



Favors Film Guides Online

Dangerous (2021) Case Study

Gap Assessment & Considerations for *Dangerous 2: The Hunt* Sequel

Regina Y. Favors

Instructional Designer, Screenwriter

Fair Use Disclaimer

This presentation falls under fair use. Source materials are appropriately attributed under copyright protection law.

Fair Use

Copyright Disclaimer under section 107 of the Copyright Act of 1976, allowance is made for “fair use” for purposes such as criticism, comment, news reporting, teaching, scholarship, education, and research.

Fair use is a use permitted by copyright statute that might otherwise be infringing.

Fair Use Definition

Fair use is a doctrine in United States copyright law that allows limited use of copyrighted material without requiring permission from the rights holders, such as commentary, criticism, news reporting, research, teaching or scholarship. It provides for the legal, non-licensed citation or incorporation of copyrighted material in another author’s work under a four-factor balancing test.

Film Stills/Images

To prevent copyright and trademark infringement claims, this Favors Film Guides Online is available in eBook format (PDF) only and available for view on the Favors Film Analysis website at www.favorsfilmanalysis.com. Click the appropriate tabs.

This eBook does not include film stills and images.

Future print and eBooks may utilize images with copyright and trademark clearances.

Copyright © 2026 by Regina Y. Favors.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or utilized in any form by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

For information:

Regina Y. Favors

Email: reginayfavors@yahoo.com

Website: www.reginayfavors.com

Amazon: <https://amazon.com/author/reginayfavors>

Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging-in Publication Data

New Filing

Favors, Regina Y. Favors Film Guides Online: Dangerous (2021) Case Study: Gap Assessment & Considerations for Dangerous 2: The Hunt Sequel. No ISBN.

The narratives and examples in this book are based on my personal experiences. Names and specifics have been changed and are fictional.

Favors Branded Titles

Bait, Hook & Switch Series

Print & eBook

Toxic Encounters: Why People Pursue Rebound Relationships, Part I
Toxic Encounters: Adult Attachment & the Problem with Rebounding, Part II
Toxic Encounters: Why You Should Go No Contact, Post-Rebounding, Part III
Toxic Encounters: When They See You As 7/8, A Case Study
Toxic Encounters: 5/6, 7/8, 9/10: Which One Has High Value? A Case Study

Casebook Series

Print & eBook

Overcoming Toxic Relationships: Toxic Encounters Casebook Series, A Companion

Life Recovery Series

Print & eBook

The Favors Life Recovery Coaching Curriculum: Relationship Readiness Assessment & Reflection Journal
Life Recovery after Romantic Hastiness: Online Topics & Planning Workbook
The Hobosexual Squatter: Overcoming Hobosexual Setback, A Reflection Workbook Companion

Financial Recovery Series

Print & eBook

Favors Financial Recovery Seminar: A Workbook Companion
Favors Sample Life Plan: Using Psychology, SWOT & SMART to Measure Financial Progress
Favors Sample Life Plan Journal: A Companion

Financial Planning Series

Print & eBook

It's Time to Get Serious about Your Finances: Tips, Strategies & Planning Guide (2027)

Overcoming Setback Series

Print & eBook

Overcoming Setback: Five Keys for Entering and Exiting Correction
Overcoming Setback Workbook: Processing Towards Life Recovery
Favors Planning Guide to Exiting Correction: A Workbook with Journal and Guided Activities

Pre-Singles Counseling Series

Print & eBook

Pre-Singles Counseling Coaching Curriculum Seminar: Introduction to the Course, A Series

Homeless Recovery Series

Print & eBook

Favors Sample Life Plan Workbook: A Case Study for Addressing Chronic Homelessness

Favors Homeless Recovery Research: Perspectives on Chronic Homelessness as Cultural Phenomenon, A Draft Document
Homeless Recovery Tips: A Practical Guide for Life Transition (Forthcoming)

Film Scripts Series

Print & eBook

Confessions of a Rebound Girl, Part I: An Independent Studies Course
Confessions of a Rebound Girl: Deuces, Part II: An Independent Studies Course
The Rebound Wife, Part III: An Independent Studies Course
Various independently published scripts (Available on Amazon.com/author/reginayfavors)

Favors Film Guides Series

Print & eBook

Favors Film Guides: Psychological Perspectives on The Town (2010), A Film Analysis Case Study (2027)
Favors Film Guides to the Option Agreement: Basics for Selling TV and Feature Screenplays, Includes a Sample TV Series Pilot Script (2027)

Favors Film Guides Online

(online website only)

Favors Film Guides Online: The Problem with Goal Development for Characters in The Town (2010), A Brief Scene Analysis Case Study eBook, Includes Film Stills
Favors Film Guides Online: Dangerous (2021) Case Study: Gap Assessment & Considerations for Dangerous 2: The Hunt Sequel
Various video lessons for different films (available on www.favorsfilmanalysis.com)

Favors Spec Scripts Series

Print & eBook

The Town 2: A Sequel, An American Crime Thriller Script
Shooter: New Class, Drama Action Thriller, TV Series Pilot Script
Bourne Girl: A Dramatic Film Script (forthcoming, scene descriptions in progress)
Southie: A Limited Series (forthcoming)
Marnie: A TV Series (forthcoming, scene writing in progress)
Shooter: Targeted (feature, forthcoming)
Leverage, A TV Series (forthcoming)
Hush 2: A Sequel (forthcoming, scene descriptions in progress)
It Ends With Us: A TV Series (in consideration)
The Taking of Pelham 123 (feature remake, planning in progress)
The Town: A TV Series (forthcoming)
We Are Richland (prime time TV series, in consideration)
Dangerous 2: The Hunt (finishing)

Favors Mentoring School Series

Print & eBook

Favors Mentoring School: Keys to Help You Overcome Procrastination to Build Capacity

Favors Business School Series

Print & eBook

The Regina Y. Favors Website: A Tentative Marketing Plan—Initial & Extended, Includes Event Planning Considerations, December 2022, Full Version

The Regina Y. Favors Website: A Tentative Marketing Plan—Initial & Extended, Includes Event Planning Considerations, December 2022, Condensed Version

The Regina Y. Favors Website Digital Marketing Plan: Three-Month Case Study, Campaign #1

The Regina Y. Favors Website Digital Marketing Plan: Three-Month Case Study, Campaign #2

The Regina Y. Favors Website Digital Marketing Plan: Digital Ad Campaign #3, Finances & Event Planning, 2023 Edition

The Regina Y. Favors Website Learning Journal: A Companion

Favors Business Topics Series

Print & eBook

Favors Marketing Lessons 101: A Workbook & Action Planning Guide

Favors Marketing Lessons 101: Basics for Creating the Buyers' Personas, A Workbook & Action Planning Guide

Favors Marketing Lessons 101: A Brief Guide to Digital Marketing

Favors Marketing Lessons 101: Digital Ads Collection & Planning Workbook, A Companion

Favors Marketing Lessons 101: Tentative Marketing Plan Template Workbook

Logo + Branding: Business Planning Basics & Sales Planning Presentations, An Active Listening Companion

Logo + Branding: Business & Sales Plan Basics Workbook, A Companion

Favors Sample Marketing Plans: Marketing Plan Case Study for Blended Cultures, LLC

Favors Sample Marketing Plans: Marketing Plan for Life Coach Category, A Preparation Guide

Favors Sample Marketing Plans: Marketing Plan Case Study for TV & Feature Spec Scripts, A Preparation Guide (in progress)

Favors Sample Marketing Plans: Marketing Plan Case Study for Overcoming Hate Setback Series (forthcoming)

How to Post a Digital Ad to Facebook Page Tutorial: A Favors Marketing Solutions Workshop Companion

Favors Academic Topics Series (Forthcoming)

Print & eBook

Favors English Lectures: First-Year Composition Strategies & Lessons

Favors Writing & Revision Tips: Guide to Instructor Feedback for First-Year Composition Learners

Favors Academic Readers

(Print)

Teaching American Literature: 1865 to the Present, Contextualizing the Literary Work (Forthcoming)

Favors Academic Mini Lectures Series

Print & eBook

Teaching Transfer Preparation in First-Year Composition: Lectures, Tutorials & Worksheets

Teaching “Grit” in First-Year Composition: Lectures, Tutorials & Worksheets
Teaching the Annotated Bibliography in First-Year Composition: A Workbook Companion for MLA & APA Formatting Styles
Teaching Are Protests Obsolete? Essay: Lectures, Tutorials & Worksheets
Teaching Career Preparation Essay in First-Year Composition: Lectures, Tutorials & Worksheets
Teaching MLA & APA Formatting Styles in First-Year Composition: A Workbook & Quiz Guide (Forthcoming)
Teaching the Obsolete Argument: Lectures, Tutorials & Worksheets (Forthcoming)
Teaching the Formal Research Paper: Lectures, Tutorials & Worksheets (Forthcoming)
Teaching American Literature: 1865 to the Present (Forthcoming)

Favors Academic Research Lectures Series
Print & eBook

Teaching What Did You Learn? Knowledge Check Essay in First-Year Composition: A Research Planning Draft

Favors Inspiration Fiction Books
Print & eBook

Ms. Molly Sutton: A Novel, Inspiration Fiction
Sandra Livingston: A Novella, Inspiration Fiction
Samantha’s Confessions: A Novella, Inspiration Fiction
Carolyn’s Daughter: A Novel, Part I, Inspiration Fiction
Carolyn’s Daughter: A Novel, Part II, Inspiration Fiction (In revision and/or reconsideration)
Esther’s Lot: A Novella, Inspiration Fiction

Favors Non-Fiction Books
Print & eBook

No: My Journey to Healing Restoration and Life Recovery (2027)

Favors Fiction Books
Print & eBook

Nina’s Journal: From Rejection to Emancipation (2027)

Favors Literary Studies (In Consideration)
Print & eBook

American Literature: “How Does it Feel to be a Problem?” Comparative Analysis of Late Romanticism to Contemporary Literary Works, 1819 to 1964, Independent Project, Part I (2027)

American Race of Men: The Life & Contexts of J. Hector St. John De Crevecoeur (1785-1813), Part II (2027)

March of the Europeans: Personal Letters on Race, Religious Indifference & European Freedom within the Eighteenth-Century Text, Part III (2027)

Remember the Ladies: Perspectives on Female Influences, From Colonial to American Revolution, Part IV (2027)

American Literature: Crossing the Color-Line: Survey of Passing Literature as Colonist Thinking, Not Literary Expression, Independent Project (2027)

A research consideration on the pre-abolitionist to abolitionist movements is in progress.

Favors Research & Scholarship Projects

Print & eBook

March of the Europeans Select Bibliography (Late 2025)

Marriage Recovery Research

Print & eBook

Marital Setback: Why Romantic Partners Live as Roommates, Tips for Rebuilding Hope, A Biblical Intervention

Overcoming Marital Setback Workbook: Journal, Pray & Write Your Marriage to Alignment (In consideration)

Overcoming Hate Setback Series

Print & eBook

Overcoming Hate Setback Series: A Reflection Workbook Companion

Distorted Vision: How to Repair Your Self-Esteem After Jealousy (forthcoming)

The Favors Journals & Planners

Print/Hardcover

The Favors Journal: A General Life Planning Guide

The Favors Academic Planner: Undergraduate Transfer Preparation Guide

General Statement from our Instructional Designer

Welcome to Favors Film Guides Online!

Favors Film Guides Online is an eBook companion to Favors Film Guides print titles but with different analysis and thematic objectives.

The former focuses primarily on the theme of goal development, using film stills and images for intellectual inquiry, while the latter focuses on applying a psychological perspective to select films, which also includes historical references based on the narrative context of the film.

Favors Film Guides print titles apply a psychological perspective to film analysis of select films. Development of print titles is currently in progress with the first title on *The Town* (2010) expected to be released by early 2027. This title applies a psychological perspective focusing on such concepts as attachment theory, parenting style, personality traits, goal orientation, and mindset. Part of the content for that title is included in *The Town* (2010) Case Study eBook, which explores goal development in the film. Video discussions accompany the case study.

Favors Film Guides Online serves as a companion, online resource. It offers critical analysis of select films using film stills and images as targets for intellectual inquiry. The content does not currently apply scholarly thinking; that is a future objective. Instead, these online case studies serve to highlight what motivates characters and their behaviors within the narrative context of the film. Analysis strategies might include focusing on the surrounding contexts when applicable and closing a gap when there isn't a print resource that already serves that goal.

While the online guide for *The Town* (2010) applies a psychological perspective, this eBook titled *Dangerous* (2021) Case Study conducts a gap assessment of the film, offers narrative development solutions, and proposes a sequel. Answers to proposed questions regarding timeline, characterization, and narrative development are included in the eBook, separated into Part One. Solutions in Part Two offer subplots to close gaps in the storyline and world building. The eBook ultimately serves to propose considerations for a sequel to the first film.

Thank you for reading this Favors Film Guides Online eBook case study. When reading the Introduction to this book, note the companion texts and spec script which are available for purchase on Amazon.com/author/reginayfavors. Visit the Favors Film Analysis website for more information and access to film analyses of select films: www.favorsfilmanalysis.com.

