one

Elmore Leonard is capable of a kind of street poetry.

The skill necessary to write such dialogue comes from years

of practice; the art comes from a creative imagination which

is working hard and having fun.

As with all other aspects of fiction, the key to writing good

dialogue is honesty. And if you are honest about the words

coming out of your characters’ mouths, you’ll find that

you’ve let yourself in for a fair amount of criticism.

HONESTY

honesty in character motivation and thoughts. use intuition to let him be what he is. intuition as to what type of person is fun, and honesty to continue that trait

You must tell the truth if your dialogue is to have the resonance

and realism that Hart’s War, good story though it is, so

sadly lacks (unfortunately, you are so far out with dialogue that you can't tell how unreal hart's war's dialogue is)

If you

substitute “Oh sugar!” for “Oh shit!” because you’re thinking

about the Legion of Decency, you are breaking the

unspoken contract that exists between writer and reader—

your promise to express the truth of how people act and talk

through the medium of a made-up story.

## Combining grrm and king

Once again, you must combine segmentational dialogue with honest dialogue and characterization dialogue.

Dialogue serves 2 purposes: situation, and characterization. It is more revealing of characterization than anything else. Segmentation is not exactly situation, although it is often tied to it. Segmentation keeps the reader reading, either through situation (ambition wanting, or fear) or through mystery/curiosity. Segmenation can also be “the reader noticing this about the character’s personality”.

However, while doing this, you must be honest to the character and what he/she would say. This is sort of tricky, but I suppose you could edit the character at this point to get him to say things that are pro-segmentation.

Honesty/segmentation/characterization together is very easy to do at the beginning, but not later when the characters are more solid and has a defined history.

## Sanderson on Dialogue Readability

have - mary said - as early as possible. the reason being, if you put it late, they will gloss over the words and then read who said it and then go back to interpret the information (making them read twice), or they just read the words without knowing who said it and the context

if you really know how to write individuating dialogue, then ok. but err on the side of putting more because the brain interprets them really fast

1. don't use too many beats (beat: mary grimaced, ")

when people go to dialogue, they enter dialgoue mode, they only concentrate on the words spoken. don't interject movement or mannerisms or long thoughts LIKE bill baldwin until you break that dialogue mode with a couple of paragraphs

just use said, don't use "commented or screamed" asked is invidsible

you want people in interpreting mode. you want them going through the page rather than focusing on reading. don't distract them

# ===situation

People always get excited about ambition first. Ambition makes me excited. a sudden onset of problem does not. so i think it is best to have both.

First, let me describe ambition. Ambition is the state in which the reader wants to read because he wants to see if something good will happen to the character (the reader must think it is good, and so it is heavily dependent on the reader's evolutionary structure and his own ambitions). Problem is the state in which the reader wants to read because he fears something bad might happen and thus reads to see if it does happen to the character (also heavily dependent on his evolutionary structure). There is a slight case where the reader reads to see if something good will happen to a character that most people will think is bad. This is such a sadistic reader. Or maybe, the character is a bad character.

sexual situations just offer so much fantasy... it allows for great imagination for the reader (he might imagine himself with some young girl - arya)

mystery is always about a question of states. about the state of someone's past (who did it; the answer to a question about states). the state of certain things. the state of the future is also a mystery (who will do it). but the state of the future is also danger and ambition (what will happen to me?). It is my general view that mystery is a much broader question about the past and future than danger and ambition (which only concerns the self in the future tense; and in some ways, a past tense)

## NARRATION (KING)

I distrust plot for two reasons: first, because our lives are largely

plotless, even when you add in all our reasonable precautions

and careful planning; and second, because I believe plotting

and the spontaneity of real creation aren’t compatible.

No matter how good you are, no matter how much experience

you have, it’s probably impossible to get the entire fossil

out of the ground without a few breaks and losses. To get

even most of it, the shovel must give way to more delicate

tools: airhose, palm-pick, perhaps even a toothbrush. Plot is

a far bigger tool, the writer’s jackhammer. You can liberate a

fossil from hard ground with a jackhammer, no argument

there, but you know as well as I do that the jackhammer is

going to break almost as much stuff as it liberates. It’s clumsy,

mechanical, anticreative. Plot is, I think, the good writer’s last

resort and the dullard’s first choice. The story which results

from it is apt to feel artificial and labored. (he is saying that using without plot and using honesty makes everything non artificial - a true story)

I lean more heavily on intuition, and have been able to do

that because my books tend to be based on situation rather

than story. Some of the ideas which have produced those

books are more complex than others, but the majority start out

with the stark simplicity of a department store window display

or a waxwork tableau. I want to put a group of characters (perhaps

a pair; perhaps even just one) in some sort of predicament (problem, which is created)

and then watch them try to work themselves free. My job isn’t

to help them work their way free, or manipulate them to

safety—those are jobs which require the noisy jackhammer of

plot—but to watch what happens and then write it down.

good writing is without fear

The situation comes first. The characters—always flat and

unfeatured, to begin with—come next. Once these things are

fixed in my mind, I begin to narrate. I often have an idea of

what the outcome may be, but I have never demanded of a set of charactersthatthey do things my way. On the contrary, I

want them to do things their way. In some instances, the

outcome is what I visualized. In most, however, it’s something

I never expected. For a suspense novelist, this is a great thing.

I am, after all, not just the novel’s creator but its first reader.

And if I’m not able to guess with any accuracy how the

damned thing is going to turn out, even with my inside

knowledge of coming events, I can be pretty sure of keeping

the reader in a state of page-turning anxiety. And why worry

about the ending anyway? Why be such a control freak?

