

Hollywood East? A Cautionary Tale of Irish Film Distribution in North America

By Brian McIlroy

[First published in The Canadian Journal of Irish Studies 29: 2 (2003): 46-52]

“Despite considerable media hype about gigantic box-office grosses for Hollywood films, the profit margin for theatrical releases at US cinemas is virtually nonexistent. The huge P & A budgets often serve as nothing more than advance promotion for a film’s planned home video/DVD/cable/international release.” (Max Alvarez in *Cinecittà* 2000: 36)

“Why did Paramount say yes? Because nobody knows anything. And why did all the other studios say no? Because nobody knows anything. And why did Universal, the mightiest studio of all, pass on *Star Wars*, a decision that just may cost them, when all the sequels and spin-offs and toy money and book money and video-game money are totalled, over a *billion* dollars? Because nobody, *nobody*—not now, not ever—knows the least goddamn thing about what is or isn’t going to work at the box-office.” (William Goldman in Goldman 1983: 41)

In this essay, I attempt to open up a new area of research in Irish film studies. Here I provide a number of arguments, reasons and reflections upon why the distribution of narrative films is so challenging in North America and why only certain kinds of Irish

and Irish-related material do achieve a modest degree of attention. It is, as my subtitle declares, a cautionary tale, one that takes into account the nature of the North American market—the most important film market in the world—and the nature of the films available to be distributed. Caution is also required in assessing an academic researcher's sources when quoting dollar figures. For example, Barry Litman and Hoekyun Ahn suggest that on average a \$50 million box-office gross will generate 200,000 sales of videocassettes. They estimate that ancillary markets account for only 20 per cent of a movie's income. However, although this ratio seems ridiculously low in the age of merchandising and a slew of other ancillary rights and income streams, they tellingly admit reliable figures are hard to come by due to “the proprietary nature of these data” (Litman 1998: 193). Yet, despite these uncertainties, it is my contention that contrary to screenwriter William Goldman's colourful remarks above, we actually do know a fair amount about what “works” and what doesn't in Irish film distribution from a variety of angles. I inevitably approach my subject from a Canadian perspective, but this does have the advantage of an analogous experience in discussing the regional, national and international contexts of film practice for English-language cinema seeking American success.

Hollywood North is the site of many US movies, TV movies of the week and TV series; it's estimated that in the Vancouver region alone, such activity amounts to \$1.2 Billion (Canadian) per year, and some \$3.3 Billion in ancillary industries and services. This unprecedented American influx has manifested itself in the last twenty years. Indeed, Neil Jordan mentions in his forward to the *High Spirits* published screenplay that he was,

at the time, the only director in Hollywood who did not have a project in British Columbia (Jordan 1989: xi). Ironically, he was to remedy this perceived deficit the following year when *We're No Angels* was shot in B.C.¹

Why, one might ask, is the westernmost province of Canada the repository of so much Hollywood money? The low Canadian dollar—in 2002 the Canadian dollar averaged between 62 and 66 cents American—is the strongest reason. But also Vancouver and its outlying areas have great scenery, lots of variety in buildings, excellent infrastructure, a modern economy, and English-speaking majority, many experienced crews, tax incentives, and is—for editing purposes—only a couple of hours by air from Los Angeles with which it shares the same time zone. Primarily, however, Vancouver, and Toronto and Winnipeg for that matter, can “pass” as a US city. Initially, the American arrival was seen by many Canadian filmmakers as a cultural invasion, a commercial, crafts and technical success story, but one which did little for Canadian writers and directors interested in Canadian stories. That’s a familiar lament around the world whenever and wherever Hollywood dominance intrudes in the non-American psyche.