Regina Y. Favors,
Instructional Designer, Favors Film Guides Online
A Favors Film Analysis Product
Regina Y. Favors Website Products

Table of Contents

Fair Use Disclaimer	2
Film Stills/Images	2
Favors Branded Titles	4
General Statement from our Instructional Designer	9
Introduction	13
Overview	13
Purpose	13
Organization	13
Favors Spec Scripts: Dangerous 2: The Hunt Sequel	14
Favors Film Guides	14
Video Lessons	14
Marketing Plan Companion Title	14
Business Concepts Companion	15
Website	15
Part One: <i>Dangerous</i> (2021)	16
Plot Summary for <i>Dangerous</i> (2021)	16
Gap Assessment	16
Question: Day Sean Died?	17
Question: Day Sean Quit His Job?	18
Question: Where are the financial records?	18
Question: What was D's job while on parole?	18
Question: What was Sean's true intent?	18
Question: Agent Shaughnessy's Affiliation	19
Question: How did D. Forrester get Sean into trouble?	19
Question: When did D. Forrester start working for Cole?	20
Question: Why does D. Forrester kill?	20
Question: What are the backgrounds of other characters?	21
Question: What were the missions?	22

Question: What is Freddie’s storyline?	22
Question: Why is Jo always by herself?	22
Question: What is Jo’s narrative and/background?	23
Question: How is Sean and the Sheriff’s friendship defined?	24
Question: Where did Sean’s mother live before the island?	25
Question: What’s the narrative of the bunker and lighthouse?	25
Question: Why did Hugh run?	25
Question: What is the history of the inn with the steel shutters?	26
Question: Why does the mother misdiagnose D.?	26
Question: Why did Sean have so much debt?	26
Question: What is Dr. Alderwood’s background?	26
Question: Does Cole have a background in psychology?	27
Solution #1: Dialogue and Scene Development Tasks	28
Solution #2: Subplot Development (Characters)	28
Solution #3: Subplot Development (Afghanistan)	30
Solution #4: Keep Existing Timelines	30
Solution #5: Explain “Go Way Back.”	31
Remaining Clarification Issues & Assumptions	32
Repairing the Narrative Regarding “Lithium”	37
Part Two: Considerations for Dangerous 2: The Hunt Sequel	40
Logline	40
Story	40
Theme	44
Opportunity Cost Lesson	44
Managing Real, Film, and Manufactured Timelines	45
Table: Film and Historical Timelines	46
U.S. Withdrawal from Afghanistan	49
World Building for D2: Afghanistan Subplots	50
Table: U.S. Withdrawal from Afghanistan Timeline	50

Research Questions for Representing CD and APD	58
Clarifying Counseling Licensure.....	59
Conclusion	62
Bibliography	63
References	63
Unformatted Links	64
Psychology Resources	65
About.....	66

Introduction

Welcome to the second Favors Film Guides Online case study of a select film.

This case study titled Favors Film Guides Online: *Dangerous* (2021) Case Study: Gap Assessment & Considerations for *Dangerous 2: The Hunt* Sequel conducts a gap assessment of the film and proposes a sequel.

This two-part case study explores some of the gaps in the narrative for the film, such as those dealing with timelines, questions about the anonymous benefactor and missing financial records of the deceased, and the role antisocial personality disorder (APD) plays in depicting the main character, Dylan “D.” Forrester, or referred to as D. Forrester in this eBook and referred to in the film as “D.”

Overview

Favors Film Guides Online is an online resource companion to Favors Film Guides, which represent print-based case studies of select films, subject to fair use. It is also a direct companion to *Dangerous 2: The Hunt* spec script. For copyright purposes, the spec script is not included.

Purpose

The purpose of this eBook case study is to offer insight into the narrative structure of the film, offer solutions for closing gaps in the narrative world, and provide a solution by introducing subplots for main characters.

Organization

The organization of this eBook case study is in two parts:

- Part One focuses on conducting a gap assessment of *Dangerous* (2021).
- Part Two focuses on considerations for a *Dangerous 2: The Hunt* sequel.

Part Two particularly repairs the initial narrative strategy surrounding lithium as a prescription option for antisocial personality disorder (APD), confirming that it is not an FDA-approved drug for APD; instead, it is FDA-approved for borderline personality disorder and bipolar disorder.

Part Two also offers subplot considerations.

Favors Spec Scripts: Dangerous 2: The Hunt Sequel

Favors Spec Scripts will not publish the sequel without copyright and trademark permission.

Favors Film Guides

The development of a print title companion is in progress. It will be available by early 2027. Here is the projected title:

- Favors Film Guides: Psychological Perspectives on *The Town* (2010), A Film Analysis Case Study

You can find more information about *The Town* (2010) Case Study by visiting the Favors Film Analysis website (www.favorsfilmanalysis.com).

Video Lessons

You may visit the Favors Film Analysis YouTube Channel or the website to access video titles. Click on any tab on the site to access a video lesson.

Marketing Plan Companion Title

There is a direct companion title that focuses on the marketing aspects for producers pitching and developing a TV series pilot. It centers on the concept of the option agreement for screenwriters.

- Favors Sample Marketing Plans: Marketing Plan Case Study for TV & Feature Spec Scripts, A Preparation Guide

The title above also houses an original feature.

Favors Sample Marketing Plans are part of the Favors Marketing Lessons 101 serials, which are both products of Favors Marketing Solutions. Visit the website for more information: www.favorsmarketingsolutions.com.

The title will be available on Amazon.com/author/reginayfavors by early 2027.

You can find information about the title on www.favorsfilmanalysis.com. Click the “Business Concepts” tab.

Business Concepts Companion

A separate companion on the concept of the option agreement will be available by middle of 2027. The tentative title is below:

- Favors Film Guides to the Option Agreement: Basics for Selling TV and Feature Screenplays, Includes a Sample TV Series Pilot Script

Information about option agreements derives directly from the marketing plan title above. The topic will explore further concepts connected to the script option, shopping, and purchasing processes.

The title will be available on Amazon.com/author/reginayfavors by early 2027

You can find information about the title on www.favorsfilmanalysis.com. Click the “Business Concepts” tab.

Website

You may access these videos and information about Favors Film Guides, Favors Film Guides Online, and Favors Film Analysis on the Favors Film Analysis website: www.favorsfilmanalysis.com.

Visit the website for more information and get access to resources.

Part One: *Dangerous* (2021)

Part One of this eBook case study conducts a gap assessment for the film.

Plot Summary for *Dangerous* (2021)

D. Forrester is estranged from his family unit. He is three months into his parole ending. He gets a letter from his brother's wife, Susan Forrester, who relays his death via holiday card. The date on the card reads December 8, 2021. When he is visited by the assassin Cole sends, D. Forrester's antagonist and former employer, he is forced to remove his ankle bracelet and travel for his brother's funeral. Once he is on the island, he encounters hostility from their mother.

The evening results in Cole and his crew intruding on the island, taking the family hostage, and "encouraging" everyone to help him if they want to stay alive. It is here where D. Forrester is forced to contend with Cole and the crew, abandoning his consistent refrain, "I don't kill people anymore." They put him in an unwinnable position if he does nothing.

D. Forrester settles the score with his former employer, eventually fighting and killing him; he is reconciled with his mother emotionally; and he leaves, knowing that people he used to work for will come after him.

Gap Assessment

Gap assessment is a business term, defined briefly by determining the differences between current state and future state. Organizations conduct gap assessments regarding skills, systems, and compliance. The goal is to highlight misalignment between expectations and benchmarks and need for improvement in area of performance.

For organizational purposes, when there is a gap, the goal is to define the gap, assess the current state of that gap, measure the gap using benchmarks, and develop an action plan. Applying a gap assessment within any environment, personal or professional, will better help to define the scope of a project, allocate resources efficiently, and align a project's objectives with the organization's goals. In essence, gap assessment is largely a diagnostic tool.

In considering this case study, although *Dangerous* (2021) offers great narrative structure, paces the intrusion events very well, and provides insight into the decisions people make when they no longer desire what they used to do and how they used to function, the film still struggles to close obvious gaps in the plot development, story world, and technical knowledge.

For example, the lithium Dr. Alderwood prescribes D. Forrester for the diagnosis of antisocial personality disorder (APD) is not FDA-approved for APD; instead, it is approved for borderline personality disorder and bipolar disorder according to mental health resources. Lithium offers

depressant qualities for APD, but it is offered as an off-label solution. Thus, it is important to depict diagnoses and the prescriptions for those diagnoses accurately. This misdiagnosis, along with Cole and Linda (mother) calling D. Forrester insane, is a major issue with plot and characterization development as well as world building even when fictional.

To close these gaps, this case study introduces considerations for a sequel. For one, a sequel would close gaps in timelines and narrative development. For two, *Dangerous* (2021) is worthy of a sequel, which would center on bringing in Afghanistan as a subplot. The subplot would primarily answer the questions of why and when D. Forrester punches his commanding officer and how he eventually crosses paths with Cole. In addition, the sequel would follow up with the claims Dr. Alderwood makes in suggesting that the men D. Forrester knew would come after him.

This case study of *Dangerous* (2021) and considerations for a sequel, tentatively titled *Dangerous 2: The Hunt* answers questions regarding the film and provides plot, narrative development, and world-building solutions. It is essentially a gap assessment based on watching and rewatching the film multiple times. It is guided by discussion questions. As well as tentative solutions, which are followed up by remaining clarification issues and repairing misapplication of a psychology term.

The structure of the discussion first begins with a question, and it is followed up either by information from the original source (i.e., the film itself) and/or an explanation of further issues.

Question: Day Sean Died?

It is unclear the day Sean died. In addition, what happened before Hugh, allegedly, killed him? What was his day like beyond merely working at the lighthouse? Here are additional questions:

- Who would know of Sean's day? Wife? Mother? Friend from college?

Susan, Sean's wife, knows the predictability of his day. He would work at the lighthouse, and she says in the film that he fell from scaffolding. However, the distance from the inn to the lighthouse is far. She claims that she kept begging him to hire someone, but he refused.

In the film, we do not go into the lighthouse to determine how he could have fallen without jumping to the immediate conclusion that Hugh pushed him. We cannot see what Sean was working on and how easy it is for a mistake to happen or how easy it is to frame the fall as a mistake.

- What makes the lighthouse vulnerable to intrusion?

We need more insight into the dynamics of the lighthouse. D. Forrester gets in and hangs the Sniper. That's the extent of our understanding about access to the lighthouse.

Question: Day Sean Quit His Job?

According to Massey, Sean was a history scholar. Massey labels Sean “big brain” and “had the memory of an elephant.” Sean taught as a professor at a college. We do not get the name of the college, nor do we get the year he quits the job. Agent Shaughnessy’s assistant informs her that Sean quit “a year and a half ago.” From the release of the film in November 2021, that might be 2019 or 2020. This is unclear.

Question: Where are the financial records?

Agent Shaughnessy’s assistant informs her that Sean purchased Guardian Island from an anonymous benefactor, paying two times the purchase price of the island. The name of the benefactor is never revealed; therefore, it is a question that is incomplete.

- Where are the financial records and contracts for the purchase?
- How does Cole find out about this financial transaction?

Connecting Cole to Sean’s decision to ask someone else for the money is not clear.

The financial records and their origin need resolution for the sequel.

Question: What was D’s job while on parole?

D. Forrester is living in an apartment, but it is unclear how he is making his living. Therefore, an obvious question would be this:

- How did he get money to pay for the apartment he is living in at the beginning of the film?

We don’t see him working on a job, but a reasonable assumption might be because of the ankle monitor. However, don’t parolees have to visit with their parole officers and pay a fee? There is not enough information here to tell the audience how D. Forrester obtained the apartment. It might be considered a half-way house that has apartments and is part of his parole. It’s unclear.

Question: What was Sean’s true intent?

Beyond the notion that Sean Forrester worked for the university as a professor and wrote books on the topics of Japanese war history, it is unclear why Sean was transitioning into becoming what seemed to be a business owner or entrepreneur. Purchasing an island to get to the gold is clear intent, but it also seemed like he was desiring to pursue business.

- Was Sean Forrester trying to do business too, or was the inn a front for something else?

Purchasing an island is a business move, not a home purchase type move.

- What else was Sean Forrester up to regarding the purchase?
- Why was it necessary for him to go around Cole?
- Why not simply ask Cole for the money?

These are questions that need answers.

Question: Agent Shaughnessy's Affiliation

Agent Shaughnessy identifies herself as being with the FBI, but when she, her assistant, and local SWAT raid D. Forrester's apartment she is wearing a SWAT patch.

- Why is Agent Shaughnessy wearing a SWAT patch and not an FBI patch when they all raid D.'s apartment?

It's a bit confusing.

- Removal of the ankle monitor requires SWAT?
- What is the jurisdiction conflict between FBI and SWAT when approaching an incident?

These are questions that need further clarification.

Question: How did D. Forrester get Sean into trouble?

Based on Agent Shaughnessy's assessment of D. Forrester and her contribution to putting him away in prison, it is unclear how he got into trouble or where it started.

In addition, based on his mother's hostility towards him at the wake and throughout the film, she suggests that D. Forrester was always in trouble, the police were called to the house a lot, and that D's "activities" distracted Sean from studying; she says that Sean had to do the work of two sons.