Sooner or later every story comes out somewhere.

And none of the story’s details and incidents proceeded from plot; they were organic,

each arising naturally from the initial situation, each an

uncovered part of the fossil. (his character development came from instinct - thinking what a character would do based on the situation and his original self, also based on instinct) instinct on what ppl will do or happen that will advance the story yet remain true and honest to people's natural qualities (SINCE PEOPLE THEMSELVES CANNOT CHANGE, THIS MEANS ADDING /DELETING/OR EDITING PEOPLE'S CHARACTERS AND NONPEOPLE WORLD) but don't get absorbed in to your theory , absorb steven king's theory of honesty

A strong enough situation renders the whole question of

plot moot, which is fine with me. The most interesting situations

can usually be expressed as a What-if question:

Please remember, however, that there is

a huge difference between story and plot. Story is honorable

and trustworthy; plot is shifty, and best kept under house

arrest. (story is the interesting situation, plot is the artificial outlining of what happens)

This isn’t a textbook, and so there aren’t a lot of exercises,

but I want to offer you one now, in case you feel that all this

talk about situation replacing plot is so much woolly-headed

bullshit. I am going to show you the location of a fossil. Your

job is to write five or six pages of unplotted narration concerning

this fossil. Put another way, I want you to dig for the

bones and see what they look like. I think you may be quite

surprised and delighted with the results. Ready? Here we go. (his idea of location of a fossil, which you must find through ADDING /DELETING/EDITING, is already an interesting situation)

Narrate this without plotting—let the situation and that

one unexpected inversion carry you along. I predict you will

succeed swimmingly . . . if, that is, you are honest about

how your characters speak and behave. Honesty in storytelling

makes up for a great many stylistic faults, as the work

of wooden-prose writers like Theodore Dreiser and Ayn Rand

shows, but lying is the great unrepairable fault. Liars prosper,

no question about it, but only in the grand sweep of things,

never down in the jungles of actual composition, where you

must take your objective one bloody word at a time. If you

begin to lie about what you know and feel while you’re down

there, everything falls down.

## Combining grrm and king

The question becomes: how do you produce awesome situations (ambition, fear, mystery/curiosities) with king’s natural flow method? You just keep editing characters and world objects and just let it naturally run until you get your first awesome situation , then you keep letting it run , and sometimes editing, until you get your next awesome situation. And you just keep doing this.

## John D Brown’s Suspense

fear, hope, anxiety in not knowing whether the fear will come true or the dissapation of this fear (hope) will come true, thus curiosity in wanting to know/read. we will also feel a second layer of hope/fear based on whether ourselves are able to find out (we hope that we will find out - 1 end result/ we fear that we will not - 1 end result)

this vital anxiety (emotional tension) is SUSPENSE

curiosity in wanting to know - is when reader is not so attached yet to sympathetic character

sympathy in wanting to know - when reader is very sympathetically attached to sympathetic character (through time or shared values or whatever)

based on:

fear and hope. how to get this? this uncertainty between fear and hope?

fear is based on a vital goal not being reached. hope is the belief that it can (due to an active protagonist). fear must be massive, but there could be a slight glimpse of hope. The fear is essential, it must be real and urgent(??). must get this goal/cannot get this goal

when readers read to see what happens to a character they care about, they wonder how the character will solve the fear. there is innate hope/ desired hope

but in order for hope to be there, there must be fear. fear . fear.

without hope, there is no uncertainty. if you know a bad thing will happen absolutely, then there's no reason to watch a protagonist. Fortunately, a proactive protagonist always delineates a slight possibility of hope, however small, which gives a reader a reason to watch. Hope never dies. As long as a protagonist can do SOMETHING (however futile), there is hope.

when it gets to the ending, this hope should be small, but the fear ought to be big, but the hope will be threre, through desired hope (which creates a agonizing disparity in predicted results, thus suspense) it's always more interesting to have a bigger problem (bigger disparity). but utlimatums where the disparity is more and more realistic is good too

Nah! hope can be there. but it's not vital. all of the anxiety is in fear and worrying if that fear will become reality

what readers are reading is mostly based on this expected thing with various bad/good results (some of which can be positive, or negative) and they are reading to see a result in the direction of the positive. that's where hope and fear come in. you can have fear. or even nothing. and then you will have hope which is loooking for a more positive result (in this sense, there is innate hope, even if the situation looks hopeless)

proof: "gosh, i hope kid x is ok with that wolf around"

- there is innate hope from him cheering

-another way to get sympathetic attention, imagine yourself in the character's shoes. imagining what you need (physical, actionwise) in order to make a story

this desire for good expectation in the light of likely bad expectation only occurs when reader sides with character.

there will not be a disparatity between the desire for good expectation and the belief in likely bad expectation if the bad expectation doesn't occur

by saying " there was lkong moment of silence" you are telling.

by saying "a moment of silence occured" you are showing something that is happening

3 types of hope/fears

danger/threat

lack/opportunity (which is sorta like grrm’s ambition)

mystery

in all cases, there are two hope/fears. hope/fear because of the divergent possible end-results, and hope/fear to know

EXCEPTION: in the case of mystery, the desire to know comes from that... but i don't think there is a hope/fear from mystery. it's a completely different mechanism that creates a desire to know/read

in the mystery, your curiosity stems from wanting to know the answer that the character wants to know