But gradually, what was clearly a difficulty began to be rethought. Federal and provincial agencies alongside private and public broadcasters provided monies to the young directors and producers emerging from Vancouver’s university and private film schools to be the beneficiaries of crews and technicians eager to work on alternative, small scale or non-blockbuster material. Also, the cultural mindset of young filmmakers began to change from the cultural nationalism of the 1970s to a greater appreciation that English-

Canadian film is just part of a North American audio-visual industry which takes no position, except that of assessing profit, in the selection of material for distribution. In other words, a compromise was reached. Some directors, like Lynne Stopkevich in a film such as *Kissed* (1997), a film about necrophilia made for \$1 million, found their work the subject of a bidding war between major American distributors. A budding auteur, such as Bruce Sweeney, whose latest and third feature, *The Last Wedding* (2001), will no doubt have at least a television and video life in Europe, is emboldened enough to demand potential distributors to invest in his next feature as part of any distribution deal. It is with such small steps that an indigenous film industry is built, and, more importantly, maintained.²

Now, it may be that Canada has the best and worst of both worlds—it sleeps next to the elephant and must adapt accordingly whenever the animal decides to change position on the bed. One might argue that this is the relationship between the UK and Ireland, and many have written that the Irish cinema today is essentially a British television industry—what is the recently feted *Bloody Sunday* (Paul Greengrass, 2002) but a British production? However, it seems to me that it is possible to see the UK and Ireland as one entity, as a potential Hollywood East, not so much a location for Hollywood offshore productions—which, of course, is very apparent in Irish cinema history--but in the possible partnerships that can occur between the needs of the Hollywood studios for the American marketplace and indigenous British and Irish material. The conjoining of the UK and Ireland is a reality for the reporting of box-office results in such trade journals as *Variety*, and it is a reality for Irish production budgets. Looking at the larger picture,

there's a further argument that British film production has only really succeeded commercially when a British company has made a decent distribution and production financing deal with an American major or mini-major. Working Title's recent deal with Universal has at least allowed a more serious entry into the North American market for its films.

In the film world, then, little space for purism exists. Bob Quinn's film work and writings argue, in a sense, for that return to small-scale production, with an agenda focused on screening works in Ireland.³ It's an admirable position, a moral position one might say, but one not shared by the majority of young filmmakers who want their stories and efforts to be recognized and enjoyed internationally. To them, an Ireland first policy is unsustainable. So, if one is prepared to see the UK and Ireland as a potential Hollywood East screening back to and alongside the magic factory of Hollywood, what Irish-themed productions obtain distribution in North America, and can one see patterns?

On the William Goldman 'Nobody knows anything' school of criticism, the case of *The Crying Game* (Neil Jordan, 1992) is trotted out. How is it that Miramax was able to purchase a film--that didn't return its European and Japanese investment-- for between \$1 million and \$1.5 million and gross \$63 million in the domestic North American market? (Giles 1997: 46) Presumably, if the deal had been made for \$3 million Palace Pictures wouldn't have gone bankrupt, its Scala cinema might not have closed, and the investors might have been pacified. Or, if an ongoing relationship with Miramax—a three or five film deal—had been leveraged, perhaps the bizarre lopsided receipts for the UK and the

US might have been swallowed. But this is the beauty of hindsight, and credit must go to Miramax's heralded marketing creativity of which much has been written on this film. *The Crying Game* is, however, the exception, the dream ticket, hiding a more prosaic reality.

Naturally, my title, "Hollywood East" is somewhat tongue-in-cheek, for, after all, isn't the East "Asia" or, in its most rarefied artistic form for Western audiences, *Madama Butterfly*, set in Nagasaki, a Treaty Port where colonizer, colonized and partly colonized met and did business? It's not so far-fetched to be conscious that Ireland and Irish film are a peculiar East to North Americans. And when that East is imported and attempts are made at marketing and advertising it, it should be no surprise that certain aspects—both emergent and residual—of this culturally colonized East should be deemed more interesting than others. I argue here, and I think without much debate, judging by those films previously circulated, that there are key tropes that appear to American distributors to be sellable. These are: (1) Irish whimsy with quirky humour, including offbeat genre films; (2) "Troubles" films with passion and violence; (3) the achievement of rising above (or at least fighting against) poverty or injustice; and (4), what I'd like to call, "Diasporic meanderings." A possibly controversial claim here is that Irish cinema in North American eyes is a cinema of the study of failure, and the task of the North American distributor is how to market failure experiences as watch-able noble successes.

