

THE UNIVERSITY OF HULL

Exploiting Fear: Directing the Hollywood Horror Franchise

being a Thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy PhD

in the University of Hull

by

Simon Andrew Wilkinson, BA (Hons), P.G.C.E.

October 2006

Acknowledgements

“It's a perfect night for mystery and horror.

The air itself is filled with monsters.”

–Mary Shelleyⁱ

I am grateful to many people for their help, both directly and indirectly, in writing this thesis.

Throughout the thesis and its evolution many thanks and the utmost of personal and professional respect must go to my supervisor Dr John Osborne, whose unerring support, approachability and faith in both me and the project has been invaluable and a true blessing during the more difficult times.

My deepest thanks, sympathy and appreciation goes out to all those friends and family who have been forced to endure my time-consuming forays into numerous cinemas and video shops over the years. Thank you for your patience, tried and tested as it was, and ability to endure if not necessarily enjoy the end results. Mum, for all the video hunts and times the shopkeepers would offer you a chair out of sympathy and the subsequent countdowns that followed. Dave, Alice, Jenny – each of you has sat through several of these. You have often instigated such an evening and survived it; albeit not without regret or recriminations. Dave; I apologise for *Vampires* and only hope my credibility will one day be restored - just as yours will be after *The 25th Hour*. Alice, hope you enjoyed our fashion-unconscious days of bad taste with *Elvira* and Jenny, your love of *Buffy* knows no bounds.

I also feel it is also important to acknowledge those films which have influenced and informed my love of the genre from the outset; one which began with a television

screening of Carpenter's *Halloween* late one Halloween night. Whilst *Amityville II* and *Creepshow* also featured in these early encounters, *Clash of the Titans* was the first film I saw on Home Video. This introduction was closely followed by a memorable viewing of *Superman* which culminated in my running up and down the street pretending to fly. Rightly banned from watching such classics as *The Evil Dead* and *A Nightmare on Elm Street* around this time, the ability to creep back downstairs or watch such films at friends' houses led to *Freddy's Revenge* and the awful *Spookies* being equally memorable.

However my first viewing of *The Howling* was interrupted at the most embarrassing moment. Nevertheless, the bars on my brother and I's bedroom window, installed by the previous owners, did not prevent the intrusive thought that the teenage boys from Hooper's adaptation of *Salem's Lot* may one night appear from the mist. Similarly, a chance encounter with Hooper's *Poltergeist* at a Pontins Holiday Camp screening also highlighted my fondness for scary movies. However, my interest in Kruger's notoriety and rising popularity reached new heights after watching *Dream Warriors* one Sunday afternoon and, a chance encounter in a comic book shop with publicity for the fourth film, led to my first purchase of Fangoria; issue 77.

A catalyst for my growing interest in feature film production, Fangoria's luscious and informative coverage of these high profile genre films opened the door, and my eyes, to the many sub-genres, directors and classics that I had previously been unaware of and was now keen to seek out. This led to the point of obsession after bluffing my way into *Child's Play* at the age of 12 and then Craven's 18-rated *Shocker* two years later. Armed with McCarthy's *Splatter Movie Guide* and a growing interest in film journalism, the news that a twenty-four hour film festival was being held in London at the Scala cinema was impossible to resist. Consequently, and at the age of 13, my Dad

and I made the journey to London for Shock Around the Clock 4 where the hilarious delights of *Meet the Feebles* were excelled only by the appearance of Clive Barker and Dario Argento to introduce their latest releases. After receiving a response to my thank you letter from co-organiser Alan Jones later that year, it perhaps comes as no surprise that my next birthday celebration attempted to recreate that experience on a smaller yet no less diverse scale. My own mini-festival was a hit with friends and cause for concern for parents with a diverse line-up which ranged from *The Exorcist* to *Day of the Dead*. With other memorable experiences that included attending such independent cinemas as the Hyde Park Picture House and the Bradford Playhouse for *Society* and *Henry* respectively continuing throughout my teenage years, my love and appreciation of the genre has failed to diminish over time.

And so, when I first conceived of this project in 2000, the idea was to expand upon an assignment I had written on Wes Craven's post-modernist approach to contemporary Horror cinema in *Scream* and *New Nightmare*. From Fincher's *Alien 3* to Blatty's *Exorcist III*, I had enjoyed and endured a range of films and began exploring the production histories of these and other such sequels. This also meant establishing the history of first films and prior academic approaches to the genre. With the active support of John Osborne and the American Studies Department at the University of Hull, I was accepted on the MPhil programme with the potential for a PhD upgrade.

With the assistance of the British Film Institute, I began what seemed like an extensive, if not exhaustive search, whilst being frequently tempted to depart on what were essentially terrific time-consuming tangents. Arguably, there will be errors, omissions and over-simplifications, for which I take absolute responsibility, as is customary, while hoping that the rest of the material will be enough to stimulate new attitudes, approaches and insights into the Hollywood Horror franchise.

Finally, the last words of acknowledgement for this thesis must belong to Steve, my partner, husband and best friend, without whom I would have faltered on a number of occasions. From endless cinema visits, both here and abroad, to endless conversations and every extended Blockbuster visit, you have stood by and alongside me day and night until the deed were done. Your support, encouragement and seemingly endless patience and capacity for understanding, space and support has been a testament to what we have. Indeed, it is to you that I want to dedicate this work.

Ultimately, I hope this end result does not let down those people who have supported me all along, as well as any interested readers who are patient enough to explore the workings of my occasionally contentious mind from which this thesis, in all its forms, has ultimately grown. And so, for the first time this century it seems I can face a Halloween without the spectre of the Hollywood Horror franchise hanging over me. That said; front row tickets for *Texas Chainsaw Massacre: The Beginning*, *The Grudge 2* and *Saw III* are already on pre-order proving that some nightmares indeed never end.

Simon Wilkinson

October 1st 2006

End Note

ⁱ Quote from Whale's *Bride of Frankenstein* (1935).

Contents

Acknowledgements	1
Contents	5
Introduction	6
Chapter 1: Don Coscarelli: In Search of Phantasm's End	40
Chapter 2: Cursed: Wes Craven's Franchise Nightmares	77
Chapter 3: Tom Savini and William Peter Blatty: They Came From Within	116
Chapter 4: Joe Berlinger: Rage Against the Machine	158
Chapter 5: Jeff Burr: Divided We Fall.	197
Conclusions	236
Appendix I: Filmography	267
Appendix II: Bibliography	290

Introduction

“If you’re going to get into the psychology of the filmmaker, you owe it to the filmmaker to understand the psychology of filmmaking and the experiences they had when they were making that movie.”¹

- David Cronenberg

“It’s possible to create a little franchise if you catch a concept at just the right time.”²

- Sean S. Cunningham

“Lets face it baby, these days you gotta have a sequel!”³

- *Scream*

The bastard son of two commonly derided and dismissed forms of filmmaking, the Hollywood Horror franchise has dominated generic feature film production. However, it has rarely attracted serious or substantial critical attention despite its successful inauguration with Whale’s universally renowned *Bride of Frankenstein*⁴ in 1935.⁵ The critical research that has been conducted into this area is still very much in its infancy and as a result significant gaps desperately need to be filled before a more fruitful understanding can be reached. Consequently, the aim of *Exploiting Fear* is to present an experiential account of the Hollywood Horror franchise from the directors’ perspectives.

My focus is the interdependence of directors, the franchise, and the Horror genre and this work will take into account the inherently biased and sometimes contradictory attitudes and experiences of these filmmakers. However, before the critical context for

this investigation is established these three key terms must be defined and the parameters and limitations of this study will be acknowledged and set.

In casting the director as protagonist, *Exploiting Fear* will examine the range of factors that have affected directors' involvement with the Hollywood Horror franchise. Ranges of experience will be placed in an appropriate context with respect to their contemporaries. This will be followed by an examination into the effect of Studios and stars as well as audiences, critics and censors upon their attitudes approaches and the end result. Indeed, the importance of pleasing or appeasing this external cinematic trinity cannot be overestimated. Therefore, this text will examine how directors have responded to these external pressures and whether there have been any discernible patterns or trends. Finally, to characterise the relationship between the director and the franchise within the Horror genre, we must take into account what role the franchise film has played in directors' careers and the extent to which their involvement has helped or hindered their ambitions.

Limited in its concerns this text excludes theoretical approaches and issues of reception and consumption but will take into account the extent to which these elements have influenced directors. In other words, such issues as the fluidity of generic definition and generational shifts in audience taste, expectation and understanding will be considered. Rather than "concentrate on classic moments"⁶ or present a stylistic analysis of individual films, shots and set-ups, this thesis has deliberately taken a step back from theory to focus on five specific patterns of involvement.

To successfully address these questions and allow for a fuller understanding of these films to take place, evidence has been collated and consolidated from a combination of

traditional academic texts and industry-produced journals; including such magazines as *Shivers*, *Cinefantastique* and *Fangoria*. In addition, I have extensively utilised documentaries, interviews and commentaries and consulted a range of both official and unofficial fan-based Internet sites to cross-reference material and comments. That said, the truth is elusive and it must be acknowledged that the reliability of such sources, many of which were designed solely as publicity and promotional materials, must be called in to question. Indeed, they may not fully reflect or even depict the true extent of a director's attitude or experiences of making a particular film. As has often been the case, inconsistencies in accounts and attitudes often shift over time and in retrospect.

Therefore, the majority of pre-release publicity must be treated as commercial promotional discourses deliberately composed for the purpose of persuading readers to see the finished film. Furthermore, those interviews conducted or commentaries recorded in retrospect, whilst still open to interpretation and biased in their nature, arguably provide a more accurate, yet by no means complete, picture of a film's production history and place in a director's career. As such it is these directors' representation of events that is the focus here and therein lays an inherent bias from the outset.

I. The Horror Genre

Writing in 1979, Wood rightly stated that "the horror film has consistently been one of the most popular and at the same time, the most disreputable of genres...dismissed with contempt by the majority of reviewer critics, or simply ignored."⁷ However, a great deal

of academic research has since been undertaken from a variety of ideological and theoretical perspectives despite critical, commercial and academic derision.

Although Clarens had published *An Illustrated Survey* in 1968, with Butler following in 1970 and more substantial works by Derry and Frank emerging in 1977, it was not until the eighties that several more significant texts sought to re-evaluate the genre through auteurist accounts (Wood: 1986) and cultural analysis (Tudor: 1989). In their attempts to establish the parameters of the genre, academics have unwittingly served to illustrate the inherent fluidity and reactionary nature of the term. Moreover, audiences, critics and high calibre marketing departments have often conspired to reconfigure the way in which we define, or in some cases redefine, what constitutes a horror film (for example see Clarens: 1967, and Wells: 2000).⁸

Through reference to Neale⁹, Naremore¹⁰ and Russell,¹¹ Jancovich has accurately summarised how approaches to genre are problematic and potentially elusive yet rarely exclusive. Furthermore, narrative histories “tend to repress the diversity within periods”¹² and “simply cannot create a clear narrative line if they are forced to deal with the diversity of horror production from across the world.”¹³ So, the question as to what actually constitutes genre, or even a history rather than ‘the’ history is subjective and fluid as opposed to static and established.