COUNTER-EXCEPTION: we hope the character finds out because we want to find out. and we ffear he doesn't. hope and fear is still here. if the character finds out, he will not be more content, but he will know. our curiosity here, like in 1/2, will be satisfied

make it hard and unpredictable

hard by

1.Probable

2. Immediate

3. Significant

4. Specific

unpredictable by : new surprises and changes, by having some hope (maybe just innate), or if it's naturally hard to predict

As we’ve seen, what the audience hopes for and what the characters hope for need not be the same thing. The same is true of our fears versus their fears. But how do hope and fear fit into the scheme of storytelling? Hope and fear are about the future. They derive from uncertainty about future events in the story, future decisions the characters might make, future discoveries or revelations that might be unearthed, future outside forces and how they will influence the journey of the characters. When we discuss hope versus fear in dramaturgical terms, this uncertainty is a function solely of the audience and its experience [my emphasis]. This is dramatic tension. We hope the man with the cobra in the shoe box won’t open the box; we fear he might and get himself or someone else bitten. We don’t know what will happen, but we know what might happen and therefore feel tension about those possibilities” (How to Build a Great Screenplay, 52).

===

### be clear on what the problem is, why it's important/blocky to the character's goals

worry is belief in negative result for a person that the reader has so intensely sided with that he is innately looking for hope

===

### make the problem hard to solve by disadvantages

- time limit

- character flaws (can be "virtues" that are flaws for that specific problem) or skill disadvantages

- lack of knowledge

the purpose is to create an underdog

===

### Part 12 – Make the problem hard to solve with conflict

Conflict with the opposition

Your character will have points of conflict with the opposition. That’s a given. The smarter and more powerful the opposition, the harder the problem is to solve, the more the reader can worry, and the bigger the triumph at the end. So you want to make your opposition character and team a real threat.

The best way I’ve found to do this is to play the story as one-man chess, thinking not just about the hero, but about the opposition as well. The hero is, for the opposition, a problem. And so I’ve found it very productive to develop the opposition’s goal, motives, and plan. So the hero makes a move, then I turn the table and ask: what cunning/smart/scary reactions might this opposition character have to what the hero just did? Back and forth I go, letting both characters act with as much intelligence and cunning as they possess.

Remember, the better the opposition, the more tension the reader will feel because a formidable opponent increases the chances in the reader’s mind that the hero will fail.

Conflict with the other good guys

Conflict with bit characters

Conflict with the setting

Conflict with self

===

Part 13 – Make the problem hard to solve with growing troubles & surprise

===

o Part 14 – Put your plot together with the story cycle

o Part 15 – Story cycle action and trouble

o Part 16 – The story cycle’s dynamo (and a little Hitchcock)

## Sanderson’s Plot

plotting:

3 act format

act 1 - intro/reaction

time to try to tackle the problem

act 2 - escalation /tries but makes things worse

absolute worst moment

act 3 - climax / pulls it out of the hat (or fails)

try/fail cycles - 2 fails minimum, 3 foreshadows (showing the object that's important to the plot) for every plot point

both of them want tension to be high. you want things to escalate. basic plotting methodology is that things get worse

heroes journey - ignorant hero -> impact character -> call to arms -> impact carrier leaves ->god's helpping-> descent into underworld/belly of the whale -> transofmration -> moment of decision -> detonement -> defeat evil -> return in wisdom

you don't have to put them in. you would be using something used to describe a story to write a story, rather than use it to inform you on writing your own story

brandon sanderson's plotting method:

PROGRESSION - the feeling that you are getting somewhere, thus you should keep reading to continue going to that destination - a sense of motion. sanderson says it's up to the writer and skills to give clues so that the reader feels this feeling (even if the story is moving through 30,000 years)

mystery - > getting to the answer

travalogue -> getting to the final destination

relationship -> two characters (will they become friends/mates?)

big problem -> solving this big problem (the subproblems and attacking them is conducive to progression feeling)

time bomb -> the end (progression is felt because you're getting to the end)

slice of life -> progression??

for each, find ways that are conducive to getting this progression feeling combine with escalation

thriller plotting -

use chapters to yank you through the story

end story with a hook, begin chapter with hook

a question at the end... and then the new chapter sorta answers it but gives a new question

he's doing epic pacing

long meaty chunk

at the end you take a break and relax, put it down if you want to (the end has low conflict)

## gardner’s plotting vs architect’s plotting

gardener writers do not just don’t plot. They do plot, but in a much more immediate tense than a architech, who plots the whole novel. Their range in plotting is much closer to the current story point. They are much centered on well continuity between each successive state in the runtime model. An architect who plots far cannot maintain the state-state continuity as well. in the novel called second life, I may very well not know how it ends, but I’ll have various loose ideas as to how the situation is near the ending

# === Emotional Response

you will writing to 1000 people, so you want a good similar response. (how can you not go for a liked similar response? it won't work that way) so what you want is a same reaction from all of them. in order to do that, you really have to write to racial/gender specific reactions. thus, deep seated evolutionarily wired emotions \*\*you will be writing to so many people. what you need to do then is to evoke race and gender specific emotions. it does exist, and you need to find out what\*\* what is true is that we are dealing with ingrained human emotional responses. that's the only thing you can evoke that will matter. a humaned general audience wide emotional response that is typical to all of humanity. because that's what you're doing, writing to all of humanity.

to write in only one way (conflict-plot) would devoid you of evoking the numerous other emotional responses

so do things that will evoke emotional responses. love, betrayal, loyalty, seeing other people die

King:

You can’t please (evoke desired emotions)

all of the readers all of the time; you can’t please even some of

the readers all of the time, but you really ought to try to

please at least some of the readers some of the time.