The mother is vague about what D. Forrester did in his childhood. Sure, the police were called, but the reason is unclear. She seems to be a mother who felt offended that she had to care for a son who was not right like the younger brother, Sean.

Even D. Forrester while in front of Sean's casket notes that Sean was the nicer brother.

Determining D. Forrester's "trouble" is necessary.

Question: When did D. Forrester start working for Cole?

This is a very important question.

Cole is D. Forrester's former employer. Cole is a fixer for the criminal underground who are infamous and rich.

From what I can gather from the conversation between Shaughnessy and the assisting agent, D. Forrester was discharged from the SEALs and went to work for Cole. However, what precipitated D. Forrester to pursue that line of work? A punch to the commanding officer and subsequent discharge are enough reasons to choose a line of work that requires violence and murder.

However, this rationale reminds me of Chris Pine in *The Contractor* (2022) where he is discharged because of taking enhancements, and he is forced to find work through a private contractor who does private contracting things for a puppet master. I'm not sure what the private contracting thing truly is, but it ends in him being hunted and separated from his family.

Thus, information about when D. Forrester went to work for Cole is necessary.

Question: Why does D. Forrester kill?

There is not enough background narrative on why D. Forrester kills.

The mother says he is insane to continue emotional distance; Cole says he is insane to provoke him to return to his former life; however, D. Forrester counters their narratives by saying, "I don't kill people anymore"; he removes the insane stigma projected onto him and reveals his diagnosis of antisocial personality disorder (APD) to Freddie, his nephew; lastly, he is forced to kill the intruders to protect his family. None of these issues suggests D. Forrester wants to kill.

- Therefore, beyond what is projected onto him, what is inside D. Forrester that prompts him to kill?

This is not a question that is really answered in the film's narrative. He just tells the Sheriff (Tyrese Gibson) when asked, "Who did you all kill?" by responding, "You would have to be more specific." Even the reasoning for the killing doesn't make sense, and the narrative is not forthcoming about who and why he kills. Again, the counter-narrative is that D. doesn't kill anymore.

Therefore, there is a conflict between what is being said and/or perceived about D. Forrester (social perception) and what he says about himself (self-perception). That could be due to the therapy sessions he has with Dr. Alderwood and/or the pills he must take (Lithium). There seems to be a connection between him saying he no longer kills anyone and taking the pills that he faithfully monitors. Answering this question is necessary.

Question: What are the backgrounds of other characters?

The backgrounds of the other characters need work and more development. There is some imbalance between the male and female characters. Let's start with the women.

The backgrounds of the women are not clear.

There is the wife's background that is not clear.

There is the mother's background that is not clear.

Jo's background is not clear.

The backgrounds of the women are not clear except for Susan sending D. a card about Sean's death and the dialogue we get from the mother's hostility towards D. Forrester.

The backgrounds of the men are clear.

Massey is Sean Forrester's friend from college, which is confirmed by D. Forrester who validates the fact by referencing Sean mentioning Massey in his letters to D.

Sheriff (Tyrese Gibson) is Sean Forrester's friend who he says he and Sean go way back, but there isn't a time reference. While the Sheriff has D. Forrester in the bunker, it is the Sheriff who says that he and Sean go way back and that Sean never mentioned having a brother.

Hugh came to work for the inn a little over a month according to Susan. When Cole comes onto the island and takes everyone hostage, he whispers something to Hugh about messing things up, and Hugh says, "I had no choice. He was on to me." Later in the film, D. Forrester suggests that Hugh come to the island to watch Sean. It was Hugh who took dinner to Sean when Sean fell from the scaffolding.

Cole, through the dialogue of Agent Shaughnessy, is a criminal underground fixer for the rich and infamous. He was D. Forrester's employer. He employed the other men in the crew who come on the island with him, eventually killing one of them because he was unnerved by his whimpering after being shot. That man's name was Whymper, ironically. The other men were Blanchard (who kept messing with Freddie, the nephew), Sniper who was given no name, Felix who seems to be Cole's right-hand man, and Pike, who I believe is the one who kept getting shot (first in the face and then in the arm).

The other man connected to Cole's crew is the one at the beginning of the film who D. Forrester finds in his apartment and who he subsequently hangs in the bathtub. In the bunker scene where Cole realizes that D. is on the island, he says, "Our man didn't get it done," alluding to the guy who was in D.'s apartment about to harm him. Instead, D. harms him, but this is only suggested through Shaughnessy's accusation. We don't see D. Forrester harming the man, but hanging an enemy is depicted with the Sniper and Blanchard. Therefore, D.'s strategy is confirmed.

Lastly, Dr. Alderwood is a clear influence in D. Forrester's life, conducting therapy sessions, facilitating breathing exercises, and prescribing pills to desensitize his responses to triggers. The

writer, Chris Borrelli, does a great job of presenting and spreading that influence throughout the film even to the very end.

In other words, there is not a clear delineation in how the women are presented and depicted and how the men are presented and depicted. We know more about the men than the women.

Question: What were the missions?

The missions are not explored in the film. The only exception may be Cole and the men's intruder efforts classified as a mission, but this is still not clear.

While in the bunker, Felix lists missions that D. Forrester was responsible for and the number of kills, calling him "dangerous" as a nod to the film's title. He lists regions, such as Bogota, Lansing, Harvey, etc., but he doesn't make distinctions.

We don't know what the missions were, what D. was responsible for, and how those missions tied back to the film's premise. D. Forrester is not on a mission here. He is attending his brother's funeral.

- Why is there a reference to his missions if there isn't a distinction made?

Defining the missions is necessary.

Question: What is Freddie's storyline?

I don't remember the other characters referring to Freddie's age, but he appears to be 8 to 10 years old in the film. For subsequent installments or when connecting Freddie to the potential series, adding five more years to Freddie's age or considering whatever age the actor will be important. Freddie has a youthful look.

Question: Why is Jo always by herself?

For Jo to be a central figure at the inn, she is always by herself. She is in the kitchen when one of the men approaches her. This is after D. Forrester uses her to create a scream for Blanchard to run to that scream.

Then while the mother and Susan and Freddie are in Sean's office looking in the tunnel, Jo comes in and asks what's going on?

That's a weird question because she is present when D. Forrester asks, "Where is Sean's office?"

- Why didn't she go along with the other characters?

Beyond the moments she is with D. in the bunker, outside, and the kitchen briefly, she is strangely by herself.

This may suggest something nefarious for the second installment.

Question: What is Jo's narrative and/background?

Jo defends Hugh against Massey, suggesting that Massey is jealous of Hugh's youth.

- Why should Jo care unless she is interested in Hugh?
- Why is there a need for Jo to take Massey down the vanity peg?
- Jo is suspect, or could she become suspect for the sequel?

Jo's background needs further clarification, especially considering how she came to work on the island.

Question: Why does D. Forrester struggle to navigate life socially?

Dr. Alderwood's instructions to D. Forrester while he is at the inn sound like he is teaching D. Forrester how to learn to navigate life socially.

- Why is D. Forrester missing this part of his development?

The types of instructions Alderwood gives D. Forrester is common knowledge:

- "Sorry for your loss."
- "Give hug."
- Ask someone how they are doing.

D. Forrester enters a self-study process on how to manage himself socially.

- Why didn't his mother provide D. Forrester with this type of home training for social life?

Linda's hostility towards her son, D. Forrester, didn't derive from his earlier years of getting into trouble. She seems to have a deep-rooted hatred for him, which makes me think about the relationship she likely had with his father or the boys' father.

There is something else going on specifically with her relationship with D. who may reflect an ignored/neglected child or the scapegoat. Sean Forrester is the golden child. This is clear.

Therefore, the parenting styles Linda has with D. Forrester versus Sean Forrester need to be considered. She seems authoritative and somewhat permissive with Sean; this is ironic considering it is revealed at the end of the film that Sean wasn't the good kid after all with his

dealings with Cole. She seems authoritarian and uninvolved with D. Forrester, treating him like a burden, which has implications in childhood.

Separate research on parenting styles and childhood traits is necessary to understand how Linda treats D. Forrester and how she carries over her attitude towards him to her grandson, Freddie. Freddie says the following to D. Forrester upon meeting him for the first time:

- Freddie: “Grandma says you are insane.”
- What conversation is Linda having with her grandson concerning her son?

This begs the following question:

- Is D. a scapegoat?

Telling her grandson about her son is the definition of framing him as a problem and giving that burden of dealing with D. to the next generation.

Therefore, it’s clear that compared to D., Sean is the golden child. Linda should not be having those types of conversations with a child.

D. explains that he is not insane. He provides a different explanation and counter-narrative for who he is and what he struggles with.

In addition, Dr. Alderwood tells D. Forrester to handle one problem at a time when he is confronted with a dilemma.

- What is the psychology literature on licensed clinicians helping their clients diagnosed with anti-social personal disorder (APD) solve problems?

The same question is useful for clients diagnosed with conduct disorder (CD).

More research on these psychology concepts is needed. See the Resources in the Bibliography as well as the Conclusion discussion for this case study.

Question: How is Sean and the Sheriff’s friendship defined?

Sheriff (Tyrese Gibson) notes that he and Sean “go way back,” but it is not clear about the origin of their friendship.

- How long ago did they meet?
- When did they meet?
- How did they meet?
- What did Sean want to talk about?
- Why didn’t Sean tell the Sheriff that he had a brother. Why keep that a secret?

This is a gap in the narrative. For *Dangerous 2*, it might be important to establish a narrative for the Sheriff. This would allow the script to include the background of the Sheriff, thus bringing back Tyrese Gibson.

However, a background on the Sheriff might work for the television series consideration.

Question: Where did Sean's mother live before the island?

The question about the mother extends to Sean and Susan.

- Where did they all live before moving to the island?

They are all on some island unaware of the secrets beneath them and the deceptiveness of Sean, yet they blame D. Forrester for everything going wrong.

Some background about their previous living arrangements is necessary.

Question: What's the narrative of the bunker and lighthouse?

It would be interesting to create a historical narrative about the bunker and the lighthouse given the fact that the Sheriff takes D. Forrester to the bunker and puts him in a cage.

It would also be interesting to create a narrative about the lighthouse given the assumption that Sean fell off the scaffolding.

It is only suggested at the end that Sean didn't fall, but it is not really confirmed that Hugh pushed him. Hugh pushing Sean needs a scene in the second film.

Question: Why did Hugh run?

It doesn't make sense for Hugh to run when he was with or in service to Cole.

- Did Hugh feel that Cole would kill him?

This question makes sense because Hugh disturbed Cole's goal to figure out what Sean had and take it, assumedly.

However, Pike called Hugh by name when he chased him.

- Therefore, why would Hugh suffer the consequence from running?

It makes no sense. A background narrative on Hugh is necessary.

Question: What is the history of the inn with the steel shutters?

The steel shutters add a nice touch to the former naval base. The location is also interesting as a future film whether for spy thrillers or horror films. The fictional location of Guardian Island is a nice setup.

Question: Why does the mother misdiagnose D.?

To me, it seems like the mother used to have some connection to psychology. She makes a point of using language to describe D. Forrester, and she consistently urges him to leave. Why?

- “I want you to leave before you cause any more damage.”
- What is the background between D. and the mother?
- Do D. and Sean have the same father?
- Did D.’s issues cause the mother’s husband/father to leave?

There is something underlying in that relationship, and it goes back to childhood because she doesn’t have the academic knowledge and professional preparation to diagnose him as insane.

Question: Why did Sean have so much debt?

The reference to Sean’s debt makes it seem like he had to deceive to get what he wanted, which means that there was an intent to get access to the island, get the gold, pay back anyone he owed, and balance out his financial issues. However, it was the debt that prompted him to contact one of Cole’s associates and not Cole.

- Why did he want to hide that place from Cole?
- What about Cole that prompted Sean to deceive?
- What was ultimately Sean’s relationship with Cole?

Remember that Sean bought the island at two times its value.

The characters in this film know a lot about psychology. This tells me that the screenwriter, Chris Borelli, knows about psychology or at least studied it for this film.

Question: What is Dr. Alderwood’s background?

Dr. Alderwood, through discussions with D. Forrester and D.’s discussions with his mother, facilitates breathing exercises, conducts intervention therapy, and prescribes medication for D.’s anti-social personality disorder (APD) diagnosis.

- How long has Dr. Alderwood been in practice?

He is depicted as a licensed clinician, but some ideas about his preparation would be interesting. We need a background narrative.

Question: Does Cole have a background in psychology?

Cole seems to know and understand psychology concepts even if he mocks D. for changing.

Cole notes that D. had been avoiding him to which D. attests.

In addition, Cole notes that D. was the best at what “we do.”

In the bunker, Cole tells one of the men who thinks prison softened D. that D. is likely a tiger just trying to change his stripes.

Cole mentions that D. is doing therapy three times per week, and he lists some of the psychology concepts that only a person in the field would understand.

- Acute sociopathic disorder
- Recurrent psychopathic behavior
- Arrested moral development

He concludes that D.’s family wants to call him insane, but it is also Cole who uses the same language. Cole suggests that D.’s true struggle is that he doesn’t want to accept who he is.

- How does Cole know so much about D.’s therapy sessions?