For the purposes of this thesis I have opted to align myself with Clover, by not only concerning myself “chiefly with American cinematic Horror,”¹⁴ but also adopting her stance on defining the genre’s parameters. By embracing her almost separatist stance, I would like to concur in stating how “it has not been my concern to define horror or to adhere to the definitions of others. I have been guided for the most part by video rental

store categorisations, which, despite some variation from store to store, seem to capture better than any definition I know what the public senses to be horror.”¹⁵ For example, retailers have adopted a less hierarchical approach to stocking films on their shelves and placed such titles as *Aliens*, *The Silence of the Lambs* and *Tremors* within the Horror section despite distributors’ attempts to convince us otherwise. In other words, *Exploiting Fear* deliberately adopts a more inclusive approach to the genre than Hollywood’s cautious re-categorisation of titles to appeal to a wider and decidedly anti-Horror demographic.

Rather than representing Horror’s cinematic history or single-handedly defining its parameters, some scholars sought to isolate and analyse specific periods, sub genres, hybrids or trends. Although some focused on Horror’s cinematic development and Universal’s Horror films (Dettmann, 1975; Soister, 1999), others settled on Hammer’s similar exploits (Coubro, 1991; Hutchings, 1993; Rigby, 2000). Two sub-genres addressed have been the supernatural (Dyson, 1997) and the appropriately named ‘splatter film’ (McCarty, 1984, 1989).

In 1994, Paul examined the unique relationship between Horror and Comedy with the interdependent links between the two a real cause for concern for filmmakers throughout production. Spielberg for example, was terrified that “*Jaws* could have turned out to be the laugh riot of 75”¹⁶ believing it would “be a turkey,”¹⁷ just as Friedkin had reportedly “gotten so close to (*The Exorcist*) that I thought it was ridiculous and people would laugh at it.”¹⁸ Rather than take their subject matter too seriously, other directors infused their films with heavy doses of black humour, self-awareness and a comic sensibility. This fusion of subtle references and cinematic in-jokes with atmospheric shocks and scares successfully evolved into the cine-literate

lunacy of Dante's *The Howling* and satirical social commentary in Harron's *American Psycho*. Such a dichotomy between intention and effect highlights the way in which directors' original intentions are subject to audience interpretation and can potentially leave a film open to commercial failure and critical ridicule.

Historically, the rise of eighties slasher films has been a key area of study and analysis and these films formed the basis of Dika's *Games of Terror* in 1990. This was followed by McCarty (1992, 1996) and later Simpson (2000). However, the period with which this thesis is concerned, despite acknowledging significant influences and inspiration from both Hammer and Universal's classic monster movie series', spans from Hitchcock's *Psycho* in 1960 through to Romero's *Land of the Dead* in 2005.

In addition to the aforementioned generic and historical approaches, academics have applied a variety of theoretical and thematic frameworks. For example, Clover's gender-based research in 1992 was influenced by Williams (1984) and impacted upon the work of Berenstein, Grant (both 1996) Pinedo (1997) and Cherry (in Jancovich, 2002). Similarly, Benschhoff's (1997) work on representations of homosexuality in Horror successfully adapted the guiding principles of Russo's *The Celluloid Closet* (1980) whereas Iaccino reviewed Derry's (1977) psychological history. Indeed, a synthesis of these two seemingly disparate approaches to gender, sexuality and psychoanalysis in Horror manifested themselves in Creed's 1993 text *The Monstrous-Feminine*. Paedophobia and the representation of children in the genre has been seen in the work of both Bussing (1987) and Westfahl and Slusser, (1999) with Tony Williams building on Wood's assertion that the family is the root of our contemporary American horrors in his *Hearths of Darkness* (1996).

From representation to reception, Weaver and Tamborini also published a collection of investigations in 1995 with several successful compilations and collections of individual essays characterising genre studies dating back to Britton's *American Nightmares* (1979). In its wake there has been Grant's *Planks of Reason* (1984) and Waller's *American Horrors* (1987); both followed by summative revisions in recent guides edited by Gelder (2000), Silver and Ursini (2000) and Jancovich (2002).¹⁹

However, what distinguishes this piece of research from these texts is the way in which it is neither theoretical nor historical in its approach. Alternatively, the concerns of this thesis are rooted in the mechanics of Hollywood Horror Franchise filmmaking and the director's role and perspective within that challenging process.

II. The Franchise

A franchise is the authorisation to sell a company's product at a particular time and place by exploiting ownership or obtaining the license to it. A popular and profitable approach to starting a new business, a franchise, in other words and for the purpose of this thesis, is a transferable property which can be legally owned. This definition rules out literary figures, directors and stars who have the potential to become marketable brand names. In this respect, all first films have the potential to be a franchise regardless of their origins.²⁰

Commonly associated with a standardised approach to production and promotion, the term implies standardisation, a successful formula and an absence of creativity from the outset. Moreover, this term can encompass every consumer product related to the title

and licensed by the franchisor, and this includes feature films, TV spin-offs, novels, comics, video games, toys and every other form of official merchandise relating directly to the title.²¹ However, this thesis only recognises feature films, in the form of prequels, sequels and remakes, as part of the Hollywood Horror franchise irrespective of their fidelity to the first film. Having characterised Horror movies as looking “like nothing so much as folktales - a set of fixed tale types that generate a endless stream of what are in effect variants: sequels, remakes and rip-offs,”²² Clover has also highlighted Horror’s generic predominance in sequel production across the budgetary range.

A sequel is commonly understood as being a text that continues the concepts, characters and story begun in a previous text²³ and is derived from the Latin root *sequi*, meaning ‘to follow.’²⁴ In much the same way that the franchise has recently been referred to as “that dreaded F word,”²⁵ sequels have been described as “cheap carny tricks,”²⁶ “pure rip-offs,”²⁷ and “an exploitation of the original film.”²⁸ Their “pulse...is always this: financial”²⁹ and they exist purely as a means of allowing “maximum profit to be derived from success, using a pre-established audience for more systematic exploitation of ancillary markets and merchandising.”³⁰ In summary then, “sequels suck.”³¹ Indeed, these have been just some of the common criticisms reiterated by reactionary critics from both inside and outside the industry. Whereas such inflammatory charges are far from being mere fabrications, this thesis will highlight the extent to which these negative descriptions fail to present an accurate picture.

Rather than uphold the tradition of calling part one the ‘original’ film, I have chosen to supplant ‘original’ with the less subjective word ‘first.’ This is because the former carries with it dual connotations of being both “unprecedented and basic;”³² neither of which can be applied to many first films despite their status as entertainment or artistic

value. In other words, to avoid bestowing unnecessary simplicity or excessive originality on such films as Romero's *Night of the Living Dead* or Coscarelli's *Phantasm*, the term 'first film' is far more appropriate when taking into account issues surrounding intertextuality, adaptation and remakes – all of which highlight the extensive use of referencing and cinematic short-hand so often employed by filmmakers. Certainly, a common misconception regarding the franchise is that it is a relatively new phenomenon plaguing Hollywood feature film production. Contrary to this popular belief the franchise has, in various guises and forms, been a successful staple of Hollywood's cinematic product, literary history³³ and all across the artistic spectrum.

Nevertheless, it was not until 1998 that two key theoretical works emerged in order to rectify the resulting gap in literature regarding two comparative elements of the franchise; the remake and the sequel (Budra and Scallenberg, 1998). Just as McLarty took the male-dominated action genre as her focus, Budra opted to examine the recurrence of the monsters in Horror and concluded that it was through a combination of charismatic creatures, incoherence, and a lack of closure that these films have continued to flourish.

Similarly, Horton and McDougal's *Play It Again, Sam: Retakes on Remakes* (1998) is another collection of essays. They are described by contributor Leo Braudy as "close kin"³⁴ to both the adaptation and the sequel, in that they are "another attempt to get it right."³⁵ However, he concludes that although they too "flirt with fidelity... (remakes) can be better than their originals" – a contentious position which to critics who single out the perceived successes as exceptions to the rule. Furthermore, they can serve to emphasise the "constant interplay between the desires of artists and the desires of

audiences.”³⁶ Naremore also recognizes how these films are in danger of being automatically assigned a low status, or even of “eliciting critical opprobrium, because they are (allegedly) copies of culturally treasured”³⁷ originals. By way of example, Naremore draws our attention to the *Psycho* franchise and how the “discourse surrounding both its sequels and prequel and its 1998 remake...encountered nearly universal derision.”³⁸ More recently, Forrest and Koos compiled a range of articles in *Dead Ringers: the remake in theory and practice* (2002) which successfully builds on the beginnings of Doris Milberg’s introductory guide, *Repeat Performances* in 1990.

Whereas the majority of texts devoted to the franchise presented narrative histories, (see Druxmann, 1977; Hicken, 1982; Nowlan and Nowlan, 1989; and Limbacher, 1991) there were initially few genre-specific texts. Foreshadowed by *A Critical Guide to Horror Series* (Hanke, 1991), which spans from Universal’s *Dracula* to New Line’s *Elm Street* series, later texts by Stell, (1998) and Holten and Winchester, (1997) adopted this chronological, franchise-specific approach to narrative histories. However, comparisons within or between them were seldom made with a chronological sequence and secular approach strictly adhered to.

In contrast, there is widespread availability of texts critiquing successful first films and providing us with a solid foundation upon which to explore franchise development. Just as Newman, (1974); Kermode, (1998); and McCabe, (1999) all focused on *The Exorcist*, with McCabe also spending some time on follow-ups and spin offs, Rebello, (1990) and Leigh and Nickens (1995) concentrated on Hitchcock’s *Psycho*. Similarly first film co-screenwriters Russo, (1985) and Gottlieb (1975), wrote extensively on *Night of the Living Dead* and *Jaws* respectively, and critic Nigel Andrews was just one of many critics who selected Spielberg’s summer blockbuster as the subject of his 1999

book. On the other hand, informative behind the scenes texts for both *The Exorcist* (Pallenberg 1977) and *Jaws* sequel (Loynd, 1978) offered detailed and often difficult production histories of these two significant New Hollywood Studio sequels and they proved to be an excellent starting point for such an investigation.

Nevertheless, similar forays into franchise territory have been scarce and only began to appear in the wake of Stephen King's first wave of adaptations and New Line's phenomenal success with the *Elm Street* franchise. King-based texts were by Jones (2001), Collins (1986) and Underwood (1987), with the first *Elm Street* companion appearing the same year (Cooper, 1987) and followed by Schoell and Spencer's in 1992. Although there are over fifty other contemporary fear franchises, six more have since received similar treatment with each text taking a chronological look at the origins and evolution of the franchise both in front of and behind the camera.³⁹

Consequently, the franchise has been receiving an increasing amount of critical attention as Hollywood continues to invest in its long-term and increasingly expensive development. However, with only the most lucrative receiving any kind of critical attention at this stage, many important examples have been rejected and neglected in the process. Therefore in *Exploiting Fear* I will strive to incorporate the full extent of the genre's franchises within a case study structure.

III. The Hollywood Horror Franchise

Despite the prevalence of the franchise across most forms of Hollywood filmmaking, Maitland McDonagh has been right to insist that it has grown “to define the (Horror) genre marketplace to a far greater degree than the mainstream marketplace.”⁴⁰ Due in part to its relative independence from the established star system and requiring comparatively less financing than other forms of mass entertainment, the Horror genre has proven itself time and again to be an attractive option for filmmakers and financiers wishing to break into Hollywood. Spurred on by cyclic development, and intensified by the unremitting efforts of filmmakers to test and push the boundaries of explicitness and acceptability, Horror filmmaking has consistently involved the mass production and aggressive marketing of a tried and tested formula. Although the Horror film and the sequel arguably rank as two of the most popular forms of filmmaking, even if only from a producer’s point of view, their role within the Studio or independent sector has seldom been considered with objectivity. In this respect, *Exploiting Fear* will provide one more piece of the puzzle with its focus firmly on the filmmaker.