# === Segmentation

All of this, when done properly, results in segmentation. Your reader becomes glued to the story through your properly designed segments that have an intended thought reaction for the reader to WANT to continue reading (often emotional – curiosity, fear, ambition (ie: wanting something good to happen that feels good for the reader either because he’s tied to the character’s vp, or he wishes the character well), how he’s tied to the char’s vp is often through ambition).

**Grrm** has reader thinking divided into segments - for instance, a segment of writing there should be doing this and this to the reader - the reader should be thinking this and this at this segment

in the prologue alone - he had first curiosity segment (are there really that many dead people there?) he then had danger segment (a guy being attacked) then he had surprise danger segment (viewpoint being attacked). before the danger segments, he had "feeling" danger segments

along with this, he had good characterization of the first guy (a really upnosed low compassion weak character person) and the other two. and he had excellent description - orwellian description that allows us to see a stage.

You absolutely must divide your reader into segments. if you don't, what will your reader be doing? what do you expect him to be doing? you have to do something to get him to think this way or that. every word (no.. paragraph/idea) should have an expected result. each work you do should have an intended reward which the reader inputs his work to get, or else he'll stop reading. make sure his work is low, and his reward (curiosity,fear, thinking of a character, seeing a description) is high

YOU must think of what the reader is thinking

the more subtler you get, the more you focus on the subtlies in what he's thinking by the impact of your subtler words (interlayers of different concepts)

if you don't do this, you are going random. that doesn't work most of the time

what do you get them to think - a want to know... step by step want to know segments

how do you do that? character, ambitions and problems (conflict), mystery (especially when there's moral and logical reason and the viewpoint character benefits from it)

make sure almost every segment does characterization, except the serious problem ones

# ===After Segmentation

After the reader puts the book down, here you can also plan what they think about it. It’s so much harder to do. it’s much more based on the reader’s personality and how he/she rethinks about what he/she read. Maybe he’ll imagine himself as one of the characters, or being a character’s situation. How do you get him to do this? Well, insert ways to get him imagine. Perhaps, add a pretty lady into the scene. Or a hot guy. Or put “what-if” creators, by adding scenes that a character didn’t do that the reader may later imagine he/she did.

For instance, sansa should have gone with sanko but she didn’t. She should have. And I imagine that. Or I imagine what I would do as a just king. Again, this goes back to our own unique ambitions and the whole viewpoint want-to-be desires. The want-to-do actions doesn’t have to happen, readers can just imagine themselves in that position to make it happen.

So much harder.

At this point, attractive characters and character want-to-bes become much more powerful.

# === how

## === HOW TO DO THIS?

your digging is for (desire to read forward- to see) thru curiosity -mystery, seeing ambitions met, conflict - for character - and for orweilien description

son of a bitch, i got hooked.

wow interesting characters, goals and ambitions.

he does create suspense by letting people wanting to see something good

the main character has a good goal (protector of the realm) but suddenly, we see an obstacle.. grrm gives us the goal, then denies us it

have people that can easily turn against each other, that is the way to create conflict

to do it well, you must be a surveyor of people. these chess pieces can only be played well when you understand them

different people, different professions

they're not gonna kill him are they, no they aren't, no they are

people will believe in magic only if it suits them (they must want to). so only bring in hard to belief things during

to use only sex sympathy is for the coarse and brute (david weber). it doesn't mean ti can't be used, but other methods are available

viewpoint moral and thought alignment. character attractiveness. conflict.

the only thign that can hook ppl immediately without character or conflict is conflict. it's the immediate hook. characters take longer time to develope attachment and is a longer hook (gets ppl back to story when they are away)

## ===single viewpoint vs multiviewpoint

multiviewpoint allows for more segmentation opportunities - should you always go this way? no, if you can do it with one viewpoint, then great!

## === Internal situation of the novel: World runtime theory

what is good, is knowing how to runtime objects especially ppl, and how to pick what types of objects. the only way to do it is to understand what you make and let them run by themselves. let them show themselves through paper

### Sanderson on Setting

setting:

writing a good book is making promises and fulfilling it

put all your cool ideas in your first book, not the second (duh) why wait, and the people who read your first one will hate the second because that's not what they wanted

if you haf to suck somewhere in plot/character/setting, let it be setting. yet setting is what defines our genre! (some, but not romance)

setting can be thought of as a character

- personality

-existed before plot and character

- things not related to pc

- quirks

-"flaws" things that are harder for people

- "strengths" things that are easier for people

layers of setting:

world

nations -

governments, religion, gender roles/rlations, mores, offensive ethics language, economics, tech, warfare, family strucuture

local setting

First law of magic

how well explained and how well the reader understands the rule, the more satisfying is the solution when a magic rule is used. the less explained, the more "wonder" there is

second law

-limitations are far more interesting for plot reasons

-abilities are interesting for sympathetic character reasons

## ==== HOW TO COMBINE GRRM AND STEPHEN KING

use (OBJECTS THEMSELVES CANNOT CHANGE, THIS MEANS ADDING /DELETING/OR EDITING PEOPLE'S CHARACTERS AND NONPEOPLE WORLD) method to satisfy SEGMENTATION, LIFE GOALS, and CHARACTERS requirements

while king wants your characters to HONESTLY tell the story THEIR way (and oftentimes not doing what you expected or planned them to do), you can still edit and change the characters and nonliving objects to push it towards GRRM's requirements

3) discovery writing is more congruent to states .. you just can't do it with plotting (can't get the states to be so connected to each other). -is there an exception? 1) using state editing and editing thinking and chance (2), you can create a runtime that is good to story (has good "want to see" elements - mystery, conflict, ambitions, etc). 4) grrm and king do not have a big all out escalation at the end. instead, the "want to see next segment" desire of the reader is cultivated throughout the story equally. it really is a discovery little by little piece, with some climax at the end

stephen king would say that when you have solid states, you should them let the runtime occur that could surprise even you.

i'm soo bored... best dive into stories. yet i don't want to read them. i want to tell them. a storyteller is a storyreader with a big ego. a successful storyteller is one with an understanding of the reader. it's a skill that can be learned. you may have to work very hard on it... since you are already dumb.

it is very exciting to have interesting characters (sometimes made for each other) and see how they interact. will i ever be able to replicate the curiosity created by a possible arya-lannister grandpa interaction?