It is one thing to have personal knowledge of Cole’s use of D., but for him to know a lot about his psychology suggests to me that Cole knows a lot more about psychology than the screenwriter reveals. Cole is essentially the antithesis of Dr. Alderwood. It would be interesting, however, to reveal that Cole and Alderwood know each other in *Dangerous 2: The Hunt*.

Lastly, Cole’s statement to D., “I’ll be in your head reminding you that you’re never going to change” is like what Agent Shaughnessy says, “People never change” or “People don’t change.” D. Forrester rebuts their arguments by saying, “I’m not insane.”

- What does this commentary suggest about people in their roles?

Dr. Alderwood believes in D. and provides instructions, tips, and tools to help him change to the point that D. says he doesn’t kill anymore, yet the people around him won’t let him be who he really is: He is not insane. He doesn’t kill people anymore.

Given this gap assessment, here are a few solutions for the above questions. Most of these questions will be addressed also in Part Two of this case study.

Solution #1: Dialogue and Scene Development Tasks

The way to close gaps in the narrative world would be to consider dialogue and scene development tasks. Here are sample tasks. This is suggested largely for the sequel.

Task #1

Find the friend from college and ask him questions. Probing exercises lead to scavenger hunts.

Task #2

Find his college. Visit the office to get Sean's belongings. This gives access to his world.

Task #3

Find the financial records from the transaction. Sean was in debt, but there was a wire transfer from a mysterious person, one of Cole's associates. Who was that person?

Task #4

Find out the link between Cole and Sean. (The Afghanistan plot works for this task.)

How do they know each other?

Was Sean Forrester under Cole's "leadership"? Was D. Forrester under his leadership?

Solution #2: Subplot Development (Characters)

Answers to the questions above might consider developing a subplot for the main characters. Here are examples:

Friend from College

Massey is Sean's friend from college. He is an archaeologist. We need his point of view. A scene goal might consider taking D. Forrester to Massey's house, break in, and include a discussion.

Research Question

A research question for the sequel script would include D. Forrester asking Massey, "When was my brother in Afghanistan?"

Answering this question might tie Cole to Sean, but there would also need to be a tie from D. Forrester to Cole as being in Afghanistan too.

Since money is a theme in the first film, the use of a popular film motif, such as "Follow the money" might work to fill the gap.

Massey's Location

It is unclear whether Massey lives at the inn or was just visiting for the funeral. He never goes to his room, so we do not know the extent of his location and whether there is any urgency for him to get home.

Therefore, for the sequel, giving Massey a place to live would make it possible for D. Forrester to visit and question him. For the current sequel script, Massey moved to Kenmore, WA to a lake house, under \$250,000. This location demonstrates the distance between Seattle and Kenmore, which is 33 minutes, near highway and Lake Washington.

College Location

We need a college for Sean Forrester. A professor with his extensive knowledge base would likely teach at the University of Washington, Department of History. For his knowledge of Japanese War History, he would likely have received a bachelor's degree in a major specific to his academic interests and a doctorate degree in Japanese History. Here is an outline of the University of Washington, Department of History information on both the bachelor's and doctorate degrees. See the links in the Bibliography area of this case study.

University of Washington, Department of History

Bachelor's degree, majors below

General history

Empire and Colonialism

Race, Gender, and Power

Religion and Society

War and Society

Capstone Seminar

Career preparation: law, journalism, public service,

Business, museum work, and education

PhD in Japanese History, 4 PhD fields, dissertation

Reading committee, once admitted into graduate program

can't change fields, dissertation shelved or should be

Inclusion of this information merely serves as a guide for closing a gap in understanding Sean Forrester's background beyond authoring books.

Sean's Work with Cole

The film's narrative doesn't explicitly connect Sean Forrester with Cole. D. Forrester hypothesizes the connection and later reveals at the end of the film that Sean was in business with Cole. Agent Shaughnessy's assistant highlights an anonymous benefactor and the financial transaction, but it is not linked to Cole, of course, because Sean gets the money from one of Cole's associates.

Therefore, the use of the Afghanistan subplot in the sequel script could bring in Cole's time as a private contractor for Cole, or he could have interned during his academic studies or served in the military in Afghanistan.

- How does Cole connect to Sean Forrester?
- How does Cole connect to D. Forrester?
- What would be the appropriate time frames for each connection?

Thus, answers to these questions would require different timelines given that D. Forrester is older than his brother, Agent Shaughnessy put D. in prison eight (8) years ago (from 2021), and D. Forrester punched his commanding officer.

The timelines development must consider D. Forrester's actions prior to 2021 while Sean Forrester dies in 2021, and his actions may consider any timeline before and including U.S. involvement and subsequent withdrawal from Afghanistan.

Solution #3: Subplot Development (Afghanistan)

Afghanistan is not a subplot in *Dangerous* (2021). It is suggested here to bring in D. Forrester's military background. He punched his commanding officer according to Agent Shaughnessy. An obvious military background would consider Afghanistan since the U.S. had a presence in the country from 2001 to 2021 (August).

In addition, possibly aligning D. Forrester's age and/or academic background with the main actor, Scott Eastwood, would help to bring in some foundation. Scott Eastwood graduated high school in 2003; he graduated from college in 2008. The subplot would be developed with these dates in mind.

Solution #4: Keep Existing Timelines

There are at least three (3) explicit timelines depicted and/or suggested in the film.

- The film was released November 5, 2021.
- Agent Shaughnessy says she put D. away 8 years ago, which would make the time he went in 2013.
- Sean suggests that D. has a few more months on parole, which suggests August 2021.
- Sean Forrester sends D. Forrester a card for Thanksgiving, which suggests November 2021.
- The card Susan sends D. Forrester about Sean's death reads December 8, 2021.

Any subsequent timeline is based on the existing dates in the first film.

Solution #5: Explain “Go Way Back.”

This speaks to the timeline issue. Sheriff tells D. Forrester that Sean never said anything about having a brother. In addition, the Sheriff in *Dangerous* (2021) tells D. Forrester that he and Sean Forrester go “way back,” but he doesn’t provide D. with a time frame.

The following considers a projected timeline based on grade and age to link conduct disorder (CD) to anti-social personality disorder (APD) for the character of D. Forrester, which will be a useful strategy for the television series and sequel. It is included here for context and to support the standard timelines.

1st grade = 7 yo

2nd grade = 8 yo

3rd grade = 9 yo - For CD, childhood onset (one symptom prior to age 10 yo)

4th grade = 10 yo

5th grade = 11 yo

6th grade = 12 yo - For CD, serious violate before age 13 yo

7th grade = 13 yo

8th grade = 14 yo - For APD, evidence of CD before age 15 yo

9th grade = 15 yo

@ 18 yo — For CD, does not meet criteria for conduct disorder

- For APD, since 15 yo (evidence), individual at least 18 yo

The solutions above begin the discussion on closing gaps in the narrative development for the first film. There are remaining issues with plot.

See the next page for more insight.

Remaining Clarification Issues & Assumptions

The remaining clarification issues may be resolved by answering one or more of the previous questions or the ones that follow.

Hugh

Hugh takes Sean dinner likely on Thanksgiving Day or some day after it before the (death and) funeral. What is the date?

Distance

What is the distance between Ohio and Washington: plane, bus, drive, boat? Sean Forrester is willing to uproot his family from one state to another.

Dr. Alderwood

D. Forrester speaks with Alderwood by phone on day of funeral, 12/8/2021. We know why.

Sheriff

Sheriff is threatened by D. Forrester because he didn't know Sean had a brother, and the Sheriff likely felt like Sean's brother. Sheriff spoke to Sean before his death. If they were closer than Sean to his brother, then why is the date unclear?

Issues I have with Jo and Her Knowledge

Jo knows D. Forrester. she recognizes him by name, saying, "You're Sean's brother." This might be obvious because of the last name, but she is quicker to acknowledge it.

"You didn't kill him?" (referring to Whympers)

- Why is this her expectation of D. Forrester?
- What does she know that only family should know about him?
- They all don't seem to talk about him beyond Linda's attitude, so how would she know anything about D. Forrester?

Jo was in the bunker, but she knows there are three (3) men, and they have a lot of guns? (after the crew member chases/kills Hugh). D. Forrester and Jo are standing at a distance from the house. She can't see the number of guys from that distance. Here is a quick outline of Jo:

- She can't see the number of guys from the distance.
- She was with D. in the bunker when the men came on the island.
- She runs to Hugh after he is killed: "What did you do, you idiot?"

- Blanchard and Whymper don't seem to know Jo, but the other guy who was shot in the face and arm seemed to know her (Pike).
- "Oh my God. You killed him?" She's asking about Blanchard.
- Who is Jo to expect so much from D.?
- She is nonchalant when the men come after her, throwing up her hands to mock them.

Jo is a very confusing character. There isn't enough indication about how she acquires knowledge.

Sean's Scar

Sean had a scar on the right side of his neck. It was stitched up.

Phone

D. Forrester has a phone (Sheriff's phone), but he never attempts to call the police. It could be his phone. The Sheriff might have taken the phone from him. It is unclear.

Hugh

D. Forrester doesn't seem to know Hugh. He wasn't part of the original crew, assumedly. He asks Susan questions about him, but he doesn't seem to know who Hugh is.

D. Forrester

When was D. Forrester discharged from the SEALs?

Shaughnessy puts him away in 2013, assumedly.

How many years can you put him in the SEALs?

Seals training is for 9 months (according to Mark Divine).

Final Scene

D. Forrester left the next morning wearing the same bloody clothes from the previous day, so he didn't stay for the burial.

Lastly, he is carrying the same bag he threw on the boat when he faked his escape, so there is a continuity issue. If he has his bag, i.e., didn't leave, then he should have changed clothes.

We don't see the rest of the cast after he leaves.

D. didn't take the last pill while on the boat; he is supposed to take 4 daily pills according to the bottle. He decides to be himself in the end. He pours the pills out into the water. It is unclear what he plans to do.

Location Indicator

I just noticed that there isn't a location indicator for the opening scene with D. Forrester, but there is one when Agent Shaughnessy visits Dr. Alderwood in Cleveland, Ohio. But Alderwood says D. visited him yesterday, so he must be in Ohio, assumedly. Here are some questions I am using for research:

- Is the parole location in Ohio?
- What are parole restrictions for Ohio?

D. Forrester taking off the ankle monitor brought Agent Shaughnessy and SWAT to his apartment. Therefore, is the FBI field office in Ohio?

The apartment could be a parole location group home situation.

There seemed to be two rooms during the raid with twin beds in each. It was quick camera action, so I can't be certain.

The apartment could have been in another city in Ohio and away from the main city.

FBI Field Offices

Cleveland: 1501 Lakeside Avenue, Cleveland, OH 44114

Cincinnati: 2012 Ronald Reagan Drive, Cincinnati, OH 45236

There is a reference on the screen to Guardian Island, Washington.

Research: "parole housing locations in Ohio."

Massey confirms that Sean's "funeral" is actually "a wake after all." Sheriff says the same thing while speaking on the phone: "I'm at a friend's wake."

Family Reconciliation

D. Forrester talking to Alderwood: "You said reconnecting with my family would be essential to my recovery."

Alderwood to D.: "You're not the same man you used to be. You show them that."

Alderwood then reminds D. Forrester to take the lithium pills because they will help with feelings and emotions.

D. Forrester changes clothes after his initial wake entrance.

Dialogue

The film tells the audience D. Forrester has APD through D.

Sheriff takes D. Forrester into custody for attempted murder.

- Sheriff: "So who all did you kill?"

This could be a question to gauge D.'s capacity, or it could be based on personal knowledge, which would counter the narrative that Sean never said anything about having a brother.

- Hugh: "Every family has at least one nut job, right Jo?" Then Jo flips him off.

What does Hugh know about Jo's family? The question seems to reveal insider knowledge. To whom is Hugh referring and/or hinting?

- Jo: "I'm taking to the sheriff and the psychopath some coffee?"

Why does she seem offended that Massey calls D. a psychopath? In addition, why is Massey calling D. something he doesn't know anything about? Massey is an archaeologist, not a psychologist.

Sheriff assuming D. is a murderer in his language, but the FBI info notes "attempted murder," not murder.

Jo:

- "You didn't kill him. He's a bad guy. . . . Shouldn't we?"

She asks this in the bunker when D. knocks out Whympers.

- "There are three guys, and it looks like they have a lot of guns."

She says this while she and D. Forrester are hiding outside some distance from the house.

Jo is not scared of the intruders. She doesn't act like it. When confronted by two of the intruders, she nonchalantly throws up her hands as if to mock them for telling her, "Don't move."

There are intruders in the house, terrorizing everyone, and she acts like it is no big thing. She's either not a very serious person, or she knows them. If she knows them, she was aware of the whole intrusion strategy.

Jo doesn't really converse with the other women, Linda and Susan. This is a high-pressure situation. Women usually band together, but she almost acts like they are not there until the camera puts them on the screen.

- “Seriously, you didn’t kill him either?”

This is Jo’s reference to Cole, so it is confirmed that she doesn’t have love for Cole, or there isn’t a connection to him to support the claim that she might know the intruders.

They sent the man at the beginning of the film to kill D. Forrester. Cole says, “Our man didn’t get it done.”