Irish whimsy is the cinematic equivalent of the stage Irish. Humour is very much part of the Irish temperament and of the North American perception of the Irish. *Darby O'Gill*

and the Little People (Robert Stevenson, 1959), *Quackser Fortune has a Cousin in the Bronx* (Warris Hussein, 1970), *The Commitments* (Alan Parker, 1991), *The Snapper* (Stephen Frears, 1993), *Hear My Song* (Peter Chelsom, 1992), *Waking Ned Devine* (Kirk Jones, 1998), even *High Spirits* and *Widows' Peak* (John Irvin, 1994) all fit into this category. Behind these films is a celebration of subversive intelligence. It's as if the Irish subaltern speaks, inside humour, a false front similar to a Trojan horse. There's also a dark streak to this humour, often revealed in the offbeat crime melodrama, as evidenced in John Boorman's *The General* (1998) and Paddy Breathnach's *I went Down* (1997) which have found a small space in US distribution.

Under the rubric of "troubles" films, we should perhaps distinguish between those to do with the 1916-1923 period and those concerning Northern Ireland 1968-present. The conflicted feelings about Ireland's move from the colonial to the post-colonial strikes a different note to the Americans (though perhaps not to many Canadians), who are willing to accept the necessity of violence to create a self-governing region, since it is the genesis of their own nation. Unsurprisingly, those few films in the 1990s, such as Deborah Warner's *The Last September* (1999) that gave emphasis to the Protestant Irish community did very modest box-office in US and Canada theatrical distribution (\$469,974), despite, in this instance, attempts to be carried along by the coattails of the English heritage film's popularity. By contrast, Neil Jordan's *Michael Collins* (1996) delivered a number of American style paybacks, the most powerful that 'righteous violence' achieves results. It earned \$11.03 million in North America.

The conflict in Northern Ireland benefits and suffers from media saturation over the last 35 years, and it has allowed numerous filmmakers to indulge in what Tom Nairn has outlined as the anti-imperialist myth.⁴ In simple terms, screenwriters have invariably closed off the topic of Northern Ireland as a festering dump of unresolved British imperialist policies, the consequences of which force fictional characters to lock in combat not so much as Protestant or Catholic, Loyalist or Republican, but as either the IRA or the British army and its representatives. *The Crying Game*, *In the Name of the Father* (Jim Sheridan, 1993), and *Some Mother's Son* (Terry George, 1996) all make the majority Protestant community in Northern Ireland practically invisible. Perceptions about the Irish-American community must play some part in this scripting tendency.⁵ Mainstream Hollywood productions, such as *Patriot Games* (Philip Noyce, 1992), *Blown Away* (Stephen Hopkins, 1994), and *The Devil's Own* (Alan Pakula, 1997), often went one stage further by focusing on dissident IRA members, thereby accentuating the basic thriller genre at the expense of local political details.

A more universal theme that occasionally strikes a chord with American audiences is the overcoming of disability, injustice and poverty. This does, in part, explain the high popularity of *My Left Foot* (Jim Sheridan, 1989) and the respectful reception accorded to *Angela's Ashes* (Alan Parker, 1999). Recent figures cited by Jack Valenti reveal that the American movie audience comprises 15% Hispanics and 11% Blacks. At the very least, then, you have 26% of the ticket-buying public who do not have to dig deep in family history to appreciate hard times. Perhaps more resonant with the 68% white population who frequent the movies is the concept of diaspora, as both the US and Canada are

countries comprised of immigrants. One had only to listen to the surnames of the police and fire services personnel who died in the World Trade Centre attacks to appreciate the Irish-American contribution to the city of New York. Of course, in cinematic terms, Irish ethnicity has a long history in US film, most notably Hollywood depictions of Irish men between the 1920s and 1950s as priests, policemen and mobsters, while Irish women invariably were depicted as long-suffering and sacrificing mothers (see McIlroy 1999). In the latter stages of the 20th century, the plot device of the return to one's roots seemed to be a commercial usable fiction. *Angela's Ashes* and *This is My Father* (Paul Quinn, 1998) delve into that well of the ruptured family history, and yet also climb nobly out of the experience once immersed. In the frenzied atmosphere of political correctness and the identity politics of the 1990s, such films allowed white Americans to value themselves and be valued.