## === work habits (grrm)

write

finish

market it

refrain from rewriting after rejection, except on editorial order

start with short fiction... but i think the skill can be created by writing long fiction too

keep your day job. you will rarely be able to support yourself

### === reading habits and writing (king)

So we read to experience the mediocre and the outright rotten;

such experience helps us to recognize those things when

they begin to creep into our own work, and to steer clear of

them. We also read in order to measure ourselves against the

good and the great, to get a sense of all that can be done. And

we read in order to experience different styles.

Reading at meals is considered rude in polite society, but if

you expect to succeed as a writer, rudeness should be the

second-to-least of your concerns. The least of all should be

polite society and what it expects. If you intend to write as

truthfully as you can, your days as a member of polite society

are numbered, anyway.

I knew, not because Owen stopped practicing, but because

he was practicing only during the periods Mr. Bowie had set

for him: half an hour after school four days a week, plus an

hour on the weekends. And as soon as his practice time was over, it was back into the

case with the horn, and there it stayed until the next lesson or

What this suggested to me was that when it

came to the sax and my son, there was never going to be any

real play-time; it was all going to be rehearsal. That’s no

good. If there’s no joy in it, it’s just no good. It’s best to go on

to some other area, where the deposits of talent may be richer

and the fun quotient higher.

Talent renders the whole idea of rehearsal meaningless;

when you find something at which you are talented, you do

it (whatever it is) until your fingers bleed or your eyes are

ready to fall out of your head. Even when no one is listening

(or reading, or watching), every outing is a bravura performance,

because you as the creator are happy. Perhaps even

ecstatic. That goes for reading and writing as well as for playing

a musical instrument, hitting a baseball, or running the

four-forty. The sort of strenuous reading and writing program

I advocate—four to six hours a day, every day—will

not seem strenuous if you really enjoy doing these things and

have an aptitude for them;

The real importance of reading is that it creates an ease

and intimacy with the process of writing; one comes to the

country of the writer with one’s papers and identification

pretty much in order. Constant reading will pull you into a

place (a mind-set, if you like the phrase) where you can write

eagerly and without self-consciousness. It also offers you a

constantly growing knowledge of what has been done and

what hasn’t, what is trite and what is fresh, what works and

what just lies there dying (or dead) on the page. The more

you read, the less apt you are to make a fool of yourself with

your pen or word processor.

My own schedule is pretty clear-cut. Mornings belong to

whatever is new—the current composition. Afternoons are

for naps and letters. Evenings are for reading, family, Red Sox

games on TV, and any revisions that just cannot wait. Basically,

mornings are my prime writing time.

Once I start work on a project, I don’t stop and I don’t

slow down unless I absolutely have to. If I don’t write every

day, the characters begin to stale off in my mind—they begin

to seem like characters instead of real people. The tale’s narrative

cutting edge starts to rust and I begin to lose my hold on

the story’s plot and pace. Worst of all, the excitement of

spinning something new begins to fade. The work starts to feel

like work, and for most writers that is the smooch of death.

Writing is at its best—always, always, always—when it is a

kind of inspired play for the writer. I can write in cold blood

if I have to, but I like it best when it’s fresh and almost too

hot to handle.

I like to get ten pages a day, which amounts to 2,000

words. That’s 180,000 words over a three-month span, a

goodish length for a book—something in which the reader

can get happily lost, if the tale is done well and stays fresh.

On some days those ten pages come easily; I’m up and out

and doing errands by eleven-thirty in the morning, perky as

a rat in liverwurst. More frequently, as I grow older, I find

myself eating lunch at my desk and finishing the day’s work

around one-thirty in the afternoon. Sometimes, when the

words come hard, I’m still fiddling around at teatime. Either

way is fine with me, but only under dire circumstances do I

allow myself to shut down before I get my 2,000 words.

When you write,

you want to get rid of the world, do you not? Of course you

do. When you’re writing, you’re creating your own worlds.

I think we’re actually talking about creative sleep. Like your

bedroom, your writing room should be private, a place where you go to dream. Your schedule—in at about the same time

every day, out when your thousand words are on paper or

disk—exists in order to habituate yourself, to make yourself

ready to dream just as you make yourself ready to sleep by

going to bed at roughly the same time each night and following

the same ritual as you go. In both writing and sleeping,

we learn to be physically still at the same time we are encouraging

our minds to unlock from the humdrum rational thinking

of our daytime lives. And as your mind and body grow

accustomed to a certain amount of sleep each night—six

hours, seven, maybe the recommended eight—so can you train

your waking mind to sleep creatively and work out the vividly

imagined waking dreams which are successful works of fiction.

What are you going to write about?

And the equally big answer: Anything you damn well want.

Anything at all . . . as long as you tell the truth.