The Hollywood Horror franchise has defined and directed the Horror genre's output since Universal and the 1930s. McDonagh has further pointed out that “Horror movies have always gone in cycles...pivotal movie...slew of imitations...diminishing returns.”⁴¹ Consequently, it is necessary to offer a brief developmental history of the Hollywood Horror franchise by taking into account the technological and industry-based factors behind it. In addition I shall also contextualise the Hollywood Horror franchise by re-presenting it as another form of film adaptation sharing similar concerns and critical attacks to those works with direct literary origins.

Despite Bergman’s claim that “film has nothing to do with literature,”⁴² Vincendeau has argued how most films “originate in some form of writing.”⁴³ Such a statement is also

pertinent when looking at the genre and the Hollywood Horror franchise. Much like the concept of sequels, the high-profile adaptation of a popular novel, play, short story or even comic book has consistently captured Hollywood's attention. This link has been highlighted by Naremore's negative description of how, "on a theoretical level, the problem of sequels and remakes...is quite similar to the problem of adaptation."⁴⁴ For example, both Browning's *Dracula* and Whale's *Frankenstein* (both 1931) not only drew their inspiration from the original source novels but also followed recent Broadway adaptations which had confirmed audience interest.

The release of Universal's *Dracula* and *Frankenstein* saw Hollywood's first Horror franchises imported and adapted from the Stage as well as European film and literature. The influence of the Gothic novel and German Expressionism weighed heavily over these early productions that, for the most part, maintained mythic sensibilities and locations. Plundering the works of Stoker, Shelley and Stevenson among others, Studios were eager to sate the appetites of audiences demanding further instalments and the resurrection of their favourite horrors. As Naremore points out, Hollywood "recognized from the beginning that it could gain a sort of legitimacy among middle-class viewers by reproducing facsimiles of more respectable art or by adapting literature to another medium."⁴⁵

Evidence to support this claim can be seen in the wealth of adaptations based on the works of Stoker, Shelley, Stevenson, Poe, Lovecraft and such contemporary figures as King, Barker and Rice. However, this has primarily been the case when the resultant film was "an aesthetically and morally conservative form of entertainment."⁴⁶ A paradoxical respectability and the genre's status as a profitable contradiction has captivated and confused Hollywood from the beginning. There is an overall consensus

that there must be some degree of public awareness of a selected title, topic or theme be it only in terms of mere recognition or vague association. This presents financiers with a reduced rate of financial and creative risk. The promise of guaranteed profits gleaned from an established and sufficiently prepped audience has been an enormous incentive for Hollywood to embrace and embellish a rich variety of tried and tested concepts.

Specifically designed to exploit the concepts, characters and iconography of its predecessor, the first successful marriage between the Horror genre and the sequel was Whale's *Bride of Frankenstein*. This licentious follow up with its literary prologue was such a resounding critical and commercial success that the series soon gave birth to a third film, a *Son of Frankenstein*, four years later. Secure in the familiarity of their terror titles from literary sources and lacking concern as to their legitimacy in literary terms, Universal Studios saw to it that Mummies, Werewolves, and Invisible Men (and Women) received swift sequelisation throughout the thirties and forties. Despite inevitable competition, Laemmle and Universal continued to dominate Horror film production before the films inevitably descended into parody and spoof wherein Abbott and Costello ultimately made their mark. Nevertheless, it was these 'Monster Movies' and later such 'Creature Features' as Jack Arnold's *Creature From the Black Lagoon*, that became the first fear franchises spawning numerous sequels and spin-offs.

Forced to compete with external factors beyond its control,⁴⁷ the Hollywood of the 1950s had to contend with an influx of independent filmmakers and distributors. Epitomised by Corman and American International Pictures, they competed with an all-too successful mix of sex, violence and sheer absurdity to capture a growing teen audience. Across the Atlantic, Hammer was also embracing Horror and began emulating Universal's classic series by injecting them with increasingly gratuitous sex

and violence and presenting them in glorious Technicolour. Having proven “themselves the masters of science-fiction,”⁴⁸ and the originators of the numerical sequel with *Quatermass II* in 1956, Hammer’s first Horror was the appropriately titled *the Curse of Frankenstein*.

Following this film’s success, the company incorporated Dracula, the Mummy and the Werewolf into their midst before several supernatural films and creature features followed. Indeed, Hammer “revitalized, redefined and revolutionized Horror movies around the world.”⁴⁹ Not only did Hammer influence such Italian Masters of the macabre as Riccardo Freda and Mario Bava it also inspired William Castle,⁵⁰ whose penchant for innovative gimmickry, coupled with a pioneering approach to publicity, saw such fifties films as *Macabre*, *House on Haunted Hill* and *The Tingler* promoted with Insurance policies, Emergo and Percepto. Corman, on the other hand, eschewed such contemporary interactive horrors in favour of a celebrated cycle of Poe adaptations that belied their meagre budgets with sumptuous sets and scenery-chewing performances.

This combination of Corman, Castle and Hammer, coupled with the commercial success of *Les Diaboliques*, inspired Hitchcock to direct an adaptation of Robert Bloch’s *Psycho*. A distinctly American nightmare based on the crimes of Ed Gein, *Psycho* was developed against distributor Paramount’s wishes, but later championed by critics as “one of the key works of our age.”⁵¹ With its shocking star sacrifice, the film also redefined the way in which films were screened and audiences attended them. Cinema exhibition similarly altered as the Drive-in gave automobile-fixated suburbanites, and later their offspring, the opportunity to experience the latest releases from the relative safety of their own front, or most likely, back seat as teenagers emerged as the target

demographic. A subsequent rise in demand for teen-orientated product was swiftly met by A.I.P. and taken to extremes by H.G. Lewis who, with low budget gore-fests *Blood Feast* and *2000 Maniacs* among others, further widened the gap between Studio and independent approaches to Horror.

This “new age of opportunity”⁵² for independent filmmakers stretched so far as Pittsburgh, the drive-in capital of the East, where Romero co-wrote and directed *Night of the Living Dead*. Released in 1968, Romero’s black and white Drive-in classic coincided with the appearance of the MPAA. Furthermore, it contrasted with Paramount’s attempt, in association with producer William Castle, to reclaim the genre through *Rosemary’s Baby*. Like Hitchcock, Polanski was reportedly convinced that this adaptation “represented (his) chance to conquer Hollywood”⁵³ and it was this film that became the first contemporary Hollywood Horror franchise in 1976.

Three years previous to this, another Satanically-themed film dominated the box office and propelled Horror back into the critically and commercially lucrative spotlight. Friedkin’s *The Exorcist* redressed the gap between Studio-sanctioned highbrow Horror and the low budget exploitation pictures. According to Troma’s Lloyd Kaufman, this was yet another example of the majors following “people like Roger Corman...into the horror field.”⁵⁴ Attracting equal amounts of controversy and success, the film played a significant part in the rise of the big budget Hollywood Summer Blockbuster that officially began with *Jaws* eighteen months later. Despite Spielberg’s need to break from Universal and the similarities between this project and *Duel*, Spielberg’s decision to direct was, according to McBride, born out of his desire to “seek acceptance and approval”⁵⁵ with a “big commercial movie.”⁵⁶ The critical and commercial success of these and other examples firmly established the extent to which new and aspiring

Hollywood directors would turn to contemporary literature to legitimise projects and guarantee a high profile release.

However, the existence and involvement of a living author also heralded the potential for an antagonistic relationship to develop between them and the director. Sometimes spilling out into the press, examples of such public production spats include Benchley and Spielberg on *Jaws*⁵⁷ and Rice and Jordan during the production of *Interview with the Vampire*.⁵⁸ Whereas some directors willingly incorporated an author's intentions others had them imposed upon the production. Spielberg and Jordan for example argued that the authors' screenplays lacked the integral cinematic elements and *Howling* director Dante simply wrote off Brander's novel from the outset. Therefore, directorial attitudes towards source novels varied and were seldom reverential. Indeed, Hitchcock's admonition that he "read a story only once, and if I like the basic idea, I just forget about the book and start to create cinema,"⁵⁹ is just one more example of this attitude. Having previously observed how the focus of their text had been shifted, stifled or substituted by a director's own stamp some authors sought to increase their involvement in and creative control over subsequent projects.⁶⁰

This situation has seen writers and literary creators invariably feel the need to publicly defend their work and directly criticise a director's alleged (mis)handling of the material. As we shall see, this is reminiscent of the first film directors' attitude towards subsequent films, and a stance echoed by audiences and critics who characteristically mix direct comparisons with unfair criticisms. Overall, the finished products often fail to live up to any preconceptions. Similarly, the Hollywood Horror franchise has elicited the same reactions and resentment from fans and creators of first films, in terms of their

fidelity to the source material, and underlines its status as another form of film adaptation.

Acknowledging Wood's separatist attitude towards adaptation,⁶¹ Vincendeau has pointed out that this issue of fidelity, and the comparing of literary texts with their cinematic counterparts, has dominated academic discussion. "The critical reception of literary adaptations has been plagued with the urge to assess how 'faithful' the film version is to its original."⁶² Ever since the first silent cinematic adaptation of Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* by the Edison Company in 1910 Hollywood's desire to scare audiences has been tempered by a reluctance to offend. In this, the first of the monster movies, the Edison Company "didn't want to seriously frighten audiences"⁶³ and so significantly altered Shelley's text to ensure that the monster didn't kill anyone and "eventually vanishes, overcome by Frankenstein's love for his bride."⁶⁴ In other words, Hollywood's attitude to the literary text is not as respectful or rigorous as many critics and audiences would like.

Naremore concurs and has expanded on this statement by pointing out that "even when academic writing on the topic is not directly concerned with a given film's artistic adequacy or fidelity to a beloved source, it tends to be narrow in range, (and) inherently respectful of the precursor text."⁶⁵ In applying these issues to the franchise, we can see how such an approach is unjust given the nature of Studio politics and budgetary constraints as financial support for the franchise dwindles. However, as film criticism continues to evolve, this single-minded over-reliance on fidelity as the primary source of analysis and interpretation has thankfully begun to decline despite its domination of academic discussion.

With imitation and creative flattery at the centre of Hollywood filmmaking, rival Studios readily cashed-in on successful adaptations of *The Exorcist* and *Jaws* by producing such similarly-themed and unofficial adaptations of their own with *The Omen* and *Orca: Killer Whale*. Powerless to prevent rival studio productions and low budget imitations from swamping the marketplace, Studios such as Warner Bros and Universal responded to cinematic plagiarism by producing legitimate numerical follow ups; thereby creating the first experimental slew of what novelist, critic and screenwriter William Goldman has since referred to as “whore’s movies,”⁶⁶ and effectively announcing the arrival of the modern Hollywood Horror franchise.