Any joint economic/aesthetic claims about Irish films and their distribution must require dollar figures to support them, although in the film world of creative accounting, proprietary information and advertising hype this approach is beset with fundamental research difficulties, as I have previously suggested. To ask, in a logical positivist manner, what is verifiable in the film business, is to open a veritable Pandora's Box. Nevertheless, releases in North America are verifiable as are box-office grosses culled from the Internet Movie database (imdb.com), *Variety* and the *Hollywood Reporter*. What is not verifiable without a forensic accounting and privileged access are the production budget actuals and the specific amounts that filter back from the theatre owner to the distributor to the originating production company. For example, Will Silke (2002:23)

estimates that 35 per cent to 40 per cent of US box-office would be returned to an “indie” distributor, with at most 50 per cent of that returning to the producer (so \$1 million box-office translates into approximately \$150,000-\$200,000 to the originating company). Every deal is different, however, and signed before the film is released, thereby incorporating a high degree of risk investment. To take a contemporary example, BBC News Online (22 January 2002) reported that Paramount Classics bought Paul Greengrass’s *Bloody Sunday* for US \$1 million for October 2002 release in North America, yet Rod Stoneman, CEO of the Irish Film Board, one of the funders of the film, told me at the April 2002 conference that the actual figure was \$750,000. The use of the \$1 million figure was, in his view, part of the self-serving hype around the film at the Sundance Film Festival.

Box-office grosses are an indicator to executives and critics alike how well the film will do in video and DVD rental and sell-through, cable, satellite, network TV, hotels, airplanes, merchandising, etc. These ancillary markets together can surpass by two-to-three times the theatrical box-office gross over a number of years, although the spiralling marketing and promotion costs that this investment entails restricts the number of films distribution companies can actively support. Jack Valenti reported in 2002 that the average costs of prints and advertising for a major studio film had risen by more than 10 per cent from \$27.31 million in the year 2000 to \$31.01 million in 2001. In other words, often at least 33 per cent of a film’s budget is required for marketing purposes, a figure that appears to be rising. Whereas a large bookstore can display 10-20,000 new titles every year, the initial theatrical window for films in North America in the 1990s always

accommodated fewer than 500 major releases. The competition to achieve one of those spots, particularly outside the in-house studio productions, is therefore fierce.

Thirteen US distribution companies control more than 96 per cent of the market and penetrate 96 per cent of the screens available. Consider the following table:

Top Film Distributors in the United States (1999)

Distributor	Gross Box Office \$	Market Share %	Films	New Films
Buena Vista	1,246,319,866	17.06%	30	22
Warner Bros	1,042,415,691	14.27%	26	21
Universal	933,161,805	12.77%	24	19
Paramount	846,698,995	11.59%	19	15
20 th Cent Fox	793,843,472	10.87%	22	16
Sony	633,965,905	8.68%	34	27
Dreamworks	323,944,044	4.43%	9	6
Miramax	319,450,834	4.37%	38	31
MGM/UA	310,101,166	4.24%	14	13
New Line	309,249,791	4.23%	24	18
Artisan Ent.	193,636,924	2.65%	17	13
Lions Gate	50,769,325	0.69%	18	14
Fox Searchlight	37,379,780	0.51%	10	8
SUB-TOTAL	7,040,937,538		285	223

OTHER	265,085,175	3.64%	306	243
TOTAL	7,306,022,773		591	466

Source: abridged from *Cinecittà* (2000: 33)

The spectacular figure one realises from this table is that 243 (52 per cent) of the 466 new films that opened in 1999 were not released by the 13 major distributors and recouped together less than 3.64 per cent of Gross Box-office. Of the 591 films on US and Canadian screens in 1999 (this figure includes 125 films initially released in 1998 that carried over), 121 or 27 per cent were officially European (*Cinecittà* 2000: 48). At first glance, this figure appears impressive, until you realise that 30 were co-productions with the US, 13 were international co-productions without the US, and the remaining 78 were European productions or co-productions. Of the \$791 million European films secured at the US and Canadian box-office (12 percent of overall Gross), 80 per cent of that amount came from the 30 co-productions with the US and only 17 percent from European only productions.