Write what you like, then imbue it with life and make it

unique by blending in your own personal knowledge of life,

friendship, relationships, sex, and work. Especially work. People

love to read about work.

And—

here’s the good part—this is a world impossible not to believe.

Grisham has been there, spied out the land and the enemy

positions, and brought back a full report. He told the truth

of what he knew, and for that if nothing else, he deservesevery buck The Firm made.

You as a beginning writer

would do well not to imitate the lawyers-in-trouble genre

Grisham seems to have created but to emulate Grisham’s

openness and inability to do anything other than get right to

the point.

### ===Grrm’s writing schedule

I get up every day and work in the morning. I have my coffee and get to work. On good days I look up and it's dark outside and the whole day has gone by and I don't know where it's gone. But there's bad days, too. Where I struggle and sweat and a half hour creeps by and I've written three words. And half a day creeps by and I've written a sentence and a half and then I quit for the day and play computer games. You know, sometimes you eat the bear and sometimes the bear eats you. [Laughs]

### Paolini’s advice:

2 things that aspiring writers neglect:

the importance of consistence. writing even when you aren't inspired. when you're in hospital, you need to be writing. really easy to procrastinate

importance of editing - learn more from editing, than ever writing - coming from someone who spend 13 years on 4 novels.

## 2ND DRAFT (king)

Wait 3 months. prepare to face your soul twin's work. don't attack it immediately, you're not shakespeare and love your work

For me, the most glaring errors I find on the re-read have

to do with character motivation (related to character development

but not quite the same). I’ll smack myself upside the

head with the heel of my palm, then grab my legal pad and

write something like p. 91: Sandy Hunter filches a buck

from Shirley’s stash in the dispatch office. Why? God’s

sake, Sandy would NEVER do anything like this! I also

mark the page in the manuscript with a big symbol,

meaning that cuts and/or changes are needed on this page,

and reminding myself to check my notes for the exact details

if I don’t remember them.

I love this part of the process (well, I love all the parts of

the process, but this one is especially nice) because I’m rediscovering

my own book, and usually liking it. That changes.

By the time a book is actually in print, I’ve been over it a

dozen times or more, can quote whole passages, and only

During that reading, the top part of my mind is concentrating

on story and toolbox concerns: knocking out pronouns

with unclear antecedents (I hate and mistrust

pronouns, every one of them as slippery as a fly-by-night personal-

injury lawyer), adding clarifying phrases where they

seem necessary, and of course, deleting all the adverbs I can

bear to part with (never all of them; never enough).

Underneath, however, I’m asking myself the Big Questions.

The biggest: Is this story coherent? And if it is, what

will turn coherence into a song? What are the recurring elements?

Do they entwine and make a theme? I’m asking

myself What’s it all about, Stevie, in other words, and what I

can do to make those underlying concerns even clearer.

What I want most of all is resonance, something that will

linger for a little while in Constant Reader’s mind (and heart)

## On tightening a finished novel (grrm):

[After A Dance With Dragons was completed] I did my sweat. That's a technique I learned in Hollywood, where my scripts were always too long. "This is too long," the studio would say. "Trim it by eight pages." But I hated to lose any good stuff — scenes, dialogue exchanges, bits of action — so instead I would go through the script trimming and tightening line by line and word by word, cutting out the fat and leaving the muscle. I found the process so valuable that I've done the same with all my books since leaving LA. It's the last stage of the process. Finish the book, then go through it, cutting, cutting, cutting. It produces a tighter, stronger text, I feel. In the case of A DANCE WITH DRAGONS, my sweat — most of it performed after we announced the book's publication date but before I delivered the final chapters — brought the page count down almost eighty pages all by itself.

## BETA READERS (king)

Most of all, I’m looking

for what I meant, because in the second draft I’ll want to

add scenes and incidents that reinforce that meaning. I’ll also

want to delete stuff that goes in other directions.

Someone—I can’t remember who, for the life of me—

once wrote that all novels are really letters aimed at one person.

As it happens, I believe this. I think that every novelist

has a single ideal reader; that at various points during the

composition of a story, the writer is thinking, “I wonder what

he/she will think when he/she reads this part?” For me that

first reader is my wife, Tabitha.

JA

Do all opinions weigh the same? Not for me. In the end I

listen most closely to Tabby, because she’s the one I write for,

the one I want to wow. If you’re writing primarily for one

person besides yourself, I’d advise you to pay very close

attention to that person’s opinion (I know one fellow who

says he writes mostly for someone who’s been dead fifteen

years, but the majority of us aren’t in that position). And if

what you hear makes sense, then make the changes. You

can’t let the whole world into your story, but you can let in

the ones that matter the most. And you should.

You’ll find yourself

bending the story even before Ideal Reader glimpses so much

as the first sentence. I.R. will help you get outside yourself a

little, to actually read your work in progress as an audience

would while you’re still working. This is perhaps the best

way of all to make sure you stick to story, a way of playing to

the audience even while there’s no audience there and you’re

totally in charge.