- Linda: “He saves himself. That’s all he cares about.”
- Alderwood: “Nobody’s perfect. . . . Deal with one problem at a time instead of all at once. . . . You’re the D. we need you to be.”

This is where D. returns after leaving and speaks with Alderwood about what to do once he gets back into the house.

D. Forrester looks to the left and to the right at the beginning when he arrives on the island and when he is speaking to Cole. This reminds me of Clint Eastwood’s film titled *A Fistful of Dollars* (1964) when he says, “The Baxters are over there. The Rojos are over there. And I’m in the middle.”

Massey was suspicious of Hugh, but Massey never went with Sean to the lighthouse to help. Did Massey live on the hotel grounds? For him to know this, he had to live there.

Sean wrote about Yamashita gold in his books, which has plural meaning more than one.

This is the end of the notes taken from viewing the film again.

Military Prison

Agent Shaughnessy mentions in *Dangerous* (2021) that D. Forrester punched his commanding officer. The narrative needs a timeline for how long D. Forrester spent in prison compared to when Agent Shaughnessy put him away.

According to the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), under Article 90 penalties, Category 3 offenses have a maximum confinement of 30 to 120 months (roughly 2 years 6 months to 10 years). The person will receive a bad conduct discharge (BCD), forfeiture of pay, and reduction in rank. Here are some links:

Appendix 2 Uniform Code of Military Justice, 2019

Link: <https://jsc.defense.gov/Portals/99/Documents/UCMJ%20-%2020December2019.pdf?ver=2020-01-28-083235-930>

The document is 54 pages.

UCMJ Article 90: Assaulting or Disobeying a Superior Officer

Link: <https://www.aaronmeyerlaw.com/ucmj-article-90/>

This is a commercial, legal website, offering analysis on the topic. There are additional links based on this keyword search.

Military Prisons in Ohio

Some contexts regarding the kind of prison D. Forrester spent time in prison is necessary.

Since D. Forrester is depicted as being on parole in Ohio, or this is suggested given that Dr. Alderwood said to Agent Shaughnessy that D. visited him “yesterday” in the film, this means that D. would be paroled to his home state, assumedly. This is suggested to ground the narrative and close gaps in plot.

According to the search results, Ohio does not currently host active military prisons. However, there are multiple historical sites, such as Camp Chase and Johnson’s Island; these sites remain important for understanding Civil War military incarceration, prisoner of war management, and other legacy categories. The locations are considered historical landmarks, offering educational and commemorative opportunities.

The above information is summarized based on the results of keyword search; however, the following information in the next section is wholly adapted, albeit summarized, from the same keyword search and may be useful for another project. Inclusion here is subject to fair use for research purposes. The results of the keyword searches derive from laptop use.

Pike

When Hugh runs, why does Pike call him a coward?

That’s a strange word to call someone. Maybe Massey calling him this is fine because he senses something. However, Pike calling him a coward seems weird. We don’t know their relationship.

Lithium for APD

Lithium is not used for antisocial personality disorder (APD). It is prescribed for individuals with borderline personality disorder and bipolar disorder.

Repairing the Narrative Regarding “Lithium”

Lithium is not FDA-approved for antisocial personality disorder (APD), but it is sometimes used off-label to target symptoms like impulsivity, aggression, and mood instability that often co-occur with ASPD.

Lithium is more established in the treatment of borderline personality disorder (BPD) and bipolar disorder. It has been studied for its potential to reduce impulsivity and anger management, stabilize mood and reduce self-harm risk, and improve emotional regulation.

Lithium is a mood stabilizer with neuroplasticity-enhancing and anti-inflammatory effects. In personality disorders, it may help to modulate dopamine and serotonin systems, reduce impulsive decision-making, and improve emotional control.

- **No ASPD-specific trial:** Most evidence derives from studies in borderline personality disorder (BPD) and bipolar disorder.
- **Off-label use:** Lithium for ASPD use is not approved and should be considered only after careful risk-benefit assessment.
- **Co-occurring conditions:** ASPD often co-occurs with mood or anxiety disorders, which may influence treatment response.
- **Therapy remains primary:** Medication is generally adjunctive; psychotherapy (Dialectical Behavior Therapy, cognitive behavioral therapy) is the cornerstone of treatment.

According to the Mayo Clinic website, there are no medicines specifically approved by the Food and Drug (FDA) to treat antisocial personality disorder (APD). Healthcare providers may prescribe medicines for conditions that sometimes occur along with APD, such as anxiety or depression, or symptoms for aggression.

Symptoms for APD include the following:

Ignoring right and wrong; telling lies to take advantage of others; not being sensitive to or respectful of others; using charm and wit to manipulate for personal gain; having a sense of superiority and being extremely opinionated; having problems with the law, including criminal behavior; being hostile, aggressive, violent or threatening to others; feeling no guilt about harming others; doing dangerous things with no regard for the safety of self or others; being irresponsible and failing to fulfill work or financial responsibilities.

Adults with antisocial personality disorder (APD) usually show symptoms of conduct disorder (CD) before the age of 15. Symptoms of conduct disorder include the following: aggression towards people or animals; destruction of property; lying and dishonesty; theft; serious violation of rules.

People with APD usually do not seek help, may not give an accurate description of their symptoms, are not diagnosed before age 18 years old; talk therapy (psychotherapy) is used to treat APD; therapy includes anger and violence management, treatment for problems with alcohol and drugs, and treatment for other mental health conditions; however, talk therapy is not always effective. Again, there are no FDA-approved medicines for APD.

Source:

Mayo Clinic Staff. (2023, February 24). Diseases & conditions: Antisocial personality disorder. *Mayo Clinic*. Retrieved from <https://www.mayoclinic.org/diseases-conditions/antisocial-personality-disorder/diagnosis-treatment/drc-20353934>. Accessed 29 July 2026.

All content provided, whether wholly adapted or summarized under this note, is subject to fair use for research purposes.

Part Two: Considerations for *Dangerous 2: The Hunt* Sequel

Part Two of this case study suggests guidelines for a sequel to *Dangerous* (2021), beginning with a logline, story concept, and thematic application followed up by considerations of subplots for main characters. The goal would be to encourage world building based on real and manufactured timelines.

Logline

Former Navy SEAL turned assassin uses a business strategy to hunt his remaining enemies.

Story

Dangerous 2: The Hunt begins with D. Forrester in a business class learning about the concept of opportunity cost. He is given an assignment to write an opportunity assessment plan for a fictional business venture. On the same day, at night in his apartment, he remembers the events from the first movie and how triggering they were.

The next day he follows the email link to participate in a three-person, online therapy session between D. Forrester, Linda Forrester, and Dr. Alderwood. The session is interrupted when Linda is taken captive. A masked individual taunts D. Forrester to find him. He leaves the Zoom call to search for his mother. Using a helicopter, he tries to access Guardian Island, but a sniper on the island shoots his helicopter; he is forced to retreat.

His hunt journey begins with visiting previous characters who he thinks has played a part in who he has become, believing that those characters have the answers he needs regarding who might have kidnapped his mother. The first part of his journey begins with visiting a safe house, relaying the narrative of his mother kidnapped, leaving, and then watching the safe house blow up. Before D. Forrester leaves, Tatum, the safe house receptionist, questions whether Cole is still alive by asking D. Forrester, "Did you see the body?" This gives rise to D. Forrester questioning the events from the previous movie.

On a rural road farther away from the explosion, two cars are pursuing him, one positioning in the back of his car and the other in the front. D. Forrester is trapped between the two cars and is forced to get control of the situation through gunfire; he causes the main driver to fall off a cliff on the road. Before he is forced down the cliff, he questions D. Forrester's belief system about getting out by asking, "You didn't think you could just get out because you killed Cole?" He says to D. Forrester that participating in missions was the choice he made. Then D. Forrester takes the keys to the car and drives off.

His visit to Agent Shaughnessy's office reveals a different relationship they have, not one of hostility or necessarily respect, but one of mutual understanding. She reveals that she has been reassigned to Washington State to clean up the Cole situation from the previous movie. D. Forrester asks about the funding source regarding the financial transactions for purchase of Guardian Island. Shaughnessy says that she cannot share too much information because the property is undergoing the probate process. D. Forrester does not reveal that his mother has been kidnapped to Agent Shaughnessy. She reveals that Massey, Sean's friend from college, lives in Washington. Before D. Forrester leaves the building, he encounters a Man in a Grey Suit, who attacks him; he is forced to defend himself, stabbing the man in an elevator. An APB is put out for D. Forrester.

He then visits Massey at his lake house, questioning him about the activities on the day Sean died. Massey reveals Sean's predictable behavior in working on the lighthouse daily. Massey mentions the roles other characters played regarding their stay at or visit to the lighthouse.

Although their discussion is brief before Shaughnessy and Washington State's police visit, Massey reveals the connection between Sean and Cole; both were in Afghanistan to D. Forrester's surprise: "When was my brother in Afghanistan?" The main character's goal segues into D. Forrester visiting a university library to search for and skim Sean's dissertation. Then he calls Shaughnessy and requests that she review the financial transactions of Sean's purchase of the island. By the end of Act One, he remembers something that Dr. Alderwood says about being hunted:

DR. ALDERWOOD (V.O.)
(inner thoughts)

You know they're going to come after you?

D. FORRESTER (V.O.)
I've been hunted before. I can handle it.

Shaughnessy and the police make it to the hangar, but D. Forrester has already left.

Act Two begins with the first Afghanistan subplot, depicting the connection between Sean and Cole. Sean travels to the country, and Cole picks him up. They ride together to the Combat Post where the Outpost Captain informs the servicemen about the U.S. plans to withdraw from Afghanistan. Cole has rank, but he is planning to become a private defense contractor. The main character profiles in this act include a CIA analyst, oil lobbyist, and private defense contractors.

They all discuss the impact of the DOHA Agreement, which outlines the U.S. to Taliban conditions for U.S. withdrawal. Cole reveals his goal to capitalize on the opportunity regarding selling U.S. secrets. For his part, Sean is tasked with developing an opportunity assessment plan for every threat to Cole's business objectives. All U.S. troops and diplomatic personnel leave Afghanistan on August 31, 2021, with the narrative extending Sean's storyline to him returning to Guardian Island, meeting with his wife Susan, and meeting later with Agent Shaughnessy, who is revealed to be Sean's contact. He brings the files he stole from Afghanistan to Shaughnessy.

The narrative returns to the present day with D. Forrester sitting in a helicopter. He calls Dr. Alderwood; this alludes to a strategy used in the previous film where D. Forrester would call and ask Alderwood for psychological guidance. He reveals that Massey told him Sean had been in Afghanistan. He also reveals that he had been in Afghanistan many years earlier. They do not discuss the status of his mother being kidnapped. D. Forrester finishes the conversation and then visits Cleveland Jail where he converses with Sniper about the events in the previous film. D. Forrester questions him about what was going on in Afghanistan during the time Cole was there, but Sniper never made it to the country. He doesn't have any direct information. He reveals that Hugh was part of the private contracting team; he was not a soldier. However, it is still unclear how Hugh knew about Sean even though Cole sent Hugh to monitor Sean. They hint at their issues with "missions" and then Sniper leaves the table. D. Forrester's flashback to Afghanistan begins.

He remembers in October 2009 that the outpost was under attack, yelling at his commanding officer for not preparing the post, punching his commanding officer and then being subsequently charged for the offense, tried, and convicted; and then later being transported to a local prison in Lake Erie. It is here where he meets Cole, who has different ideas for him, which include torturing him into submission to do his "missions." Their first mission includes robbing a safety deposit box.

However, it is a setup. Cole strikes D. Forrester from the back. They all leave him there, he is caught by a bank guard, he kills the guard by reflex, and then he runs to his mother's house. She is hostile towards him and tells him he must leave. He is finally caught, and Agent Shaughnessy puts him away in 2013, which is a time frame that aligns with what she says in the previous film about putting D. away eight (8) years ago; the film's release was 2021. The team members conducting the robbery are all the same from the previous film: Felix, Blanchard, Whympers, and Pike. Sniper is not present. When D. Forrester returns to prison August 2013, Cole is there. He says, "Welcome back, D." This ends Act Two.

Act Three returns to present day when D. Forrester calls Shaughnessy, who is now at the jail speaking with Sniper. D. Forrester asks Shaughnessy about the gold, about what happened to it. She says that the gold was a federal issue and that the government took possession of it. He asks again about the financial transactions to which Shaughnessy says that they will get a cyber team on it. He asks about Cole's status. Shaughnessy initially says, "We found him dead," but then she reveals that Cole is still alive and in a coma. She tells him that he still needs to answer for the incident in the elevator with the Man in a Grey Suit, but he abruptly ends the call.

Shaughnessy questions Sniper about what he told D. Forrester about the gold. Shaughnessy remembers something in flashback about her discussion with Sean, who swears her to secrecy never to tell D. Forrester about his time as a double spy in Afghanistan. He reveals to Shaughnessy that Cole will find him because he has the counterintelligence Cole wants to peddle to foreign entities. It's Shaughnessy who reveals that Cole used to be a licensed psychologist who eventually lost his license because of his own greed. They discuss D. Forrester's background with the legal system. The flashback ends with Sean giving Shaughnessy the papers he stole.