Naturally, the key distributors' ability to spend at least a third of the production budget on advertising is an enormous part of their success. And it's the main reason why the independent distributors can only hope for moderate coverage and reward. Thus, to talk about distributable Irish film focusing on theme, character, setting and style or genre is only part of the equation. To some extent, the rich studio distributed film versus the poor

independent distributed film is a constant, but the variable is that an Irish film can be a studio distributable film.

Consider the various kinds of feature film finance/distribution scenarios, reproduced here from John W. Cones' *The Feature Film Distribution Deal* (1997: 30):

	In-house production /distribution	Production Financing distribution	Negative Pickup arrangement	Acquisition deal	Rent-a- distributor
Source of Production Funds	Studio/ distributor	Studio/ Distributor	lender	Third party	Third party
Source of p & a funds	Distributor	Distributor	Distributor	Distributor	Non- distributor
Time of Agreement	Prior to production	Prior to production	Before film completed	After film completed	After film completed

Studios may, as the table suggests, initiate a project in-house or buy the idea brought to it by an independent production company whereupon they may keep the attached producer and director or select their own. In both cases, they assume all costs. The third option—

the negative pickup—is more complex, whereby an independent producer and director can come to the studio for partial production and distribution funds and services; in return, their film may have to meet certain aesthetic requirements (casting, changed ending, etc.), depending on the extent of the completion of the film. Distributors will want to see a rough assembly to decide upon the wisdom of a negative pickup arrangement. Having the studio onside for distribution will often trigger funds from other lenders/investors to complete the film. A fourth option—the acquisition deal—is also common. It’s the hope of young filmmakers as they premiere their work at festivals that a distributor will buy their film with generous terms. The fifth option—rent-a-distributor—is a final chance for those films not picked up by or at festivals, although this strategy is only for the true believer with deep pockets. Knowing that European films cover at best only 12 per cent of the Gross Box-office, a US distributor who is approached with a project will ask the obvious questions:

Is the Director bankable, or at least clearly competent?

Is there a star attached?

If no stars, what other compelling hook is there?

Is the property pre-sold? Based on a successful book or life story?

Will it be PG13 or R?—the two commonly successful adult movie ratings.

If humorous, will it be a good spring/summer release? If serious, will it be a good

Fall/Winter release?

And these are only some of the questions needing powerfully persuasive answers. Only John Boorman seems confident and established enough to raise \$8 million to make *The General* without securing any distribution deal for Europe and the US until after the film is completed. A more accurate picture is probably to look back to his first film made in Ireland—*Zardoz* (1974) starring Sean Connery, which was made under the negative pickup arrangement. Looking at the profile of Jim Sheridan’s four major films distributed in the US, it’s significant that the above questions can be almost totally addressed, and that he progressed to a production/financing arrangement with Universal.

Film	Gross Box-office (imdb.com)	Distributor
<i>My Left Foot</i> (1989)	\$14,750,000	Miramax

Bankable director?—not specifically, but theatre success

Star actor?—not specifically, but well-known (Daniel Day Lewis)

PG13/R?—yes

True life story?—yes

Fall/Winter release?—yes (November 1989)

[Oscar winners Daniel Day Lewis and Brenda Fricker]

The Field (1990) \$1,414,000 Avenue Pictures Productions

Bankable director?—yes

Star actors?—yes (Richard Harris and Tom Berenger)

PG13/R?—yes

True Life story?—no, but a pre-sold property (play)

Fall/Winter release?—yes (December 1990)

[Oscar nominated Richard Harris]

In the Name of the Father (1993) \$25,010,000 Universal Pictures

Bankable director?—yes

Star actors?—yes (Daniel Day Lewis & Emma Thompson)

PG13/R?—yes

True Life story?—yes

Fall/Winter release?—yes (December 1993)

[seven Oscar nominations]

The Boxer (1997) \$5,799,000 MCA/Universal Pictures

Bankable director?—yes

Star actors?—yes (Daniel Day Lewis and Emily Watson)