With a rich ancestry stretching back to the earliest forms of Greek tragedies alluded to in Craven’s *Scream 2*, shocking climaxes and apocalyptic conclusions pre-dated this time when a first film’s end was fashioned around a pre-emptive strike on the part of the Studios in the form of shock epilogues and sequel set-ups. Indeed, by prohibiting narrative closure adaptations of *The Birds* and *Rosemary’s Baby* have since been open to (re)interpretation in future films.⁶⁷ However, directors have rarely agreed with authors’ conclusions, preferring to sacrifice, spare or shift character and meaning to ensure a satisfying cinematic experience. With Mann’s *Manhunter* and Dante’s *The Howling* being particularly strong examples, Spielberg not only spared his on screen personas in two monster movies⁶⁸ but also resurrected the T-Rex for the final shots of *Jurassic Park*. However, the director did not prevail in finishing *Jaws* with a decidedly apocalyptic final shot of “a lot of (shark) fins on the horizon, coming to the island”⁶⁹ as survivors Brody and Hooper optimistically kick their way to shore – a shot in keeping with the director’s shrewd sequel making sensibilities.

Horror's natural tendency towards open-ended and apocalyptic finales finally reached its apotheosis with *Carrie*; a film that not only introduced cinema audiences to Stephen King but also to the generic staple known as the shock epilogue. An extension of the aforementioned apocalyptic conclusion in which the "killer always returns for one last scare,"⁷⁰ De Palma's shock epilogue was itself "inspired by the end of Boorman's *Deliverance*."⁷¹ This nightmarish scenario, in which the film's antagonist remains alive in some form at the first film's conclusion, dramatically influenced the future of Horror filmmaking and facilitated the narrative ease with which franchises were resurrected. From the final murderous image of *Pet Sematery* to the resurrection of a female *Candyman*, first films invariably set the stage for future sequels just as *The Howling* and *Interview with the Vampire* explicitly indicated the direction follow-ups could take. In other words, filmmakers' narrative choices or compromises allowed production companies to exploit these titles time and again as methods of distribution and exhibition dramatically exploded.

The unprecedented growth in cable, satellite and pay-per-view channels along with advances in film technology at this time also opened up the potential for many filmmakers, regardless of budget and backing, to finance, film and distribute their product. Then again, changing methods of distribution and exhibition also contributed to a dwindling interest in venues like the traditional Drive-In and Grind House where low budget Horror had cultivated a fertile breeding ground. The introduction of the Sony's Betamax video cassette recorder in 1975, along with its newer rival VHS, ushered in a new era of feature film production, distribution and spectatorship. As had previously occurred in the drive-in, the Home Video market led to an increased demand for new titles and the rediscovery of old ones. Whereas the drive-in merely altered the environment in which films were exhibited, Jancovich has described how:

“The advent of the domestic video machine had been treated with great suspicion by the major Hollywood Studios, which feared that it might finally destroy the family altogether. They were therefore originally very cautious about releasing their films on video, and the rental and retail market became dominated by smaller, independent companies, which filled the resulting gap.”⁷²

This substantial gap in the market and seemingly insatiable demand for product was readily exploited by independent and international filmmakers. In order to compete with their big budget rivals, Corman and Band shrewdly increased the sex and violence quotient in their films thus distinguishing them from the more mainstream fare on offer. For example, once Spielberg announced his return to the monster movie market with a technologically ground-breaking adaptation of Crichton’s *Jurassic Park*, Corman committed to an adaptation of *Carnosaur*. Such was Corman’s commitment to the concept that, by the time Spielberg returned for a second instalment, Corman had released a third entry in his dino-franchise. As competition increased and many independent production companies went bankrupt, the franchise was embraced as a successful method of corporate reinvention and economic survival.

Previously, Studios had presented and promoted their actors, auteurs and icons. However, the favorable reception of sequels to Lucas’ *Star Wars* and Stallone’s *Rocky* combined with the critical acclaim received by sequels to *The Godfather* and *The French Connection*, saw them take over as the industry’s most bankable and dependable commodity.⁷³ In addition to the reduced risk and relative profitability of the franchise, Studios were inspired and incensed by the success with which the independents had cashed-in. Indeed, Universal’s follow ups to *Jaws* and *Psycho*, for example, could be

seen as a direct response to the slew of low budget imitations and threats to their first film concepts. Similarly, Romero experienced cinematic plagiarism throughout domestic and international markets with *Children Shouldn't Play with Dead Things* and Fulci's *Zombie Flesh Eaters* being marketed as the sequel to Romero's own follow up in various foreign territories. And so, as the seventies drew to a close no film was safe from becoming a Hollywood Horror franchise; highlighting Romero's claim that, although "Hollywood still thinks of Horror as schlock, the perpetual poor relative. They're willing to turn to it if it's making money."⁷⁴

This proliferation of sequels, primarily within the Horror genre, has led many critics and insiders to diagnose Hollywood with a severe bout of 'sequelitis,'⁷⁵ the symptoms of which are said to be a clear lack of creativity and a conservative approach to 'playing it safe.' Such negative connotations have admittedly been backed-up by some deserving product. Moreover, this growth in the Horror, and specifically slasher sub-genre, ironically became the subject of author Robert Bloch's literary follow up to *Psycho*. Through his work, Bloch criticised Hollywood's cynical approach to filmmaking and Universal "loathed"⁷⁶ this novel's condemnation of their "blood bath tactics."⁷⁷ Initially reluctant to pursue this franchise, a case of potential copyright infringement, in which the Picture Striking Company had announced *The Return of Norman* as their next feature, sensationally stirred up worldwide media speculation to such an extent that Universal found the project impossible to resist. By the time *Psycho II* was released in 1982, Fox's *Omen* franchise had reached the end of its current cycle with a fitting yet temporary conclusion after three instalments and Damiani's *Amityville II: The Possession* had become the first prequel of the Hollywood Horror franchise.

As the eighties progressed, New Line's success with the iconic child killer Freddy Kruger⁷⁸ inspired courses of action that either involved the accumulation of established titles or the development of more franchise-friendly genre titles in-house.⁷⁹ Whereas 'The House that Freddy Built'⁸⁰ grew in size and stature, companies such as New World, Vestron, Empire and DEG fell into bankruptcy, liquidation or receivership. As the slasher boom dwindled, the collapse of companies like New World encouraged production companies to acquire recognisable product in an over-crowded market. Whereas Fox fused the remake and the sequel for a follow up to Cronenberg's *The Fly*, Warner Bros became the first major Studio to specifically create Horror sequels for the direct to video market with Cohen's third *It's Alive* and *A Return to Salem's Lot* in 1987.⁸¹

In this and all respects, the industry has demonstrated its ability to meet and then exceed audience demands to saturation point. Technical advances have also helped this situation with new opportunities for filmmakers allowing the Hollywood Horror franchise to take hold. Combined with the growth of cable and pay-per-view channels like HBO, which began its satellite distribution programming in 1975, this avenue has been expanded and explored by competitors such as Showtime. The increase in Cable and VCR penetration contributed to the production of franchises specifically designed for the Home Video market. With such concepts as 'product recognition' and 'brand identity' built into the franchise mentality, Studios and independents capitalized on these benefits with the added bonus of ancillary markets and additional merchandising. In other words, with the industry no longer restrained by or limited to the theatrical market, an increasing number of films, and particularly their sequels, resurfaced either as direct-to-video, pay-per-view or network/cable television premieres.

Following this expansion, the Hollywood Horror franchise has flourished or floundered, depending upon your perspective, by trading on fresh icons in foreign and domestic markets. The resurrection of *The Children of the Corn* franchise is a key success story in this respect. As Trimark, New Horizons, and Full Moon films dominated the direct-to-video Horror franchise market, with *Leprechauns*, *Puppetmasters*, *Wishmasters* and *Children of the Corn*, spiralling costs saw alternative forms of distribution exploited to secure a return on investments. Indeed, 2005 has seen the industry's perception of the Home Video market dramatically adjust as companies like Paramount and Universal have begun to invest more heavily in direct-to-video fare and open up specific distribution arms to exploit the DVD premiere market.⁸²

Prior to this, the Weinsteins and Miramax established Dimension films to capitalise on these markets and began accumulating recognisable genre titles like *Hellraiser* and *Halloween* at various stages in their numerical development. Besides the assimilation of these troubled titles into an evolving portfolio, the success of Craven's *Scream* trilogy saw Dimension become the focal point for the financing and distribution of the Hollywood Horror franchise. Since 1996, the company has been involved with over twenty different sequels to such first films as *Prophecy*, *Mimic*, *From Dusk Till Dawn*, *Dracula* and of course *Scream*. Through an inconsistent process of farming out sequels and promoting novices and experienced members of its production family into the director's chair, it could be argued that Dimension spear-headed the (sub)standardisation and some level of experimentation within the Hollywood Horror franchise.

Similarly, Michael Bay's Platinum Dunes production company has built itself around adapting classic genre titles for contemporary audiences with such titles as *The Texas*

Chainsaw Massacre (and a new prequel), *The Amityville Horror*, *The Hitcher* and even *Friday the 13th*. Promoted as re-imaginings, redouxes or simply remakes these titles, along with a new batch of creature features designed to replicate the success of Universal's first iconic monster movies, have brought the Hollywood Horror franchise closer to the literary adaptation.⁸³ Undeniably, the Horror remake revival has been adopted by producers as a means of resurrecting the profitability of a title and re-introducing the franchise to a younger contemporary audience. Just as these adaptations have dominated Horror film production, the Universal trend of combining Horror series' to ensure their continuation has also been regurgitated⁸⁴ to bring the Hollywood Horror franchise full circle.

With the introduction of the DVD in March 1997, Horror has once again capitalised on its comparatively low costs and high potential for profit in new markets. DVD has successfully built on the foundations of the Special Edition and Laserdiscs before eclipsing them completely with the added potential of commentaries, documentaries, deleted scenes and alternative endings. This has generously allowed for the re-release or re-mastering of 'old classics' and the digital debut of new ones as a new way of experiencing and analysing film. Furthermore, DVD sales surpassed those of Videos for the first time in 2003⁸⁵ and the Hollywood Horror franchise has benefited from its established fan-base and a fresh teen audience. In this respect, the Hollywood Horror franchise has demonstrated that, like any good cast, it has been one worth repeating through an endless series of sequels, prequels and remakes.

IV. The Horror Film Director

Auteurism –

“a theory of filmmaking in which
the director is considered the primary creative force behind a film.”⁸⁶

The auteurist approach to film theory saw directors ranked and placed in a hierarchy according to their artistic potential and achievements as perceived by critics in *Cahiers du Cinema*. This influential group of French critics emerged in the 1950s and was responsible for reviving and popularising the on-going debate surrounding cinematic authorship. First published in 1951, their manifesto for an auteurist approach to film theory and criticism was eventually epitomised in Françoise Truffaut’s 1954 essay ‘*A Certain Tendency of the French Cinema*.’ This advocated that increasing attention be awarded to specific American films and filmmakers.

Dick, in *Anatomy of Film*, stated that “auteurism entered America”⁸⁷ through Andrew Sarris who adopted and adapted this theory first in a 1962 essay and then later in *The American Cinema*. Furthermore, Sarris imposed “a ranking order of his own”⁸⁸ and distilled the theory down to three essential principles or criteria.⁸⁹ However, many scholars have raised legitimate objections. Citing collaboration and control as dissipating factors they have countered that the potential for any individual, be it writer, director, producer or special effects artist to have sole control over the finished film is limited if not impossible. Indeed, this contentious debate brings us back to the key issues of context, content and influences.