The narrative returns to the present day with Shaughnessy leaving the prison after speaking with Sniper and checking in with her assistant about tracking D. Forrester, who is now walking through a national park to get to a structure that represents a resource center. It is a cover and functions as a safe house. It is revealed in this exchange between D. Forrester and the safe receptionist that the FBI put Cole up somewhere and that Shaughnessy cannot tell him who the anonymous benefactor is. When he reaches an area of the safe house, he enters a room. Someone behind the door opens it off camera.

Shaughnessy visits with Cole in the hospital who still looks like he is in a coma. She receives a text from her assistant about Dr. Alderwood losing his license in 2020. She has a brief flashback to show how Cole came to be under FBI purview. The flashback ends, and Cole wakes up. They have a revealing exchange.

COLE HANSEN

Does D. know?

AGENT SHAUGHNESSY

No.

COLE HANSEN

Good. Keep it that way.

AGENT SHAUGHNESSY

Copy, boss.

The narrative reveals who Agent Shaughnessy works for with this exchange.

D. Forrester visits another character from the previous film, namely Jo, who is in her kitchen making coffee when she discovers him. He asks her to tell him about her relationship with Hugh. Jo reveals old knowledge about Hugh being the one to take Sean dinner, but D. Forrester notes the distance between the inn and the lighthouse. He asks about how she got the job at the inn. Once he leaves, Jo calls someone and says, "He was just here." The person is revealed to be Agent Shaughnessy who informs Cole of D. Forrester's recent visit.

Dr. Alderwood sits at a licensing board meeting to qualify for a renewal, but it comes with conditions. After the meeting, he answers a phone call and bolts from the building.

D. Forrester visits the Man with Gun from the previous film. He lives at a lake house. The men discuss what Cole was after, but the Man with Gun says, "It was a mission. Like all his missions." Man with Gun makes an interesting assessment of D. Forrester's status. He was on parole, but he was also free, which means he had options. Cole didn't want D. Forrester to have options, so he ordered him killed, risking the mission. D. Forrester leaves.

In the next scene, three sets of feet walk into the hospital room where Cole is sitting. Those three sets of feet are Agent Shaughnessy, Jo, and Dr. Alderwood. They are all revealed to work for or

have connections to Cole. Alderwood reveals that the board has restored his license, and Cole has reestablished D. Forrester as an enemy. This ends Act Three.

The resolution is in progress.

Theme

Here is a brief exploration of the primary theme. The primary source material is found in the References section at the end of this case study. Act Three ends at page 114.

Opportunity Cost Lesson

The theme for the sequel centers on the business concept called “**opportunity cost**,” which is defined as choosing the value of the next-best alternative one gives up when making a choice. Because sources are often limited, such as time, money, and labor, choosing one option means automatically foregoing the benefits of the other option.

When considered during the entrepreneurial process, there are **four distinct phases**, which include the following:

- identifying and evaluating the opportunity
- developing the business plan
- determining the sources required, and
- managing the resulting enterprise.

For example, identifying includes determining the categories of sources, such as consumers, business associates, and technical people; evaluating, thus, is assessed by determining if a specific product or service has the returns needed for the resources required.

The **cause of the opportunity** is important. Here are some key questions for consideration:

- Is the cause of the opportunity representative of technological change?
- Is the cause of the opportunity representative of market shift?
- Is the cause of the opportunity representative of government regulation?
- Is the cause of the opportunity representative of competition?

Determining cause of opportunity is predicated on identifying the **window of opportunity**. This is the period for creating new venture based on the market size and length and risk and rewards.

Risk is usually associated with market, competition, technology, and the amount of capital involved. Thus, risks and rewards consider possible subsequent opportunities that include multiple distribution channels. Pursuit of the opportunity must consider the personal skills and goals of the entrepreneur.

Given the above considerations, what results is the creation of an opportunity analysis, called an **opportunity assessment plan**, which is defined as not a business plan; instead, it focuses on the opportunity and not the entire venture; and it provides for the basis of marking the decision, especially on whether to act on the decision. The opportunity analysis includes explorations of the following categories:

- Description of the product or service
- Assessment of the opportunity
- Assessment of the entrepreneur and team
- Specifications for all the activities and resources needed
- Source of capital

What is most unique about the opportunity assessment plan is the pursuit of answers before choosing the decision. One of the questions involves determining **market need**. From this focus on market need is further questions about personal observations, social conditions, market research data, available patents, existing competition, the necessity of the international market and competition, and revenue generation. These secondary factors determine the effectiveness of meeting market need, which determines commitment of resources.

Once the opportunity assessment plan is complete, the entrepreneur begins the business planning processes.

Source

Hisrich, R.D., & Peters, M.P. (2002). *Entrepreneurship*. Fifth Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Managing Real, Film, and Manufactured Timelines

The following table incorporates timelines depicted in *Dangerous* (2021), timelines for the sequel, and timelines based on actual historical events to support the Afghanistan subplots.

Here is the projected timeline to support the existing narrative for *Dangerous* (2021) and to manufacture one for the sequels. The information is based on what the characters reveal and what is suggested in certain scenes. Consider all events real where it applies. More rows will be added after this entry date. The grid on the following page is tentative.

Table: Film and Historical Timelines

Dates	Events	Notes
September 1, 1939 – September 2, 1945	World War II dates	The war is referenced in the first film.
October 7, 2001 – August 30, 2021	U.S. military presence in Afghanistan	See separate timeline tailored to the event.
2003	Sean graduated from high school, entered 2000, dual credit student.	Manufactured
2005	Sean graduated with a bachelor's degree; entered 2001	Manufactured
2010	Sean graduated from college with a PhD in Japanese History	Manufactured
2011	Freddie's birth year.	He looks 10 in the film. (assumption)
2013	Agent Shaughnessy of the FBI says she put D. away 8 years ago.	This year is projected from the year of the film's release, November 2021. (assumption)
2019	Sean approximately quits job (1 year and a ½ ago)	Shaughnessy's assistant provides this information. (assumption)
February 2020	Flashback	Pre-pandemic, Afghanistan, outpost
January 1, 2021	Still in flashback	Installation of President Biden

Dates	Events	Notes
May 1, 2021	Still in flashback	Outpost captain posts sign with revised deadline for U.S. withdrawal from Afghanistan, Taliban launches offensive.
August 18, 2021	Still in flashback	Reporting of Taliban fighters entering Kabul
August 19, 2021	Still in flashback	Personnel place sensitive material in bags
August 2021	Sean notes “few months” in his card about the completion of D.’s parole	Assume three months from release date. Manufactured a specific date based on connection to real events.
August 31, 2021	End flashback	American servicemen depart to combat post, troops board the plane.
November 5, 2021	<i>Dangerous 2021</i>	Film release date
November 2021	Flashback to Guardian Island	Montage of events from the first film
November 25, 2021	D. Forrester receives a card for Thanksgiving from Sean while he is eating a TV dinner on the holiday.	This is on a Thursday for the given year, assuming he didn’t receive it before or after the holiday.
Date unknown	D. Forrester receives a card from Susan regarding Sean’s funeral to be held December 8, 2021. The date is written on the card.	The destination is Guardian Island, Washington state.

Dates	Events	Notes
December 6, 2021	Dr. Alderwood says D. Forrester came by yesterday (from 12/7), which would be today, 12/6.	
December 7, 2021	Agent Shaughnessy visits Dr. Alderwood. Assistant tells Shaughnessy that the funeral is tomorrow, December 8, 2021.	To ensure continuity from the date between the visit to Alderwood and when the assistant tells her about the funeral, Shaughnessy is wearing the same outfit.
2022	Present day	References to January 2022, spring semester 2022 in sequel script. Return to present day.
Spring Semester 2022	D. taking a business course, topic on opportunity cost Zoom call with Alderwood, mother, and D.	
January 2022 to February 2022 (subject to change)	Present day	Various activities depicting D. going out and searching for answers, encountering obstacles.

Note on Scott Eastwood's Academic (Real)

Scott Eastwood graduated from high school in 2003 and college in 2008.

Note on Age Difference (Manufactured)

In the film, D. Forrester is older than Sean Forrester, but it isn't clear the age difference. However, in the picture he views, they look a year or two apart.

Note on Dual Credit (Real but Manufactured for Sequel)

Dual credit begins in the junior year, 11th grade; college readiness standard. Dual credit was first approved in Texas in 1995.

Dual credit began in Washington State in 1990 with the creation of the Running Start Program, which allowed 11th and 12th grade students to take college courses and earn both high school and college credit.

University of Washington offered concurrent enrollment in 1982: College in the High School. Dual credit program began in Ohio in 1989 – first lauded as Postsecondary Enrollment Option (PSEO), created by the Omnibus Education Reform Act.

Note on Sheriff’s “Way Back”

If Sean Forrester and Sheriff go way back, and Sean never mentioned he had a brother, then when did D. begin exhibiting conduct issues? So much to the point that D. and Sheriff never crossed paths? When did D. leave the house? Here is a task for consideration:

- We could say Sean and Sheriff have known each other since high school, 9th grade specifically.
- If we suggest that Sean and Sheriff knew each other “way back” as defined to be high school, then we could kick D. out of the house before high school.

Refer to Solution #5: Explain “Go Way Back” in this case study for context.

U.S. Withdrawal from Afghanistan

The U.S. withdrawal from Afghanistan is a consideration for the sequel.

There are two subplots for Sean Forrester and Dylan Forrester, and Sean’s subplot connects directly to Cole’s presence in the first film. D. Forrester meets Cole after D.’s subplot with Afghanistan completes.

The timeline regarding the U.S. withdrawal informs the timeline for the sequel. The Afghanistan outpost hierarchy also informs the development of a scene. For example, the Combat Outpost (COP) offers a tactical core. COPs tend to be small, temporary, or semi-permanent bases. They are built in strategic locations and on low ground near roads for resupply. The purpose of these bases is to combine combat security with counterinsurgency (COIN) missions. The base may contain a few hundred personnel. The challenges with this type of construction are limited air mobility, vulnerability to ambushes, and political sensitivity.

An example of a COP is depicted in the film *The Outpost* (2019) where the base is COP Keating (Kamdesht). The film is an influence for developing the subplots for the sequel. There are additional hierarchy examples; when conducting an internet search, use “Afghanistan outpost hierarchy.” A host of examples result. Use the link in the section on the next page.

Source

Here is the link: <https://legalclarity.org/us-withdrawal-from-afghanistan-a-timeline-of-events/>.

Link:

<https://www.bing.com/search?q=afghanistan%20outpost%20hierarchy&FORM=ARPSEC&PC=3VSS&PTAG=1386>.

World Building for D2: Afghanistan Subplots

The world building for *Dangerous 2: The Hunt* considers the timeline of the U.S. withdrawal from Afghanistan to add context for both D. Forrester and Sean Forrester.

Based on the Legal Clarity document, this is a timeline of the events leading up to the U.S. withdrawal from Afghanistan. Here is the source entry:

- Legal Clarity Team. (2026, April 1). U.S. withdrawal from Afghanistan: Timeline and aftermath. *LegalClarity.com*. Retrieved from <https://legalclarity.org/us-withdrawal-from-afghanistan-a-timeline-of-events/>. Accessed 14 July 2026.

The content in the table is wholly adapted from the source referenced above. This essentially works like a note-taking exercise. It is summarized.

Should any material be used for commercial purposes whether in the sequel script or some other literary medium, if it is not subject to fair use, then careful steps will be taken to prevent copyright and trademark violations.

The information contained in the table although summarized in some parts for brevity is considered factual information based on the provided source.

The table is on the next page and is marked as follows:

Table: U.S. Withdrawal from Afghanistan Timeline

Date	Incident and/or Explanations
September 11, 2021	Referred to as 9/11. Four coordinated Islamist terrorist suicide attacks by al-Qaeda against the United States. The U.S. launched a global war on terror, seeking to eliminate hostile groups deemed terrorist organizations and the governments that supported them.
February 29, 2020	Doha Agreement between U.S. and Taliban in Doha, Qatar signed. U.S. agrees U.S. withdraw all military forces, coalition partners, civilian personnel, private security contractors, trainers, and advisors within 14 months, making the deadline May 1, 2021. U.S. must reduce its force from 13,000 to 8,6000 troops and call for the release of up to 5,000 Taliban prisoners. Taliban agrees: Afghan soil would not be used by any group to threaten the security of the U.S. and its allies. Deal: contained classified annexes that addressed provisions for long-term U.S. counterterrorism presence, Taliban denunciation of terrorism, mechanism for monitoring the semi-truce, terms for future CIA operations in Taliban-controlled areas.
January 1, 2021	Biden takes office, inherits the deal, U.S. troop levels in Afghanistan had already dropped to 2,500. Faces a choice to honor the withdrawal agreement or risk an escalation of Taliban attacks against a shrinking American force. Resets the deadline for August 31, 2021. Conclusion: unwinnable war that did not have a military solution.
March 2021	Investigation: SIGAR had warned that a complete troop withdrawal would likely cause the Afghan government to collapse. Carol Perez, acting Undersecretary for Management later testified to Congress with a line that captured the entire debacle: “We were still in planning when it fell.”