PG13/R?—yes

True Life story?—no

Fall/Winter release?—yes (December 1997)

What leaps out at this selective overview of the work of three different distributors is the relative failure of *The Field* despite Richard Harris's Oscar nomination. The film was handled through the small but respected Avenue Pictures Productions; its releasing pattern and results were unimpressive to audiences and theatre owners alike. It's a film about extreme failure and hard to market; in short, it is a depressing story, lacking the clear achievements of the other three films. Naturally, the Sheridan oeuvre can become tied up too easily with auteurist assumptions, about one man's obsessions with working class Irish males. One receives a slightly different perspective, if one profiles the work of two distribution companies, and their Irish film product.

In the following table, we can scan the results of Sony Pictures Classics and Fox Searchlight Pictures, two subsidiary companies with a mandate to acquire and market low to medium budget films, including “art cinema” and “foreign.” It seemed to many observers that they were created to outmanoeuvre Miramax and to tap into the “Indie” market that was best illustrated by Fox Searchlight Pictures' taking on of Sundance Film Festival hit, Ed Burns' Irish-American *The Brothers McMullen* (1995).

The Brothers McMullen (Ed Burns, 1995) \$10,246,000

(opened August 1995)

The Van (Stephen Frears 1996) \$621,093

(opened May 1997)

Waking Ned Devine (Kirk Jones, 1998) \$24,700,000

(opened November 1998)

It's not too clear what one can make of these figures, except a few broad statements that films with humour will have a better chance of succeeding in the American marketplace beyond the benchmark of \$1,000,000 gross. The relative failure of *The Van* may have been the result of its television drama look and its general absence of traditional rural landscapes, something *Waking Ned Devine* supplied in abundance. On the other hand, *The Van*'s May release might have been the critical problem, slotted between the more knowable Easter Holiday period and the summer blockbuster. The serious Irish films of Sony Pictures Classics were mostly released in the fall/winter period, yet even this subsidiary company of a major studio was unable to break out of the level of revenue recouped by the independent distributor Avenue Pictures Productions in promoting Sheridan's *The Field*.

Clearly, the industrial model of the US distribution market with its economies of scale and block booking practices favouring the major studios makes it difficult for

independent distributors to succeed dramatically. Additionally, since there are so many English-language films for the distributors to choose from, Irish films will never have easy access. Yet, while it may be true that a first time director and his/her film may make no profit, it is an investment in experience for director and producer, and it is a calling card. Critically, the film receives international exposure and sales. To have achieved American distribution, one of those 466 slots in 1999, for example, is no mean achievement.

Even Artisan Entertainment, one of the 13 major distributors, must struggle for audiences for its films. Of the 153 titles it distributes listed on imdb.com, only one is Irish—Paddy Breathnach's *I Went Down*, which garnered a respectable \$405,000 in its three-week run. Compare this result with Artisan's distribution of name director Ken Loach's *My Name is Joe* (1998) which recouped only \$346,695 over a slow four month release (January-April 1999). Elsewhere, the tale only gets worse—Peter Sheridan's *Borstal Boy* (2000) managed \$87,074 (Strand Releasing); Michael Lindsay-Hogg's *Frankie Starlight* (1995) reined in just \$78,168 (Fine Line); Liam McGrath's *Southpaw: The Francis Barrett Story* (1999) earned a meagre \$26,822 (The Shooting Gallery). One of the major difficulties in selling film rights to an American distributor is that it will generally reserve the right whether it will release theatrically or immediately “dump” to video. John MacKenzie's *When the Sky Falls* (2000) bought by Trimark (now part of Lions Gate) went straight to video, while Miramax perhaps are still recovering from Gerard Stembridge's *About Adam* (2000) which only secured \$151,559 after a three week run, and have yet to release in

theatres or on video Thaddeus O'Sullivan's *Ordinary Decent Criminal* (2000) starring Kevin Spacey.