Although Twitchell acknowledged the genre’s artistry and originality, he considered auteur criticism “quite beside the point when explaining horror.”⁹⁰ Clover meanwhile

has concurred that “auteur criticism is at least partly besides the point;”⁹¹ suggesting that directors “operate more on instinct and formula rather than conscious understanding.”⁹² However, a more extreme view has been propagated by Dickstein in *The Aesthetics of Fright*. In this he argued that “the ‘art’ of horror film is a ludicrous notion since Horror, even at its most commercially exploitative, is generally sub-cultural like the wild child that can never be tamed.”⁹³ In other words, the genre is not and cannot be crafted, created or controlled but must be visceral. In so far as this relates to the Hollywood Horror franchise, which seeks to harness the profitability of a proven concept over a series of films, Dickstein would perhaps question its legitimacy and validity on these terms.

Jancovich has pointed out how writers such as Kitses described the way in which “many directors (have) worked best within specific genres. This observation led them to see genres not simply as formulaic narratives against which directors defined their authorial personality, but rather as a resource on which the director drew – something that was at least as enabling as it was constraining.”⁹⁴ Indeed this thesis will illustrate the extent to which genre and the franchise have been instrumental in establishing a director’s auteur status. Moreover, it will examine the extent to which the Hollywood Horror franchise provides a “vital structure through which a myriad of themes and concepts”⁹⁵ can be explored by directors able to exploit their own fears, neuroses and concerns.

In light of this, scholars such as Kitses have begun to deviate from the established hierarchies of New Hollywood auteurism, as epitomized by the likes of Spielberg, Coppola and Scorsese, to analyse the careers of less prolific figures.⁹⁶ For example, studies of Jonathan Demme (Bliss, 1996) and Richard Fleischer (Bourgoin, 1986) have appeared alongside profiles and biographies of Ridley Scott (Sammon, 1999) and James

Cameron (Heard, 1997 and Shapiro, 2000); united in their temporary association with the Hollywood Horror franchise. Of those directors associated almost exclusively with the genre, only those from the 1970s have, as yet, received similar treatment.⁹⁷ More general collections on contemporary Hollywood directors include *The Movie Brats* (Pye and Myles, 1979), *Postmodern Auteurs* (Van Gunden, 1991), *A Cut Above* (Singer, 1998), and *Directors Close Up* (Kagan, 2000). This profiling and or interviewing of various influential directors has increasingly been applied to the rising number of younger, less experienced directors and those operating on small budgets and outside the traditional Hollywood Studio system. However, the majority of this literature has only been produced in the last ten years.

Alternatively, Tom Weaver, Bill Warren and Randy and Lee L'Officier have compiled interview-based collections entitled *Monster Movie Makers* (Weaver, 1994), and *The Dreamweavers: Interviews with the Fantasy Filmmakers of the 1980s* (L'Officier and L'Officier 1995). Furthermore, other writers have profiled directors in a range of self-explanatory titles guaranteed to grab the audience's attention.⁹⁸ In addition to these exploitation-focused authors, Dennis Fischer has, in *Horror Film Directions 1931-1990* (1991), critiqued several sequel directors who, for the most part, have been derided and dismissed by other writers in this field.

In *Caligari's Children*, Praver has pointed out how audiences, and particularly those attending Horror sequels, not only "want to satisfy various latent needs and dispositions...(but also) want to be surprised by something new or different."⁹⁹ In other words, directors must recognise and respond to the external and internal demands imposed upon them. If a sequel rigidly adheres to the established formula, it risks disappointing the audience and jeopardizes the franchise's future; but should it deviate

too far from the original concept, audiences will be alienated and consider the film a disappointment. Maitland McDonagh concurs with Prawer in this respect and has commented how this “balance between keeping the elements people loved from the first film while taking the material in a new direction is a tough one.”¹⁰⁰ Therefore, *Exploiting Fear* will also examine the way in which directors of the Hollywood Horror franchise have dealt with the dilemmas involved in producing a successful follow up.

Furthermore, it will provide a considered overview of the production process from the director’s perspective by adopting a case study approach. Each of the five chapters will pay particular attention to issues of tone, content, test screenings and censorship and focus on directors’ relationship with the Hollywood Horror franchise. Chapter 1 will chronicle Coscarelli’s seemingly monogamous involvement with and control of the *Phantasm* franchise. Chapter 2, on the other hand, will address Wes Craven’s ambivalent relationship with the Hollywood Horror franchise throughout the course of his career. In Chapter 3 the focus will shift to the rise of the special effects artist and the ascension of first film cast and crew members into the director’s chair by referencing Tom Savini and William Peter Blatty’s involvement with the *Night of the Living Dead* and *The Exorcist* franchises. Departing from this nepotistic trend, Chapter 4 will then take on the largest category of directors thus far; the franchise outsiders as represented by *Blair Witch 2*’s Joe Berlinger. Finally, Chapter 5 will deal with the inevitable rise of the sequel maker as epitomised by *Leatherface: The Texas Chainsaw Massacre III*’s Jeff Burr.

Culminating in a series of conclusions, based on the evidence uncovered and provided by directors and key personnel, this text will hopefully begin to redress the critical

perception of the Hollywood Horror franchise and enlighten audiences as to the myriad of issues and inconsistencies that surround so many other cases of film adaptation.

End Notes

¹ Xavier Mendik. 'Logic, creativity and (critical) misinterpretations: an interview with David Cronenberg' in Grant, 2000: 117.

² McDonagh, 1995: 93.

³ Spoken by Stuart 'Stu' Macher who, along with his dominant partner Billy Loomis, was one of the slasher-inspired serial killers in Wes Craven's *Scream* (1996).

⁴ For a detailed production history of what is regarded as Whale's greatest achievement see Curtis, 1998: 233-254.

⁵ However, Whale's celebrated sequel came two years after Schoedsack's less successful *Son of Kong* (1933) a family friendly follow up which was hastily constructed and failed to inspire audiences in the same way its predecessor had done earlier that year.

⁶ Jancovich, 2002: 9.

⁷ Wood, 1979: 13.

⁸ Other generic and historical approaches to Horror can be seen in Praver, 1980; Twitchell, 1985; Hardy, 1986; Underwood, 1987; Carroll, 1990; King, 1991; and Soren, 1997.

⁹ Neale has consistently written on and revised his notions regarding the definition of genre (see Neale: 1980, 1990, 1999).

¹⁰ James Naremore. *More than Night: Film Noir in its Contexts*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1998, pp. 9-39.

¹¹ David J. Russell, 'Monster Roundup: Reintegrating the Horror Genre', in Nick Browne. Ed., *Refiguring American Film Genres: Theory and History* Berkeley: University of California Press (1998).

¹² Jancovich, 2002: 9.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Clover, 1990: 5

¹⁵ Clover sets this up in her Introduction to *Men, Women and Chainsaws* (Clover, 1990: 5).

¹⁶ McBride 1997: 240.

¹⁷ Ibid. p241.

¹⁸ As reported by Richard Finney on page 58 of his article 'Nanny and The Possessor: The Guardian.' *Fangoria* 91, April 1990. pp30-33 & 58.

¹⁹ These similarly titled surveys of recent and celebrated articles are *Horror: The Film Reader* (Jancovich, 2002), *Horror Film Reader* (Silver and Ursini, 2000) and *The Horror Reader* (Gelder, 2000).

²⁰ The origins of a franchise are numerous, ranging from the literary, as in the case of Conan Doyle's *Sherlock Holmes*, Tolkien's *Lord of the Rings* and Rowling's *Harry Potter* novels, or such alternative, but by no means less fruitful, sources as comic books, video games or even particular toys. The upcoming resurrection of the *Transformers* franchise highlights this form of media synergy.

²¹ There are of course the unofficial, unlicensed books and other merchandise, not to mention reams of fan-sites and forums, which would not fall under the definition of the franchise, but form an integral part of the franchise's functionality and success. Indeed,

an established fan base is a fundamental aspect of a franchise's popularity and longevity.

²² Clover, 1990: 10.

²³ Budra and Schellenberg, 1998: 7.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ This was actor Sir Ian McKellen responding to criticisms of another *X-Men* film in *X3*. Scott Chitwood. 'X-Men: The Last Stand. Set Visit Part 3.'

<http://www.superherohype.com/news/featuresnews.php?id=3863> (Downloaded: February 23rd 2006).

²⁶ Steven Spielberg speaking in 1975 at the San Francisco film festival in McBride, 1997: 257.

²⁷ Crawley, Tony. "The Sequel\$\$\$ Game." *Photoplay*. Vol 33. No 10. October 1982. pp 58-61. (p58).

²⁸ Dupont, David. 'It's Only A Movie: Play It Again Sam.' *Starburst* 92. April 1986. p35.

²⁹ Goldman, 1999: 48.

³⁰ Blandford et al, 2001: 209.

³¹ One character attempting self-criticism in Craven's *Scream 2* (1997).

³² Braudy's Afterward in Horton and McDougal, 1998: 327-334. (p329).

³³ See Part Two's table of 'sequel narrative modes.' Budra and Schellenberg, 1998: 12.

³⁴ Braudy's Afterward in Horton and McDougal, 1998: 327-334. (p327).

³⁵ Ibid, p329.

³⁶ Ibid, p333.

³⁷ Naremore, 2000: 13

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Examples of such texts include; David Thompson's *The Alien Quartet* (1998), Bill Warren's insightful *Evil Dead Companion* (2000), John Brosnan's timely look at the *Scream* trilogy (2000), Daniel O'Brien's cash-in on the popularity of Hannibal Lecter with *The Hannibal Files* (2001) and most recently Stefan Jaworzyn's *The Texas Chainsaw Massacre Companion* (2003). Cunningham's *Friday the 13th* franchise finally achieved some form of critical and historical evaluation in 2005 with Peter M. Bracke's *Crystal Lake Memories: The Complete History of Friday the 13th* and David Grove's *Making Friday the 13th: The Legacy of Camp Blood* to coincide with Paramount's box set DVD re-release of the first eight instalments.

⁴⁰ Maitland McDonagh, 'The State of the Horror Nation', *Fangoria*, no. 103, (June 1991), p. 23.

⁴¹ Maitland McDonagh Interview. *Scream and Scream Again*. Documentary.

⁴² Dick, 1990: 175.

⁴³ Vincendeau, 2001: xi.

⁴⁴ Naremore, 2000: 13

⁴⁵ Naremore, 2000: 4.

⁴⁶ Ibid, p5.

⁴⁷ Factors which influenced Hollywood's hold over the American cinema-going public included the US Supreme Court's Paramount Decree in 1948, the impact of television and such fundamental sociological shifts as the onset of the baby boom and sub urbanisation.

⁴⁸ Rigby, 2000: 41.

⁴⁹ Ibid. p44.

⁵⁰ Paraphrased from Rigby, 2000: 44.

⁵¹ Robin Wood, *Hitchcock's Films Revisited* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1989) p.150

⁵² Gomery, Douglas, 'The Economics of the Horror Film', in James Weaver and Ron Tanborini (eds), *Horror Films: Current Research on Audience Preferences and Reactions*. (Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1995), p. 53.

⁵³ Wexman 1985: 49.

⁵⁴ Maitland McDonagh, 'The State of the Horror Nation', *Fangoria*, no. 103, (June 1991), p. 22.