May 1, 2021	Initial deadline for U.S. withdrawal. Final phase for physical withdrawal began. Over the following weeks, U.S. military methodically closed dozens of installations across the country and transferred equipment to Afghan forces.
May 2021	Taliban launched a sweeping offensive, seizing dozens of rural districts. Provincial capitals fell in early August. Afghan soldiers, cut off from the airport and resupply, proved willing to negotiate surrenders or abandon their posts. Afghan government did not grasp that its military could not sustain itself until Biden's withdrawal announcement.
July 2, 2021	American forces quietly vacated Bagram Airfield, which was a massive base north of Kabul that had served as the operational hub for the entire war. Afghan officials accused the U.S. of leaving overnight without notifying the base's incoming Afghan commander; the facility was briefly unguarded and open to looting. Vast majority of civilian contractors who maintained the Afghan military's aircraft and logistics systems departed. Without those maintenance teams, the Afghan Air Force could not keep its helicopters and planes flying, and the army's supply chain began to break down almost immediately.
August 6, 2021	Investigation finding: The embassy did not fully engage in evacuation planning until August 6, just nine days before Kabul fell.
August 14, 2021	Investigation finding: The government had not determined who would be eligible for evacuation or identified transit countries to receive evacuees. As many as 35 consular officers, many of them untrained volunteers, were processing the thousands of people pouring into the airport each day.

August 15, 2021	Taliban fighters entered Kabul. President Ashraf Ghani fled the country. The internationally recognized government dissolved. The security apparatus that the U.S. built collapsed in a matter of weeks. Fall of Kabul triggered noncombatant evacuation operation centered at Hamid Karzai International Airport.
August 18 and 19, 2021	Reinforcements from 82nd Airborne Division, the 24th Marine Expeditionary Unit, and National Guard units surged into the airport beginning August 18 and 19, bringing the American military presence from 1,000 to nearly 6,000 troops. Focus was on extracting American citizens, diplomatic personnel, coalition partners, green card holders, at-risk Afghans, those eligible for Special Immigrant Visas (SIV).
From August 19 th to August 31, 2021	Over 17 days, nearly 800 military and civilian aircraft from more than 30 nations carried approximately 124,000 people out of Kabul, including 6,000 Americans. Roughly half of the Air Force's fleet of 222 C-17 transport planes were committed to the operation. Massive crowds pressed against the airport perimeter, families passed children over razor wire to soldiers, and people clung to departing aircraft on the runway.
August 26, 2021	ISIS-K suicide bomber named Abdul Rahman al Logari detonated an explosive vest at Abbey Gate, one of the airport's entry points. He killed 13 U.S. service members and roughly 170 Afghan civilians. American dead included: 11 Marines, one Navy corpsman, and one Army soldier. U.S. military struck back, conducting drone strikes against ISIS-K targets.

August 29, 2021	Pentagon launched a drone strike on a vehicle in a Kabul neighborhood that it initially claimed was carrying explosives for a second attack on the airport. Investigation revealed the target was an aid worker. The strike killed 10 Afghan civilians, including 7 children. General McKenzie called it a “tragic mistake.” For the Afghans who made it out, resettlement was managed through Operation Allies Welcome, federal effort led by the Department of Homeland Security, beginning August 29, 2021. DHS established a Unified Coordination Group with FEMA serving as the lead coordinating body to manage the transition from military evacuation to domestic resettlement. The process included immigration processing, COVID-19 testing and quarantine, temporary housing at safe havens, and eventual placement with resettlement agencies and community partners across the country. Separate pathway for Afghans who did not meet SIV requirements through Priority 2 refugee designations with eligibility extending to spouses and children.
48 hours before deadline	Remaining military and diplomatic personnel who had been securing the airport worked to process the last groups of evacuees and destroy sensitive equipment. Last American service member to step onto Afghan soil was Major General Chris Donahue, commander of the 82nd Airborne Division, who boarded a C-17 cargo plane at Hamid Karzai International Airport on August 30, 2021.
August 31, 2021	Reset deadline for U.S. withdrawal. General Kenneth F. McKenzie Jr., Marine Corps four-star general commanding U.S. Central Command, confirmed that every American service member had departed. The final flight left the airport under Taliban control hours before the deadline expired.

After 31, 2021 Post-withdrawal	Assessment: Withdrawal left a substantial amount of U.S. funded military equipment in Taliban hands, including guns, ammunition, armored vehicles, and helicopters originally provided to the Afghan security forces. American troops disabled dozens of Humvees and aircraft before departing to prevent their use, but the Taliban gained access to arsenal of functional military equipment.
Mid-2025	Tens of thousands of Afghans who had worked alongside U.S. forces as interpreters, drivers, security guards, and support staff were promised a path to safety through the Special Immigrant Visa (SIV) program. Eligibility required employment by or on behalf of the U.S. government in Afghanistan, and the program was the primary legal channel for at-risk Afghans to resettle in the U.S. Scale of the backlog was staggering. As of mid-2025, 18,800 applicants who had already received Chief of Mission approval were undergoing visa processing while another 64,475 were in pre-review and 47,000 were awaiting Chief of Mission review with thousand more had expressed interest but not yet submitted completed application.
December 2025	Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction (SIGAR) found that the primary factors behind the collapse were the sudden loss of U.S. airstrikes, low morale, and institutional distrust between Afghan commanders and their U.S. government. U.S. airstrikes activity had dropped from 7,243 strikes in 2019 to just 1,631 in 2020 and fell to nearly zero during the withdrawal. Operational restrictions under the Doha Agreement prevented U.S. aircraft from targeting Taliban forces staged more than 500 meters from Afghan positions, giving Taliban freedom to attack. Note: The numbers referenced in this section may fall under multiple documents. The document does not include a link to a direct source to account for the numbers above. However, there are multiple entries for the bibliography that follows.

January 1, 2026	Effective date for Presidential Proclamation 10998 that fully suspended visa issuance to Afghan nationals, including Afghan SIVs as part of a broader entry restriction covering 12 countries. The suspension froze the promise made too many still in the pipeline.
-----------------	--

Bibliography

This is a brief bibliography using the following information:

Search term: special inspector general for afghanistan reconstruction pdf

Link: https://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/report/sigar/sigar-final-report_20251203.pdf

This link above began the search and produced multiple results included in the entries below.

Aloise, G. (2025, December). Final report: Seventeen years of reconstruction oversight, forensic audit. *Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction*. Retrieved from https://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/report/sigar/sigar-final-report_20251203.pdf. Accessed 14 July 2026.

Note: The report runs 137 pages and is titled Final Report: Seventeen Years of Reconstruction Oversight, Forensic Audit. The link is in the bibliography entry.

Committee on Oversight and Accountability. (2023, April 19). Testimony of John F. Sopko, special inspector general for Afghanistan reconstruction. *U.S. House of Representatives*. Hearing. Retrieved from <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/GOVPUB-S-PURL-gpo220906/pdf/GOVPUB-S-PURL-gpo220906.pdf>. Accessed 14 July 2026.

This is a hearing document based on the testimony of a SIGAR official that runs 21 pages.

Fields, A. (2009, January 30). Message from the special inspector general for Afghanistan reconstruction. *Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction*. Retrieved from <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/tr/pdf/ADA553737.pdf>. Accessed 14 July 2026.

This is a second formal report prepared by SIGAR, directed by Section 1229 of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2008. This document runs 117 pages.

Fields, A. (2009, October 30). Quarterly report to the United States Congress. *Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction*. Retrieved from <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/tr/pdf/ADA512600.pdf>. Accessed 14 July 2026.

This is the fifth quarterly report from a SIGAR official that provides an update on the status of reconstruction efforts in Afghanistan. This document runs 161 pages.

Legal Clarity Team. (2026, April 1). U.S. withdrawal from Afghanistan: Timeline and aftermath. *LegalClarity.com*. Retrieved from <https://legalclarity.org/us-withdrawal-from-afghanistan-a-timeline-of-events/>. Accessed 14 July 2026.

This is a document used to create the table for this note's entry. This is an online resource summarizing the event, and when printed, it is paginated at six pages.

Sopko, J.F. (2015, January 20). Statement of john f. sopko, special investigator general for afghanistan reconstruction. DOD task force for business and stability operations in Afghanistan: Preliminary results show serious management and oversight problems. Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support. *Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction*. Retrieved from https://www.armed-services.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/Sopko_01-20-16.pdf. Accessed 14 July 2026.

This document outlines management results from stimulating private sector growth and investment in Afghanistan's war-torn country. This document runs 41 pages.

Sopko, J.F. (2018, April). Private sector development and economic growth: Lessons from the U.S. experience in Afghanistan. *Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction*. Retrieved from <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/GOVPUB-S-PURL-gpo91433/pdf/GOVPUB-S-PURL-gpo91433.pdf>. Accessed 14 July 2026.

This is the third in a series of lessons learned reports issued by SIGAR to examine how the U.S. government supported private sector development in Afghanistan since 2001 through efforts led by the U.S. Agency for International Development. This document runs 246 pages.

Sopko, J.F. (2019, May 9). Statement of john f. sopko, special investigator general for afghanistan reconstruction, oversight of u.s. spending in Afghanistan. Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee (HSGAC) Subcommittee on Federal Spending Oversight and Emergency Management (FSO), U.S. Senate. Testimony. *Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction*. Retrieved from <https://www.hsgac.senate.gov/wp-content/uploads/imo/media/doc/Sopko%20Testimony.pdf>. Accessed 14 July 2026.

This is a document outlining the testimony of a SIGAR official regarding spending for Afghanistan reconstruction. This document runs 17 pages.

Sopko, J.F. (2024, January). Cash shipments to Afghanistan: The UN has purchased and transported more than \$2.9 billion to Afghanistan to implement humanitarian assistance, SIGAR 24-12 Evaluation Report. *Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction*. Retrieved from <https://justthenews.com/sites/default/files/2024-02/SIGAR-24-12-IP.pdf>. Accessed 14 July 2026.

This is a document outlining cash shipments to Afghanistan. This document runs 34 pages.

Research Questions for Representing CD and APD

Since antisocial personality disorder (APD) is part of the narrative in *Dangerous* (2021), and since lithium is not an FDA-approved prescription for APD, ensuring that it is represented appropriately, if necessary, is important for the sequel and television series considerations.

Based on the information that clarifies the use of lithium for APD depicted in the film and determining according to evidence that it is not appropriate, to satisfy the conspiracy idea that D. Forrester had been a pawn in a larger game since his Afghanistan stint, it is important to create a research plan. I'm not sure of the research hypothesis, yet, but here are some tentative considerations. They are subject to change.

Research question:

Will research participants who present with high levels of aggression and propensity to commit murder based on their previous behaviors, criminal or non-criminal, be less likely to commit murder with depressant-based medication?

Research purpose:

The purpose of the research is to determine if depressant-based medication works for antisocial personality disorder (APD) where the research participant presents with aggressive behavior, past or present.

Research goal:

The research goal is to assess previous military servicemen who served in Afghanistan between 2001 and 2021.

Research thesis:

The research thesis is research participants who present with aggressive behavior based on past or present behaviors, criminal or non-criminal, with depressant-based medication, will be less likely to commit murder.

Moral dilemma:

The moral dilemma is that a licensed clinician purposely misdiagnosed a therapy client so that a pharmaceutical company could try out "lithium" on Afghanistan veterans. Instead of prescribing lithium to patients presenting with borderline personality disorder (BPD) or bipolar disorder, researchers prescribed lithium to clients presenting with antisocial personality disorder (APD), clients who typically do not seek treatment because they don't believe they need help. The clients who needed the medication to deaden their responses to stimuli were given placebo pills instead so that researchers could measure whether the ones who take lithium were inclined to commit murder and whether the ones who received placebos would be inclined to commit

murder. The ones presenting with BPD received placebo. The ones with APD received the BPD client's medication.

Given the clarification information on the use of lithium in the first film as a solution for D. Forrester's antisocial personality disorder, the following question remains for plot development:

- What does this mean for Dr. Alderwood?

A plot consideration could be that he was discovered based on this moral dilemma but not criminally charged. Although lithium is not FDA-approved for APD, it can be used even if it is not the standard practice. His license was suspended pending investigation.

Therefore, now we need a hearing for Dr. Alderwood in the script.

Clarifying Counseling Licensure

For *Dangerous 2: The Hunt*, I'm bringing in the licensing board information for Dr. Alderwood. This puts him in a hearing to answer questions regarding client management of D. Forrester

For Ohio, the licensing board is called Ohio Counselor and Social Worker Board. It is responsible for licensure of professional counselors, social workers, and marriage and family therapists. It was established in 1984.

To become a licensed professional counselor (LPC), one must possess a master's degree from a clinical mental health counseling program, clinical rehabilitation counseling program, or addiction counseling program accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP).

Applicants must complete the National Counselor Examination (NCE). The application process includes submitting an LPC application, submitting required documents, and registering for the exam. License verification is conducted via the Ohio.gov website. Continuing education requirements apply.

Source:

Staff. (n.d.). LPC application instructions. *Counselor, Social Worker, and Marriage and Family Therapist Board*. Ohio.gov. Retrieved from here: <https://cswmft.ohio.gov/get-licensed/counselors/lpc-application-instructions>. Accessed 30 July 2026.