A film is marketable when there is, as Justin Wyatt remarks, 'the match between a star and a project, a pre-sold premise (such as a remake or adaptation of a best-selling novel) and a concept which taps into a national trend or sentiment' (Wyatt 1994: 15). To this statement, one can emphasise merchandizing, including the music soundtrack possibilities, and any other synergies to suit the vertically integrated and increasingly laterally integrated conglomerates that are highly interested in every North American major release for future global ancillary profit. If Irish filmmakers and producers wish to "crack" the North American market, they have to understand the constraints I have mentioned in this essay, hire good entertainment lawyers, seek out quality 'indie' distributors after trying the majors and mini-majors for co-production, and examine the themes of their film to judge whether it taps into or originally reworks what I have termed here "Hollywood East."

Notes

¹ For a mainly economic and industrial analysis of B.C. film and Hollywood, though one sensitive to the cultural issues, see Mike Gasher (2002). British Columbia has a population of around 4 million, similar to that of The Irish Republic.

² Cynics or realists, depending on one's point of view, would remark on Lynne Stopkevich's second feature, *Suspicious River* (2002); primarily financed by an American company, its tale of a receptionist at a hotel on a nondescript highway giving sexual favours for money from the guests is hardly culturally "Canadian" despite the two leads' Canadian citizenship. The money that is transacted is visibly American.

³ Bob Quinn has been eerily consistent over the years. See my interview with him in McIlroy (1989: 142-146) and his passion for Irish images for Ireland is implicit throughout his recent book *Maverick* (2001).

⁴ I elaborate on this point in chapters one and two in McIlroy (2001).

⁵ Film critic Alexander Walker argues this very point about these films when he was interviewed on the UTV programme, *How the Movies See Us* (broadcast December 1998).

Bibliography

Anon. BBC News Online, 'Bloody Sunday Film to Reach US' 22 January 2002

Available: HTTP: [Hhttp://www.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/entertainment/tv_and_radio/1776018H](http://www.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/entertainment/tv_and_radio/1776018H)

(5 April 2002)

Cinecittà (2000) vol. 1 no. 2 (Nov-Dec) [Special issue on European films in the North

American market] Available HTTP:

[Hhttp://www.cinecitta.it/magazine/num02e/46CINECI.PDF](http://www.cinecitta.it/magazine/num02e/46CINECI.PDF) (12 August 2002)

Cones, J.W. (1997) *The Feature Film Distribution Deal: A Critical Analysis of the Single*

Most Important Film Industry Agreement. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois

University Press.

Gasher, M. (2002) *Hollywood North: The Feature Film Industry in British Columbia*.

Vancouver: The University of British Columbia Press.

Giles, J. (1997) *The Crying Game*. London: BFI.

Goldman, W. (1983) *Adventures in the Screen Trade*. New York: Warner Books.

Jordan, N. (1989) *High Spirits*. London: Faber and Faber.

Litman, B.L. and H. Ahn. (1998) 'Predicting Financial Success of Motion

Pictures: The early '90s Experience' in Litman, B.L. (1998) *The Motion Picture*

Mega-Industry. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 172-197.

McIlroy, B. (1989) *World Cinema 4: Ireland*. Trowbridge, Wiltshire: Flicks Books.

-- (1999) 'Cinema, Irish in' in *The Encyclopedia of the Irish in America*. Ed. Michael

Glazier. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press: 150-153.

-- (2001) *Shooting to Kill: Filmmaking and the "Troubles" in Northern Ireland*.

Richmond, B.C.: Steveston Press.

Quinn, B. (2001) *Maverick: A Dissident View of Broadcasting Today*. Dingle, Kerry:

Brandon.

Silke, W. (2002) 'Anatomy of a Suicide: The Death and Failure of Larry Meistrich's The

Shooting Gallery, 2001' *Film Ireland* 85 February/March, 20-24.

Straightforward Productions. (1998) *How the Movies See Us*. Ulster Television.

Valenti, J. Press Release, March 5, 2002. Available

HTTP: http://www.mpa.org/jack/2002/2002_03_05a.htm (5 April 2002)

Wyatt, J. (1994) *High Concept: Movies and Marketing in Hollywood*. Austin, Texas:

University of Texas Press.