A movie producer sent the following memo to the head of the movie studio.

"We need to increase the funding for the movie Working Title by 10% in order to ensure a quality product. As you know, we are working with a first-time director, whose only previous experience has been shooting commercials for a shampoo company. Since the advertising business is notoriously wasteful, it stands to reason that our director will expect to be able to shoot after take, without concern for how much time is being spent on any one scene. In addition, while we have saved money by hiring relatively inexperienced asssistant producers and directors, this savings in salary will undoubtedly translate to greater expenditures in paying the actors and unionized crew overtime for the extra hours they will spend on the set waiting for the assistant directors and producers to arrange things. If we don't get this extra money, the movie is virtually assured to be a failure."

Write a response in which you examine the stated and/or unstated assumptions of the argument. Be sure to explain how the argument depends on these assumptions and what the implications are for the argument if the assumptions prove unwarranted.

The argument made by the movie producer reaches the conclusion that the movie studio must increase funding for the movie 'Working Title' by 10%, to ensure that the end product is of high quality. This conclusion is based on the premise that the movie's director does not have much prior experience, and that increasing funding would help compensate the actors and crew for their overtime work. However, in reaching their conclusion, the movie producer makes three assumptions, the validity of which could drastically affect their argument's validity.  
  
First, the producer makes an assumption that the first-time director's experience in advertising will impede their ability to decide timeframes for takes. This assumption is based on the producer's belief that the advertising business is wasteful. It may be the case that the director has trained prior to this movie, and has improved their skills since their previous job. In fact, there is a possibility that the advertisements directed by them were done systematically, without being 'wasteful,' as the producer hypothesises. In this case, it is possible that the crew would be able to get work done in a streamlined manner, in a way that does not require them to work overtime. This would mean that the 10% increase in funding would be unnecessary for the movie's production.  
  
Second, the argument seems to assume that hiring inexperienced staff would translate to higher expenditures in paying the actors in overtime. However, there is no evidence to substantiate this claim. Even if we assume that the previous assumption works out in the argument's favour, the inexperienced staff may still demand higher wages. It may also be the case that the actors do not care to negotiate a higher salary; they may already be content with their salary without this increase. It may be possible for the actors and unionized crew to engage in other events or movie gigs during the time taken for set adjustments. If any of this were the case, then the demands of the producer are unwarranted, and the 10% increase would be unnecessary.  
  
Finally, the producer assumes that existing funds are insufficient for the success of the movie. But they have not put forth any evidence that proves this. If anything, the movie may flop due to its contents, plot, camerawork, soundtrack, or a number of other reasons not directly related to actors' salaries. Perhaps, the extra funding is unnecessary for this, and the existing funds can be reallocated towards improving aspects of the movie that could potentially fall apart. In failing to display the insufficiency of current funds for the movie's success, the producer has not made a strong case for their claims. The head of the movie studio would not be persuaded by this, and would probably simply request the producer to reallocate funds. Hence, if no attempts were made to make do with the existing funds, then the argument breaks down, making the funding increase unnecessary.  
  
In conclusion, the argument, in its current form, considerably fails in its ability to address the claims made, by paying no attention to the stated and unstated assumptions. If the movie genuinely needs more funding, the producer must strengthen their argument using a stronger foundation - with explicit specification of evidence. They could compile a sheet of all the expenses, and make a more informed decision about how to move forward. While absence of such evidence raises questions about the argument's intentions, proper evidence can base those intentions on logic, hence making the argument dramatically more persuasive.