⁵⁵ McBride, 1997: 232-3.

⁵⁶ Ibid. p233.

⁵⁷ McBride, 1997: 239-40.

⁵⁸ Rice's initial displeasure over Cruise's casting as Lestat is well documented. Mark Salisbury. 'Interview with the Director.' *Fangoria* 138. November 1994. pp 44-50.

⁵⁹ Naremore 2000: 9.

⁶⁰ For example, Robert Bloch's experience with Hitchcock and *Psycho* saw a blind bid of \$9000 accepted for the rights to *Psycho* in perpetuity. Consequently, he received nothing from the film's financial success, its sequels or any subsequent merchandising. This was repeated in Stephen King's decision to let Doubleday have all film rights to *Carrie* fifteen years later. After such literary injustices, novelists and their agents have acted in a shrewder manner, insisting on sequel rights, profit participation and even the opportunity for authors to adapt their own stories.

⁶¹ Vincendeau, 2001: xi citing Wood, 1999: 7.

⁶² Ibid, xii.

⁶³ Quackenbush, 1980: 7.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ The politics of fidelity and subsequent rebuttals of its stringent application to film adaptation have been debated at length in such collections as *Film/Literature/Heritage*, Vincendeau, 2001, *Adaptations*, (Cartmell and Whelehan, 1999) and finally *Film Adaptation*, Naremore, 2000. However, Naremore concedes that McFarlane's *Novel to Film* (1996) also attacks this singular strand of film criticism.

⁶⁶ William Goldman, *Which Lie Did I Tell? More Adventures in the Screen Trade* (New York: Pantheon, 2000), p. 48.

⁶⁷ Although a cinematic sequel to Polanski's adaptation appeared in 1976, a Showtime-produced sequel to Hitchcock's *The Birds* finally took off in 1994.

⁶⁸ Spielberg spared Richard Dreyfus' character of Hooper in *Jaws* and Attenborough's character of John Hammond in *Jurassic Park* despite their dramatic deaths at the hands of the authors.

⁶⁹ McBride, 1997: 244.

⁷⁰ As described by Randy Meeks in Craven's *Scream* (1996).

⁷¹ Survivor Sue Snell takes flowers to the site of the former 'White House' only to be ambushed by Carrie's bloodied hand before waking up to discover it was only a dream. Brian De Palma Interview. 'Visualising Carrie.' *Carrie: Special Edition DVD*.

⁷² Jancovich, 2001: 6.

⁷³ Aljean Harmetz. 'The Sequel Becomes the New Bankable Film Star.' *The New York Times*. (8/7/1985). p16.

⁷⁴ Michael Rowe, 'Dawning of New Dread', *Fangoria*, no. 200, (March 2001), p. 50.

⁷⁵ A common term used to describe this phenomenon with connotations of disease, illness and decay.

⁷⁶ Rod Leming. 'From Psycho to Asylum: The Horror Films of Robert Bloch.'

http://mgpfeff.home.sprynet.com/leming_interview1.html (Downloaded: August 15th 2002).

⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸ For a more in depth examination of the *Elm Street* marketing phenomenon see Ian Conrich, 'Seducing the Subject: Freddy Kruger', in Alain Silver and James Ursini, 2000: 223-35.

⁷⁹ Although the vast majority of producers and distributors trading in established titles were interested in propagating their own, Embassy and MGM/UA were keen to distance themselves from the growing trend and sold off the rights to *The Howling* and *Child's Play* series respectively. Needless to say these two franchises soon found a new home as Hemdale offered *Howling II* producer Stephen Lane the proverbial too good to be true deal and Universal gave *Child's Play's 2* a bigger budget, better marketing and improved distribution.

⁸⁰ Dan Scapperotti. 'New Line Cinema: The House That Freddy Built' *Cinefantastique*, vol. 20, no. 1 / 2, (November 1989), pp. 89 & 124-5.

⁸¹ In interim periods spanning from a few months to several years if not decades, many franchises were adopted and adapted for the small screen. Repackaged to accommodate dwindling returns and ensure a low level of risk yet healthy return, episodic TV Horror was inspired by the pioneering success of *Alfred Hitchcock Presents*. Such attempts began with Universal's ill-fated pilot for *Bates Motel* in 1987, itself a spin off from Hitchcock's *Psycho*, with fear franchises *A Nightmare on Elm Street*, *Friday the 13th*, *Poltergeist*, *Tremors* and most recently *Blade* all flirting with the television format to relatively short-term success.

⁸² Morgan J Freeman has been quick to praise Lions Gate's similar release strategy for *American Psycho 2* which saw the film debut with significant store-based promotions publicity and DVD extras.

⁸³ Following its mixed experiences with *Psycho* and *The Mummy*, the Studio has since released *Dawn of the Dead* and *King Kong*.

⁸⁴ Consequently, such films as *Freddy Vs Jason*, *Alien Vs Predator* and even proposals for a *Halloween* have strengthened the foundations of the Houses of New Line, Fox, and Dimension. These grudge matches have arguably ushered the franchise into its final stages with Universal even attempting to recreate *Frankenstein Meets the WolfMan* in *Van Helsing*.

⁸⁵ Studio Briefing Report. 'The VHS is Dead (Well Kinda); Long Live the DVD!' March 20th 2003. <http://us.imdb.com/StudioBrief/2003/20030320.html#4> (Downloaded: March 23rd 2003).

⁸⁶ Dick, 1990: 144.

⁸⁷ Ibid. p146.

⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ "(1) An auteur is technically competent. (2) An auteur has a personality that manifests itself in recurring stylistic traits that become his or her signature. (3) An auteur's films exhibit a tension between the auteur's personality and his or her material." Dick, 1990: 146.

⁹⁰ Clover, 1990: 11.

⁹¹ Ibid.

⁹² Ibid.

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ Jancovich, 2002: 12.

⁹⁵ Ibid. Quoting Kitses, 1969: 26.

⁹⁶ For Polanski see Butler, 1970; Wright Wrexman, 1985; and even Polanski, 1986 and for DePalma see Bliss, 1983 and Bouzereau, 1988.

⁹⁷ In this respect I am referring to the likes of George R. Romero (Gagne, 1987; Caruso, 1992, and Williams, 2003), David Cronenberg (Rodley, 1993 and Beard, 2001), Larry

Cohen (Williams, 1997), John Carpenter (Cumbow and Muir both 2000), and Wes Craven (Robb and Muir, both 1998).

⁹⁸ For example, *Filmmaking on the Fringe: The Good, the Bad, and the Deviant Directors* (McDonagh, 1995), *Down and Dirty: Hollywood's Exploitation Filmmakers and their Motives* (Qualres, 1993), *The Fearmakers: The Screens' Directorial Masters of Suspense and Terror* and *The Sleaze Merchants* (both McCarty, 1995).

⁹⁹ Praver, 1980: 46.

¹⁰⁰ McDonagh, 1992: 23.

Chapter 1:

Don Coscarelli: In Search of Phantasm's End

“Owing to its popularity and marketability, the horror film has traditionally been the proving ground for unknown directors, since it’s much easier to find a distributor for horror movies than it might be for a drama or comedy.”

John McCarty¹

Having contextualised the development of the Hollywood Horror franchise and re-appropriated it as another form of adaptation, Chapter 1 will now consider the extent to which directors’ continued association has affected and informed their careers. As such, this chapter will chart the inspiration and experiences of low budget filmmakers by addressing the range of push and pull factors that have dictated their repeated return. Whereas mainstream Hollywood filmmakers were drawn to the commercial success of a literary adaptation in the hope of replicating Spielberg or Friedkin’s commercial success, from Pittsburgh to Michigan and Texas to New York, independent filmmakers George A. Romero, Sam Raimi, Tobe Hooper and Frank Henenlotter launched their careers by exploiting certain audience’s fondness for Horror. They grabbed Hollywood’s attention through a series of nihilistic narratives and ground-breaking depictions of violence designed to shock Studios and audiences.

Taking a case study approach, this Chapter will focus on the career of Don Coscarelli and his twenty-five year association with the *Phantasm* franchise spanning four films to date. Other directors in this category include Ted Nicolaou and Harry Bromley

Davenport in relation to the *Subspecies* and *Xtro* franchises respectively.² After assessing directors' attitudes and approaches to the tone and content of a franchise, this chapter will address these films' methods and modes of production and reception by taking into account the role of Studios, audiences and censors. Thirdly, this chapter will consider the benefits and consequences of Coscarelli's independence from the Hollywood studios and production companies eager to support the Hollywood Horror franchise and the extent to which this has impacted upon his career.

Don Coscarelli: Phantasm

The promise of profits and a higher profile as a result of media exposure and controversy attracted many film directors to the genre. This was reinforced by the perception that the very nature of the genre rendered it the most cost-effective and attractive to financiers and distributors. Indeed many other first time and relatively unknown filmmakers saw the Horror film as an economically shrewd and realistic means of making a successful impact on studios and audiences.

Directors are drawn to the genre for its enduring popularity, profitability and relative practicality. This choice to work within a traditionally disreputable genre has inspired filmmakers like George Romero, who believed that a low budget Horror film "would serve as a ticket into the film industry."³ Similarly, Hooper and Raimi selected the scary movie format as "something we could do for very little money and still have the prospect of getting it into theatres"⁴ and "the most easily marketable film to make."⁵ Indeed, Raimi knew that "if I made a horror picture I could get the money and make the movie."⁶ And so, from *Dead* directors Romero and Raimi to serial killer creators

Carpenter and Hooper, Horror has guaranteed the necessary financing, distribution deal, and access to the widest possible audience.

In contrast to Romero, Raimi and to a lesser extent Hooper, Coscarelli had already infiltrated Hollywood with his first two pictures. Raised in Southern California, Coscarelli practiced the art of filmmaking throughout his formative years. He became the youngest director to have a feature film distributed by a major studio when he sold his independently produced and critically acclaimed drama, *Jim The World's Greatest*, to Universal at nineteen. In his follow up, released by Twentieth Century Fox in 1976, Coscarelli continued to target the pre-teen market with *Kenny and Company*. Having eschewed film school in favour of practical experimentation with some degree of critical and commercial success, Coscarelli gathered together his key cast members before starting work on his third feature. Ultimately entitled *Phantasm*, this film predated the rubber reality aesthetic of Craven's *Elm Street* and Cunningham's *House* franchise with its nightmarish narrative and open-ended approach. Released in 1979, *Phantasm* was one of the more innovative first films of the period and soon acquired cult status. Furthermore, it has spawned three sequels to date – all written and directed by Coscarelli.

Clover has concluded that “Horror filmmakers turn remarkably often on fantasies, dreams and childhood memories, or mention myths or folk tales or legends by way of establishing archetype, or directly or indirectly reveal a dependence on Freud.”⁷ However, these first films were also hugely indebted to Horror's cinematic heritage in that sections, scenes or entire scenarios were often grafted, ‘homaged’ or simply plagiarised from previous films or documentaries.⁸ A fine example of first film intertextuality can be seen in Myrick and Sanchez's *The Blair Witch Project*. This film

drew inspiration from Benjamin Christensen's witchcraft documentary *Haxan* and elements of Deodato's *Cannibal Holocaust* and Craven's *Last House on the Left*.⁹ Similarly Raimi fused *Night of the Living Dead* with *Dawn of the Dead*.¹⁰ More in keeping with Clover's Freudian assertion, Coscarelli's inspiration stemmed from a recurring nightmare in which the director was "fleeing down endlessly long marble corridors, pursued by a chrome sphere intent on penetrating my skull with a wicked needle."¹¹ The effects of this personal investment and attachment to first film concepts, characters and themes saw directors like Coscarelli reluctant to relinquish their creative control of the franchise and allow others to (re)direct their Hollywood Horror franchise.