This is an official website regarding licensure preparation and requirements for potential licensed professional counselors. It is useful information for determining the professional requirements Dr. Alderwood was expected to fulfill and complete.

Staff. (n.d.). Disciplined licensees. *Counselor, Social Worker, and Marriage and Family Therapist Board*. Ohio.gov. Retrieved from here: <https://cswmft.ohio.gov/for-the-public/disciplined-licensees>. Accessed 30 July 2026.

The information is part of footer navigation tab that houses information about licensed professional counselors who were disciplined based on State of Ohio Counselor, Social Worker, Marriage and Family Therapist Board.

This part of the website houses information on LPCs who signed consent agreements to surrender their licenses, participate in supervised counseling to maintain their licenses, or agree to revocation of their licenses subject to renewal. Lastly, there is a link for information about when an LPC's license is adjudicated as suspended for a year defined in the hearing document. Here are the additional links for sample disciplinary licensees:

Helen Abramovitz, Consent Agreement – Surrendered

Link: <https://dam.assets.ohio.gov/image/upload/cswmft.ohio.gov/disciplined-licensees/E-0001134.pdf>

The board received a complaint against Abramovitz, arguing that she failed to maintain proper standards of care. Abramovitz decided to permanently surrender her professional clinical counselor license.

Nancy Adams, Consent Agreement – Completed

Link: <https://dam.assets.ohio.gov/image/upload/cswmft.ohio.gov/disciplined-licensees/C-0004084.pdf>

Adams blurred professional boundaries and provided a treatment session for a client in her home and had the client provide her transportation to work and a medical appointment. The board concluded that Adams must work under supervision for 18 months, with a minimum of one-hour face-to-face supervision per week, beginning on the date the supervisor is approved. The supervisor must submit quarterly reports regarding the supervision, and the report should focus on areas of concern, areas for improvement, record keeping practices, and ethical decision-making. Adams must take an additional six hours in counselor ethics continuing education.

Note: This is the source that would work well with the hearing for Dr. Alderwood in the sequel script.

Stephanie S. Adams – Revocation

Link: <https://dam.assets.ohio.gov/image/upload/cswmft.ohio.gov/disciplined-licensees/S-1100809.pdf>

Adams allowed her social work license to expire. The board received an application for license as a social worker. The Board's Social Work Professional Standards Committee granted the Social Work license but with a permanent reprimand on the license for practicing without a valid social work license. Note: This is also useful for creating the dialogue in the script for Dr. Alderwood.

Joi Adell – Adjudication Order, Completed

Link: <https://dam.assets.ohio.gov/image/upload/cswmft.ohio.gov/disciplined-licensees/C-1500340.pdf>

A Notice of Opportunity for Hearing was issued to Adell by the Counselor, Social Worker, and Marriage and Family Therapist Board. An administrative hearing was held in front of a hearing officer. There were both state and defense exhibits. The committee modified the Recommendations of the Hearing Officer to an additional year of suspension added to the current suspension time. Adell must continue to renew her license and complete continuing education requirements.

The original consent agreement that preceded this hearing concluded that Adell, while working at a counseling agency, had engaged in sexual intimacies with one of the two former clients she was seeing for couples counseling in violation of Ohio Revised Code and Ohio Administrative Code. Adell's professional counselor license was suspended. She was required to receive personal counseling from a board approved mental health practitioner for a period of 18 months, for a minimum of two one-hour sessions. The practitioner must provide quarterly reports. Should Adell fail to comply, the board would pursue additional disciplinary action.

Inclusion of this information, whether wholly adapted or summarized, is subject to fair use for research purposes.

Conclusion

The unique aspect of this case study is that it encourages further research into parenting styles, attachment theory, motivation, goal orientation, personality traits, and mindset.

Except for Dr. Alderwood, with each character in *Dangerous* (2021), the goal is to remind D. Forrester of who he used to be. He explicitly says to Jo in the bunker, “I don’t kill people anymore.” He tells his nephew Freddie, “I’m not insane.” He distinguishes his previous behavior when to only killing bad people. He consistently reaches out to and calls Dr. Alderwood for guidance on how to address issues he is struggling with at the house and with his family. He studies the cards he prepared to guide him through social experiences and reconnection with his family. He addresses his enemies, resolving those issues when provoked. He takes lithium pills as prescribed. He is self-aware and intentional, yet every person, including his mother, consistently adopts and pushes the narrative that he is dangerous and not to be trusted even though the intruders are the ones who pose danger.

Given previous case studies where I have applied psychological concepts referenced above, it would be interesting to do the same later for *Dangerous* (2021). For example, when considering the differences between **fixed mindset** and **growth mindset** as explored in Carol Dweck’s book titled *Mindset: The New Psychology of Success, How We Can Learn to Fulfill Our Potential* (2007), a person with a fixed mindset always has to look smart in every situation; the person is not willing to take risks for fear of failure compared to someone with a growth mindset who is willing to embrace challenges and learn from criticism. Cole in the film refuses to accept that D. Forrester has changed. Cole needs him at the same capacity and temperament he was when he was a killer. D. Forrester avoiding Cole triggers the latter’s need to shepherd him back into the fold with the crew of mercenaries. Consistently telling Cole that he is not insane is met with resistance and eventually with the same refrain as D. Forrester is forced to kill Cole.

Another aspect of the film’s narrative is the strained relationship D. Forrester has with his mother, Linda Forrester, who frames him as a problem in front of the other characters at the inn. She doesn’t give them a chance to get to know D. Forrester. She makes up their minds for them. There are four types of **child rearing styles**: authoritarian, authoritative, permissive, and uninvolved. The fact that D. Forrester needed index cards to manage his social interaction suggests that Linda was uninvolved with this part of his development. She was also authoritarian towards him, which is defined as high coercive control, low autonomy granting, and cold, rejecting, and critical (Berk, 2014). This means that D. Forrester was likely a scapegoat. Linda seems to favor Sean Forrester over D. Forrester; this suggests that she was more authoritative towards Sean, willing to offer “teachable moments” for the golden child (Berk, 2014).

There are additional psychological concepts that apply to *Dangerous* (2021), but these two mainly present a future opportunity to apply these terms directly to the dynamic between Linda Forrester and D. Forrester.

At the end of the day, D. Forrester proved to be the most conscientious about change, and Dr. Alderwood contributed to and furthered that purpose, encouraging D. to stay the course.

Bibliography

This section combines sources used and considered within this case study. If a section houses an annotated bibliography specific to that section's content, then the annotated information is not carried over into this area of the case study. Only the entry without the annotation is included.

References

Aloise, G. (2025, December). Final report: Seventeen years of reconstruction oversight, forensic audit. *Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction*. Retrieved from https://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/report/sigar/sigar-final-report_20251203.pdf. Accessed 14 July 2026.

Berk, L. (2014). Development through the lifespan. 6th edition. Pearson.

Committee on Oversight and Accountability. (2023, April 19). Testimony of John F. Sopko, special inspector general for Afghanistan reconstruction. *U.S. House of Representatives*. Hearing. Retrieved from <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/GOVPUB-S-PURL-gpo220906/pdf/GOVPUB-S-PURL-gpo220906.pdf>. Accessed 14 July 2026.

Fields, A. (2009, January 30). Message from the special inspector general for Afghanistan reconstruction. *Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction*. Retrieved from <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/tr/pdf/ADA553737.pdf>. Accessed 14 July 2026.

Fields, A. (2009, October 30). Quarterly report to the United States Congress. *Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction*. Retrieved from <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/tr/pdf/ADA512600.pdf>. Accessed 14 July 2026.

Hisrich, R.D., & Peters, M.P. (2002). *Entrepreneurship*. Fifth Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Legal Clarity Team. (2026, April 1). U.S. withdrawal from Afghanistan: Timeline and aftermath. *LegalClarity.com*. Retrieved from <https://legalclarity.org/us-withdrawal-from-afghanistan-a-timeline-of-events/>. Accessed 14 July 2026.

Mayo Clinic Staff. (2023, February 24). Diseases & conditions: Antisocial personality disorder. *Mayo Clinic*. Retrieved from <https://www.mayoclinic.org/diseases-conditions/antisocial-personality-disorder/diagnosis-treatment/drc-20353934>. Accessed 29 July 2026.

Sopko, J.F. (2015, January 20). Statement of John F. Sopko, special investigator general for Afghanistan reconstruction. DOD task force for business and stability operations in Afghanistan: Preliminary results show serious management and oversight problems. Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support. *Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction*.

Retrieved from https://www.armed-services.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/Sopko_01-20-16.pdf. Accessed 14 July 2026.

Sopko, J.F. (2018, April). Private sector development and economic growth: Lessons from the U.S. experience in Afghanistan. *Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction*. Retrieved from <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/GOVPUB-S-PURL-gpo91433/pdf/GOVPUB-S-PURL-gpo91433.pdf>. Accessed 14 July 2026.

Sopko, J.F. (2019, May 9). Statement of John F. Sopko, Special Investigator General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, Oversight of U.S. Spending in Afghanistan. Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee (HSGAC) Subcommittee on Federal Spending Oversight and Emergency Management (FSO), U.S. Senate. Testimony. *Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction*. Retrieved from <https://www.hsgac.senate.gov/wp-content/uploads/imo/media/doc/Sopko%20Testimony.pdf>. Accessed 14 July 2026.

Sopko, J.F. (2024, January). Cash shipments to Afghanistan: The UN has purchased and transported more than \$2.9 billion to Afghanistan to implement humanitarian assistance, SIGAR 24-12 Evaluation Report. *Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction*. Retrieved from <https://justthenews.com/sites/default/files/2024-02/SIGAR-24-12-IP.pdf>. Accessed 14 July 2026.

Staff. (n.d.). Disciplined licensees. *Counselor, Social Worker, and Marriage and Family Therapist Board*. Ohio.gov. Retrieved from here: <https://cswmft.ohio.gov/for-the-public/disciplined-licensees>. Accessed 30 July 2026.

Staff. (n.d.). LPC application instructions. *Counselor, Social Worker, and Marriage and Family Therapist Board*. Ohio.gov. Retrieved from here: <https://cswmft.ohio.gov/get-licensed/counselors/lpc-application-instructions>. Accessed 30 July 2026.

Staff. (n.d.). Ph.D. degree: Doctor of philosophy in history. *Department of History*. University of Washington. Retrieved from here: <https://history.washington.edu/phd-degree>. Accessed 8/4/2026.

Staff. (n.d.). Undergraduate programs. *Department of History*. University of Washington. Retrieved from here: <https://history.washington.edu/undergraduate-programs>. Accessed 8/4/2026.

Unformatted Links

Helen Abramovitz, Consent Agreement – Surrendered

Link: <https://dam.assets.ohio.gov/image/upload/cswmft.ohio.gov/disciplined-licensees/E-0001134.pdf>

Nancy Adams, Consent Agreement – Completed

Link: <https://dam.assets.ohio.gov/image/upload/cswmft.ohio.gov/disciplined-licensees/C-0004084.pdf>

Stephanie S. Adams – Revocation

Link: <https://dam.assets.ohio.gov/image/upload/cswmft.ohio.gov/disciplined-licensees/S-1100809.pdf>

Joi Adell – Adjudication Order, Completed

Link: <https://dam.assets.ohio.gov/image/upload/cswmft.ohio.gov/disciplined-licensees/C-1500340.pdf>

Psychology Resources

Ainsworth, M.D., & Bell, S.M. (1970). Attachment, exploration, and separation: Illustrated by the behavior of one-year-olds in a strange situation. *Child Development*, 41(1), 49-67. Retrieved from <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1970-08130-001>.

Ainsworth, M.D., Blehar, M.C., Waters, E., & Wall, S.N. (2015). Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation. Routledge.

Attenweiler, W. J., & Moore, D. (2006). Goal orientations: Two, three, or more factors? *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66 (2), 342-352. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.1015.3418&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

Berk, L. (2014). Development through the lifespan. 6th edition. Pearson.

Bowlby, J. (1988). A secure base: Parent-child attachment and healthy human development. Basic Books.

Dweck, C. (2006). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. New York: Ballantine.

Feist, J., Feist, G. J., & Roberts, T. (2013). Theories of Personality. (8th edition). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Mooney, C. G. (2010). *Theories of attachment: Introduction to Bowlby, Ainsworth, Gerber, Brazelton, Kennell, & Klaus*. Minnesota: Red Leaf Press.

About

My name is Regina Y. Favors. I am the instructional designer for all Favors Film Analysis content, which extends to print guides, online guides, and video lectures.

I have a bachelor's and master's degree in English and a second master's degree in applied psychology.

I am a former college instructor. I taught first-year composition as well as American Literature: 1865 to the Present.

My research interests for filmmaking include the economic impact of remakes and sequels; story and world building; and case studies. I'm partial to spy thriller, heist, and Civil War narratives.

I'm currently developing a print-based film guide for *The Town* (2010) and an essay on *Diablo* (2016). All projects are ongoing.

You may visit my primary site here: www.reginayfavors.com and my film analysis website here: www.favorsfilmanalysis.com.

Progress with the latter site is ongoing.

Thank you for reading this film analysis case study.