(having the right type of ideal reading is important) an independent one, who will tell the truth

fuck this, i'm writing for parth. all women just fall away when i say something stupid. well i think if parth is too impatient to read (and just not the reader sort), i should give it to my sister

The Rewrite Formula probably wasn’t the only reason I

started to get some results; I suspect another was that it was

just my time, coming around at last (sort of like Yeats’s rough

beast). Still, the Formula was surely part of it. Before the Formula,

if I produced a story that was four thousand words or so

in first draft, it was apt to be five thousand in second (some

writers are taker-outers; I’m afraid I’ve always been a natural

putter-inner). After the Formula, that changed. Even today I

will aim for a second-draft length of thirty-six hundred words

if the first draft of a story ran four thousand

Your Ideal Reader can be of tremendous help when it

comes to figuring out how well you did with the back story

and how much you should add or subtract on your next

draft. You need to listen very carefully to the things I.R.

didn’t understand, and then ask yourself if you understand

them. If you do and just didn’t put those parts across, your

job on the second draft is to clarify. If you don’t—if the parts

of the back story your Ideal Reader queried are hazy to you, as well—then you need to think a lot more carefully about

the past events that cast a light on your characters’ present

behavior.

IR is good for pacing. when the event movement is too slow (too much filler) or too fast

It turned out

that Tabby was right—as soon as I saw it in print, I knew.

Three million people or so have read Bag of Bones, I’ve gotten

at least four thousand letters concerning it, and so far not a

single one has said, “Hey, turkey! What was Mike doing for

community-service work during the year he couldn’t write?”

## Sanderson’s Editing process

1.0 pure go through with no deleting (only notes on what to do during revision

2.0 revision using the notes; fix all the major continuity problems

--- small gap

3.0 polish, better grammer, more powerful description, cut 10%

send out to alpha readers

--- big gap 6 months

4.0 incorporate alpha's suggestions and ur own reflections (6 months allow you to think of fundamental changes) - sometimes you worry about things that aren't real, but soemtimes you do need to worry because they are true worries

5.0 Second polish (cleaning up the language, dialogue, viewpoints are strong)

[Send to betas, fans etc. - not the same people as alphas - plus editor]

6.0 Last fixes

7.0, 8.0: copy edit and proofreads (polishes)

alpha readers differ from beta in that betas will say they're bored while alpha readers will realize what's the true cause of boringness (this characer is static) and will know how to fix it

# ===THEME (king)

Your job during or just after the first draft is to decide what something

or somethings yours is about. Your job in the second draft—

one of them, anyway—is to make that something even more

clear. This may necessitate some big changes and revisions.

The benefits to you and your reader will be clearer focus and

a more unified story. It hardly ever fails.

in a novel, you're going to have difficulty having plot (suspense conflict) the whole way. thank god for this honesty stuff and discover plots (suspsense conflicts)

honest narration of characters is interesting hopefully than plotted (despite more conflict) . it will add to realism and thus sympathy ( and perhaps plot) but will it add to plot - realism element?

stephen king's novels don't work on tv because it lacks his voice. tv wants conflict

And I repeat: no big deal. These are just interests which

have grown out of my life and thought, out of my experi-ences as a boy and a man, out of my roles as a husband, a

father, a writer, and a lover. They are questions that occupy

my mind when I turn out the lights for the night and I’m

alone with myself, looking up into the darkness with one

hand tucked beneath the pillow.

I should close this little sermonette with a word of warning—

starting with the questions and thematic concerns is a

recipe for bad fiction. Good fiction always begins with story

and progresses to theme; it almost never begins with theme

and progresses to story. The only possible exceptions to this

rule that I can think of are allegories like George Orwell’s

Animal Farm (and I have a sneaking suspicion that with Animal

Farm the story idea may indeed have come first; if I see

Orwell in the afterlife, I mean to ask him).

But once your basic story is on paper, you need to think

about what it means and enrich your following drafts with

your conclusions. To do less is to rob your work (and eventually

your readers) of the vision that makes each tale you write

uniquely your own.

# Tackling Editors and Agents

query letters

1000 - query letter

100 -2-3 chapters (description, characterization)

10 - full manuscript (plot)

1 - buying the manuscript

it can be done!

2-3 chapters and full manuscript, the stuff are sorta together

editor's full manuscript (plot):

# SELF PUBLISHING

if you can: 1. like doing it all yourself, editing, cover

2. platform/market

3. don't mind the smaller shelf space

if you are gonna do selfpulbishing

1. cover

2. editing

3. layout

4. upload

if you neglect publishers, you don't get the crucial co opt space. co opt space is 2nd to word of mouth. co op space puts the book in front of reader's eyes

then do this!

# Last Comments (sanderson)

It's all about fun. it's all about entertainment. it’s all about people sitting on their butt doing nothing (lazily) but worrying the heck and having huge mental exercises due to reading your stuff

# What You Must Do

1. **You must dig for characterization: thinking of attractive quality characters (and high justice/moral characters), thinking of view-to-be characters in light of an evolutionary/sex male/female reader. All these characters must be real and honest according to the same evolutionary/sex theory. (they don’t have to be for attraction), but when they are, it creates identity(viewpoint want to be) understanding and realism**
2. **You must force your viewpoint characters to enter interesting situations (fear, ambition, mystery) through segmentation. Dialogue is a special vehecle for interesting situations.**
3. **You must do this with good clear not overdone not underdone *orweillian*? description filled with a) terse words b) concrete words c)multipurpose words (5 senses, evoke character, setting,tone) d) nonblocky**
4. **You must use segmentation to evoke character and situation and description?. Note: oftentimes segments will overlap.**
5. **You must consider how the reader will think about your characters and situations while he isn’t reading.**
6. You must finish. Finishing is important.
7. Editing/Beta Readers

Even if it’s hard, this is what you must do. This is what every writer who wants to be published must do. And what every writer that has been published has done.