Due to their inexperience, unconventional approach or geographical location, directors found that the majority of these first films tended to avoid or be ineligible for Studio financing. Consequently, the use of promo reels, trailers and press books, along with sample footage or shorts proved instrumental in securing investors and facilitating the original and additional funding needed to finance these individual first films. Following Romero's formation of Image Ten,¹² the creative trinity behind *The Evil Dead*¹³ joined "together and formed the grandly named Renaissance Pictures"¹⁴ with the sole aim of finally making a feature length film. Whereas *Sleepaway Camp*'s Robert Hiltzig, apparently "got (his) film financed by raising \$50,000 in shares,"¹⁵ Hooper took a more complex approach to financing *The Texas Chainsaw Massacre* by combining private investors with the corporate approach.¹⁶ Coscarelli, on the other hand, was in a comparatively more secure position and financing for *Phantasm* came from previous successes and parental support. Free from industry trappings, investors and co-producers, Coscarelli was spared from several complications as the franchise expanded – a marked contrast to those whose financing and overall control was the root of conflict.

Moreover, the gruelling schedules, perpetual lack of money and unorthodox financing impacted upon the way in which they were shot. Schedules for *The Evil Dead* and *Basket Case* for example were erratic and extended over the course of several months with shooting only taking place when money was available. Of all these first films, *The Blair Witch Project* was unique in its execution. Improvisation and manipulation was combined with ‘reality’ television to produce a contemporary, internet-based incarnation of the elaborate Horror hoax film. Rather than reflect reality, Coscarelli’s film challenged our notions of it and was the direct the result of a “very long, very difficult and very challenging,”¹⁷ year and a half production process. During this time *Phantasm*’s overlong script and themes were repeatedly refined and restructured well into shooting perhaps inadvertently contributing towards the film’s disjointed dream-like quality.

With no official studio backing, many first films were forced into the process of trying to secure a distribution deal during or after post-production. In some cases however, this stage of the (post) production process also saw films fall foul of corporate carelessness, creativity and control. For example, Romero’s refusal to reshoot *Night of the Living Dead*’s ending and “have Ben survive”¹⁸ cost him a distribution deal with Columbia pictures and American International Pictures.¹⁹ Nevertheless, what distinguishes embryonic and experimental low budget independent first films like *Phantasm* from their Studio-endorsed counterparts is the fact that they were ever finished at all. Despite its origins, Coscarelli’s film was fortunate enough to secure a traditional platform release through distributor Avco-Embassy²⁰ and, similar to *Halloween* and Compass International Pictures, it followed the traditional low budget distribution method of “bicycling prints”²¹ to build up its core audience.

Building awareness of a first film that has no direct literary or cinematic precedent involves infiltrating the market through innovative publicity campaigns; a technique exploited and explored by William Castle in the fifties and sixties. Fictional ratings, curses and creative gimmicks have often accompanied the release of Horror pictures that have also benefited from an embittered or antagonistic relationship with the media. Even prior to *Variety's* condemnation of *Night of the Living Dead* "as 'an unrelieved orgy of sadism' which worked for this film rather than against it,"²² Horror traded on its notoriety as critics inadvertently help raise the profile of a first film.

Alternatively, critics have contributed to the cult success of a first film with Stuart Gordon's *Re-Animator* finding an appreciative audience at a midnight Cannes screening where it was awarded a special Jury prize. In addition to this unsolicited accolade, the film also received a begrudging level of respect from *Chicago-Sun Times* critic Roger Ebert who quoted Kael's sane observation that "the movies are so rarely great art, that if we can't appreciate great trash, there is little reason for us to go"²³ in his review. Indeed Kael had previously rebuked negative reviews of Carpenter's *Halloween* and helped improve that film's mainstream "credibility"²⁴ and spear-headed its reassessment. In addition, this vocal *Village Voice* reviewer also encouraged her readers to seek out Henenlotter's *Basket Case* as the perfect antithesis to the "sweetness and light"²⁵ of Spielberg's *E.T* in the summer of 1982.

In a similar vein, literary sensation Stephen King single-handedly championed Raimi's *The Evil Dead* around the same time in describing it as "the most ferociously original horror film of the year."²⁶ The success afforded Raimi's *The Evil Dead*, following its introduction at the AFM (American Film Market), was repeated by *The Blair Witch*

Project at the Sundance Festival where it was picked up for distribution by Artisan. Furthermore, it was heralded as an “extraordinarily effective...celebration of rock-bottom production values”²⁷ by Roger Ebert of the *Chicago Sun Times*. Whereas some directors like *Re-Animator*'s Gordon adopted a pre-emptive strike, by writing off critics from the outset, Coscarelli's attitude and approach has been far more condemnatory in describing their role as largely “irrelevant”²⁸ and declaring that reviews are governed by a “herd mentality”²⁹ that highlights their “disdain”³⁰ towards the genre.³¹

The success of these low budget exploitation pictures either catapulted or confirmed these relatively new directors' status. It also suggested the potential for respectability and employment within the Hollywood film industry. With directors like Coscarelli starting their careers outside Hollywood, in both financial and geographical terms, the next step involved balancing bigger budget, Studio-based projects with creative freedom. For some, like *Re-Animator*'s Stuart Gordon, this meant familiar themes and comparatively similar scripts firmly rooted in the Horror genre and more specifically another Poe adaptation based on the short story *From Beyond*. Nevertheless, other directors resisted the temptation to remain within the genre and/or trade in their autonomy and pursued more personal projects. Very few however were allowed to gravitate towards mainstream filmmaking during this time.

Having selected Horror as a route to commercial and creative development, many directors experienced an increase in the opportunities available to them. Ever since *Psycho*'s success entrenched Hitchcock within the Universal Studio system,³² directors have similarly dealt with shrewd corporations keen to secure their services and, perhaps more importantly, their titles and back catalogues. Since *Psycho*, many studios and production companies have purchased the rights to their pictures, and any sequels,

leaving directors with little or no (financial) stake, interest or incentive in pursuing a lucrative franchise. For many other first film directors, their initial cult success resulted in a two-fold process of brand name identification whereby author and director were to be forever associated.

Although Raimi eschewed repetition on a collaboration with roommates Joel and Ethan Coen on *Crimewave*, Hooper eventually caught Spielberg's eye for *Poltergeist* after suffering a legion of interference on his *Chainsaw* retread *Eaten Alive*. Coscarelli was also "seduced"³³ into shooting an adaptation of Andre Norton's teen-orientated fantasy novel *The Beastmaster* with MGM. However, these experiences were often characterised by interference, disappointment and a sense of frustration at an industry overrun with bureaucracy and proverbial red-tape. Coscarelli came from an autonomous scenario on *Phantasm* to one where he was essentially a hired hand, with little to no input into the scripting or editing process.

In light of this, the director has since argued that his vision of *The Beastmaster* was castrated from the outset with casting choices vetoed and final cut denied.³⁴ In the wake of Studio-based disappointment, Coscarelli became embroiled in De Laurentiis' desire to successfully adapt King by signing on for *Silver Bullet* - a werewolf project from which the director eventually resigned - before shooting the fantasy film, *Survival Quest*, for ill-fated independent New World pictures. Despite the cult status of *Phantasm* and the success of his previous pictures, Coscarelli found it increasingly untenable to relocate, produce anything resembling a satisfying or satisfactory film, and as such his reputation faltered.

During this difficult period, the director was given the opportunity to direct what he later described as being “pretty low end Horror sequels”³⁵ to *A Nightmare on Elm Street* and *Conan the Barbarian* and declining such offers on the grounds that he had “an aversion to doing sequels to other people's films.”³⁶ Indeed, as the industry rabidly pursued the franchise, established genre directors were approached to take on all manner of franchise films with even Cronenberg tempted to direct *Basic Instinct 2* on account of its “very perverse, dark, complex script.”³⁷ Just as *Re-Animator*'s Stuart Gordon was “informally propositioned”³⁸ by Anthony Perkins to helm *Psycho IV: The Beginning*,³⁹ *Piranha*'s Joe Dante was not only attached to a planned *Orca II* for De Larentiis but he was also instrumental in the development of *Halloween III* and *Jaws 3* for Universal.⁴⁰

Typical of Hollywood's determination to exploit a filmmaker's perceived market value, he was later offered sequels to *Warlock* and the *Texas Chainsaw Massacre*.⁴¹ With Hollywood coveting the success of Horror sequels and the director reluctant to work on any one of the many sequel projects offered, Coscarelli was reportedly put “under pressure”⁴² to return to the film which established his cult reputation. And so, as the eighties progressed and the opportunities to direct non franchise films dwindled, a disenfranchised Coscarelli faced two options as an established genre filmmaker – to sequelise himself or somebody else.

A Universal Phantasm 2

With many first films funded and filmed outside Hollywood, first film directors were not contractually obliged to return. Indeed, a director's partial or outright ownership of

these potentially lucrative properties even served to prohibit others from making a follow up without them. This placed filmmakers like Coscarelli in an enviable position, both creatively and financially. Even when Studios controlled sequel rights, they were anxious that first film directors remained involved and adopted increasingly aggressive strategies to secure their return. Through a combination of creative and financial incentives, they tried to ensure that the creative forces behind first films participated fully in the development of the Hollywood Horror franchise.⁴³

As with Whale's triumphant return with the *Bride of Frankenstein*,⁴⁴ Fischer has argued that "Romero's big break came when he decided to do a sequel to *Night of the Living Dead*, something long anticipated after the success of the first film."⁴⁵ Soon after Romero's return, Larry Cohen worked with Warner Bros on *It Lives Again* as a negative pick-up following their successful re-release of the first film. Although both directors had continued to make low budget exploitation fare in the meantime,⁴⁶ a return to the franchise was a return to form for some filmmakers. Similarly, it was the complications and comparative failure of *The Beastmaster* and *Survival Quest* that confirmed Coscarelli's return to his own first film, and the Hollywood Horror franchise, rather than participate in the development of someone else's sequel.