## A different way to think of it

Old methodology: Use bs’s viewpoint and description as the cone. Grrm’s character sexuality and evolution and the picking of certain characters within the evolutionary strand as the point. King’s honesty on how the cone and the point is constructed and run. Your knowledge and conjecture on character runtime also on how characters are constructed (picked for the reader) and run. Your segmentation on how it is viewed and pretty much everything. Scott meredith’s plot as what’s going around. And SM’s schedule and no-first-draftness on how its worked. Also playtime on how its done, too.

New methodology: Use BS’s viewpoint and description as the cone (description). Grrm’s character evolution and sexuality combined with your own runtime methodology in selecting what the point is and how its run (CHARACTER AND CHARACTER RUNTIME). Use king’s honesty to help you with runtime. Use scott meredith’s plot as a guideline as to what’s going on around and inside the character in terms of situation (situation). Runtime is sorta mixed with situation. (your selection will be based on how c and r combine with situation) Then do your segments on how this runtime is viewed. Then SM’s schedule and your own playtime.

Two types of sympathy. Situation sympathy, and innate sympathy (sexual for instance). Situational sympathy is how the character looks in context of what’s happening in and around him (environmental). Innate sympathy is just how the character looks in terms of genetics and his current evolutionary state to the reader.

real world objects operate according to the combination of grrm's sexuality and evolutionary emphasize and your own operational theory. objects in fiction do not have to abide to these real world objects. they can detour from it, but do know that real world objects have passions that can help with reader-viewpoint-want-to-be as well as as having attributes that are attractive.

Your own operational theory (combined with a sexuality/evolutionary theory makes it wholistic, of course):

different information inputs

different emotional evaluation mechenisms / and emotional buttons (especially sexual)

different logic routines (perception and understanding / decisive action)

different outputs

So, you first do evolutionary/sexual selection of characters (innate sypathy), and then think of their runtime methodology (runtime/situational sympathy). When picking characters, you think of all of this interweaved together. “How will this type of character appeal to readers?” you think. Combined with the situation? (You do all this picking with acknowledgement of real life characters/objects and how they work)

Then, once you have your character, you must let your character do the thinking and acting. In order to do that, you must pretend to be that character. (king) You must pretend to have the emotional and logical mechenisms of that character (runtime methodology). You are limited.. you may never be truly that character, but you must try. (how will this appeal to the reader? Except through realism? – sometimes, all of it fits together and it does appeal to readers. Sometimes it doesn’t)

So in summery:

Character (grrm’s character sexuality (innate) emphaisze based on understanding reader’s sexuality and evolutionary – combined with how this person’s mind is constructed – which will show personality – also can be based on how reader’s are evolutionarily constucted) and character runtime (sk’s honesty and your own runtime logic – shows situational sympathy and personality (a runtime innate)) 🡪 description and viewpoint (bs)

🡪 attacking the situation / plot (sm)

Me: schedule and play

(use sk to help with runtime)

(don’t forget to dig for new characterization and if ur discovery-plotting… new situations)

It is truly baesd on bs’s description and viewpoint first (in terms of seeing the actual world of the story) then plot and characterization

Another way to look at it: it’s the (yours) emotional and logical construct (combined with sexual and evolutionary innates influenced by grrm) that affects runtime personality and runtime sympathy (sympathy through experience(want-to-be) and sympathy through situation(underdog) - (information-externalworld based sympathy)-that is slightly dependent on character being very relatable to the reader (note: harry potter’s being a downtrodden kid)). This runtime construct also influences how the character views and describes things around him. It also influences how the character deals with and gets into certain situations (plot).

---

A lot of this character runtime sympathy, you won’t know until you do it. You won’t even know what it is until you hit that mark. So you need to know what to do when hitting that mark. (do as in, what the character should do to create a sympathetic runtime)

Stephen king’s characterization is based on runtime/situational sympathy.

You cannot do character runtime sympathy analysis until its actually run. It’s why it’s called runtime. You can predict tho, based on the character itself.

### Gratification

Your schedule will force you to work 6 hours a day from 4-10, and you’ll be better off for it. Think of it as doing better than your peers. Your reward: the feeling that you get from a hard day’s work. The true sense of a job well done; gratification.

### No fun in writing doesn’t mean you can’t still be good

Just because you aren’t a natural writer doesn’t mean you can’t still be good. It’s all about how much work you put into it. If you do bichok, and steadily maintain your devotion, taking opportunities (stopping trading this month, for instance), you will improve. Especially if you take opportunities to write when you can.

So boring, but to fill it, that’s what I do all do. is manufacture characters/settings/situations

## Possible Mistakes

1. You being so concentrated on situational segmentation that you forget to characterize and think of character issues.
2. You neglect description.
3. the difficulty with writing is that you don't know when you're doing well. so it's very easy to become super obsessive and perfectionistic when you're already ok, and second guessing. you need to find a way to rate your own works

Easy stuff

1. Easier to make a character more masquiline attractive, if you know they will die (less jealousy from you). But they don’t have to die… why don’t you pretend all characters will die (to stop jealousy? And thus write them better? In a way, they all will die)
2. You write the fastest when there is a battle scene (full of danger and interest) and you are interested too, so put more battle scenes!
3. Imagine yourself being fat. Why do fat people become good authors? Because they don’t think of themselves as much and focus more on other people. They are more imaginative because their world sucks. There is the type of writer who is playing the role, and then there’s the writer who writes for others (fat, who doesn’t have an ambition, instead he wants to fill others with ambition)

# Something that is unique to each genre

Some genres love certain concepts. Fantasy loves the idea of using or fighting dragons. Military sci fi loves the idea of humancentric actions and the defense of a mother world (Sol). Sol is just an awesome concept, and