Like Coscarelli, Raimi found financing for a second instalment comparatively easier to secure than for a new project or their previous efforts. After soliciting interest from Embassy Home Entertainment, Raimi eventually defected to De Laurentiis after five months of deliberation and delays. Wary of films whose marketability was unproven, Studios and production companies were less resistant to financing any number of follow ups, particularly with first film directors attached. The financing for Coscarelli's *Phantasm* sequel "came from Tom Pollack, who was at Universal, and was really

interested in getting a horror franchise”⁴⁷ following New Line’s success on *Elm Street*. Such an endeavour proved particularly attractive as a low risk high return investment once placed alongside flagship features and potential Summer Blockbusters. Indeed, the demand for previously established concepts and themes that could be transformed into a lucrative franchise was a strategic priority for Universal, who actively campaigned to control the future of Hollywood Horror franchise production, with or without first film directors at the helm.⁴⁸

One incentive, or consolation, for those directors returning to the franchise was an increase in both the schedule and budget afforded to the production. According to Coscarelli, the budget for *Phantasm II* was set at \$3 million, a sum the director has since described as, “the lowest amount of money that Universal has ever spent on a movie in that decade but the largest amount of money that *we’ve* ever received.”⁴⁹ Similarly, *Maniac Cop*’s Bill Lustig was another returning director who publicised the sequel as an opportunity to “deliver on the action and thrills”⁵⁰ with “four times of the production value of the first.”⁵¹

These incentives were apparently also a deciding factor in H.G. Lewis’ decision to commit to *Blood Feast 2* almost forty years after the first film and thirty years since his last film.⁵² However, it was not until working with Universal on *Army of Darkness* that *Evil Dead* director Raimi issued a frank statement to directors in describing how, “when you work with a studio...you’re saying, ‘I will trade creative autonomy for Studio money, Studio marketing and a Studio release.’”⁵³ Nevertheless, this opportunity to work with a bigger budget allowed directors like Coscarelli to indulge their imaginations further, and improve upon their first effort. With the benefit of better production values

and more technical experience – this lure successfully enticed directors back to the franchise.

Raimi's experience notwithstanding, another incentive employed by increasingly desperate Studios keen to recreate a first film's success, besides an increase in budget, fees and or profit points, was the offer of more or complete creative autonomy. Although Horror film directors like Raimi were excluded from this there were some examples in that Romero and Lambert, who had previously only co-authored or supervised the final scripting of *Night of the Living Dead* and *Pet Sematery*, were free to develop concepts, characters and ideas in keeping with their own creative concerns. Lambert, for example, pointedly saw *Pet Sematery II* as "a big raw lump to which I could bring some of my own taste, feeling and story ideas."⁵⁴

Similarly, and more in keeping with the Blockbuster mentality, both Burton and Dante were seduced by Warner Bros into directing *Batman Returns* and *Gremlins 2* on the condition that there would be "no compromises this time round"⁵⁵ and they "could do whatever they like."⁵⁶ Having endured substantial restrictions and Studio reservations on first films, returning directors increased their creative autonomy in second instalments. Burton's *Batman Returns* for example, adopted a much darker tone to the extent that the director's final cut temporarily flirted "with losing its essential PG-13 rating"⁵⁷ before coming under fire from within for being "a supposed children's picture that wasn't for children."⁵⁸ Despite their apparent fondness for expensive follow-ups and willingness to negotiate with first film directors, Warner Bros were unimpressed and disappointed by Burton's and Dante's sequels with Dante later recalling how "they really disliked the picture almost as much as they disliked the original – after all they hated the first one."⁵⁹

Hoping to follow in the footsteps of Coppola and *Godfather Part II* with the retention of the first film director, Studios attempted but failed to retain Friedkin and Donner for sequels to *The Exorcist* and *The Omen* respectively. Similarly, Universal approached Spielberg twice to helm the sequel to his phenomenally successful Summer Blockbuster. However he was, for the time being at least, refusing to indulge in “corporate business”⁶⁰ after failing to convince the Studio that a prequel of sorts surrounding Quint’s experience on the USS *Indianapolis* was a viable option. Wary of unfavourable comparisons to first films or eager to embark on new projects on account of their success within the genre, these and many other directors were unable to overcome their reluctance to return.

Back in the low budget independent arena however, and in the wake of complex legal wranglings, box office receipts and video rentals, directors apparently felt an obligation to their original investors. Sequels were a means of acquiring further financial remuneration on their behalf. Although not entirely altruistic in their endeavours, Hooper and Raimi cited this concern as the partial inspiration behind their return to *The Texas Chainsaw Massacre* and *The Evil Dead*. Initially attached as producer, Hooper has since commented how he reluctantly saw his *Chainsaw* sequel as a “vacation”⁶¹ that “looked like fun at the outset,”⁶² one that “Cannon wouldn’t have time to fuck up like they had done with *Lifeforce* and *Invaders From Mars*.”⁶³ As a major shareholder in the franchise, Hooper had urged the designated trustee to license the sequel rights to Cannon, with whom he had just signed a three picture deal that included these ill-funded-and-received forays into science-fiction.

Despite a fierce resistance to a *Basket Case* follow up, Henenlotter finally succumbed because it was perhaps the only means by which he could get another project off the ground. After getting “the money for *Frankenhooker* by agreeing to do *Basket Case 2*,”⁶⁴ the director traded on the brand name and role of franchisor to see his ‘terrifying tale of sluts and bolts’⁶⁵ reach fruition. Consequently, returning directors saw to it that their somewhat reluctant return contained some form of creative and financial compensation, through which they could secure the necessary financing and support to make other pictures.

Having cited autonomy, altruism and the ability to direct another film as reasons behind their return, first film directors like Coscarelli publicly chose to frame their follow up as a means of “going back to my roots”⁶⁶ throughout the publicity and promotion of their sequels. However, it is apparent from directors’ testimonies and limited post-mortems that the alternatives to such an approach ranged from the unappealing to the harsh reality of unemployment. With financing the key to any filmmaker’s career, the Hollywood Horror franchise functions as an invaluable safety net and bargaining tool which many directors saw fit to utilise on an increasingly regular basis as the eighties progressed and the financing and distribution options for low budget independent first films dried up.

In contrast to his filmmaking experiences within the Hollywood Studio system, Coscarelli later described his experience on the first film as “wonderful,”⁶⁷ and intended to recreate that situation in which he was surrounded by friends and students as opposed to employees and executives. In the wake of Studio interference on subsequent films, such nostalgic and rose-tinted reflections were common amongst directors. This was

after their first films were transformed into potential franchises by corporations keen to capitalise on an existing trend.

As Raimi has indicated however, this Studio backing, a bigger budget and over-dependence upon previous successes usually came at a price, one that would encroach upon the tone, content and running timing. Accordingly, Universal's decision to fund Coscarelli's *Phantasm II* hinged upon his adhering to specific creative and casting criteria. Forced to re-cast the role of his central character and protagonist Mike using a relatively well-known actor,⁶⁸ Coscarelli was also told to ensure that "the film made sense."⁶⁹ These demands for narrative clarity and cohesion contradicted the first film yet Coscarelli attempted to frame this interference in a positive light. His representation of events in pre-release interviews explained how there was now "some narration flowing through the picture...so that even the least intelligent members of the audience would know where they were and who the bad guys were."⁷⁰ Such concessions to a perceived audience, either unfamiliar with the first film or narrative surrealism, immediately set an unfair distinction between the first two pictures which the director sought to offset with a bigger budget and an experimental shift in tone and content.

Like the majority of first films created prior to the early eighties slasher boom, *Phantasm* was designed as an "effective low budget...stand alone film."⁷¹ Consequently, the director "had no master plan"⁷² or fleshed out story arc to fall back on after ten years. With other sequels released in swift succession,⁷³ directors were anxious to ensure that audiences "who liked the original picture were going to like the sequel."⁷⁴ To fulfil those demands, and extend the life of the franchise in keeping with Universal's plans, Coscarelli portrayed his sequel as being "bigger and better"⁷⁵ and including those "things that genuinely worked in the first picture."⁷⁶

From the outset then, repetition and familiarity were essential ingredients in returning directors' safety nets. Just as Lambert's *Pet Sematery 2* deliberately courted contemporary audiences with a predominantly teenage cast, *Phantasm 2* liberally borrowed from 'buddy movie' clichés and adopted a road movie sensibility to secure a wider audience. Added to this recipe was an obligatory damsel in distress complete with romantic subplot. Furthermore, Coscarelli's approach was in keeping with the pressure to reveal more of and about their monsters and he made extensive use of advances in special make-up effects. At its weakest point, this first sequel seemed constructed around a series of startling special effects set-pieces which partially detracted from the horror of the first film.

Returning directors repeatedly dealt with Studios more interested in repetition, running times and recouping their original investment than in releasing the films as intended. They also faced pressure from audiences, critics and censors to conform to their preconceived expectations with a film that would develop and adhere to the rules set down. Romero's *Dawn of the Dead*, for example, underwent significant re-editing at the hands of Italian director and distributor Dario Argento who allegedly "didn't get it,"⁷⁷ and so "deleted all the funny scenes, and made the film more action-oriented."⁷⁸ Prior to these edits, the film was given an X rating apparently forcing Romero, Rubinstein and independent distributor United Film Distribution "to ignore the existence of the MPAA and the ratings board altogether."⁷⁹ Consequently, this early sequel was released unrated with a "disclaimer notifying patrons of the film's spectacularly violent content"⁸⁰ to distinguish it from hardcore pornography.

However, Romero's *Dawn of the Dead* is a rarity in the genre since the majority of filmmakers are contractually and economically bound to work within the confines of the MPAA's R rating. Such subjective and intangible notions as tone and intensity have become keywords in the MPAA's attitude and approach towards genre pictures and a source of intense frustration for filmmakers trapped within a subjective and Studio-owned system. Moreover, to present the MPAA's CARA (Classification and Ratings Administration) as an optional, self-regulatory, non-censorial entity is to deny the reality of economic censorship that most filmmakers contractually face.⁸¹

Furthermore, directors' experiences at the hands of the MPAA are diverse and inconsistent with big budget Studio backed productions allegedly receiving a more favourable reception than lower budgeted films. For example, Spielberg's family-orientated and PG-rated *Jaws* successfully pushed the envelope with an intensity that was matched only by its box office success. Indeed, from *Jaws* and *Jurassic Park* through to Productions of *Poltergeist* and *Gremlins*, the director's ability to assault a family audience with monsters, murder and mayhem is perhaps best illustrated by the furore surrounding his first sequel, *Indiana Jones and the Temple of Doom*. Indeed both the festive violence of *Gremlins* and Spielberg's partially disowned sequel, which featured sadistic torture and a sequence in which a man has his heart ripped out, have been cited as the impetus behind the introduction of an intermediate PG-13 rating.

Whereas Spielberg's appeals for re-ratings were successful, some directors reportedly employed Hitchcock's well-documented tactics of purposefully layering shooting scripts (or films) with controversial elements to cut back on as negotiating tools⁸² and simply returning films to the censor untouched. Pre-production consultation with the censor was another way in which directors endeavoured to pre-empt problems, cuts and

deletions. Harking back to the days of the Hayes Office and the necessity of script approval, the majority of daunted directors arguably shied away from excess with most adaptations diluted and distilled for mass audiences. Graphic sequences in particular have been dropped or delicately shot and re-shot by directors in light of Studio concerns and a contractually obliged R rating.

Having challenged or side-stepped censorship issues on a first film, the demands of second instalments saw directors like Romero, Hooper and Raimi adopt a similar stance on sequels. Indeed, Raimi's attempts at appeasement on *Evil Dead II*, involving the substitution of slime for blood or altering its colour, highlighted these concerns when the film was also released unrated by a specifically-created subsidiary of DEG.⁸³ However, the majority of returning directors were caught between contractual obligation and aforementioned preconceptions that sequels should raise the bar with the MPAA accused of double standards and grudge bearing. That said, Coscarelli's *Phantasm* sequel for Universal was particularly graphic for its time and appeared to slip by the censor relatively unscathed perhaps elevated by its status as a Studio endorsed product.

In the low budget arena however directors Oullette and Henenlotter were not so fortunate or well funded and had to pull back from their original intentions for their *Unnameable* and *Basket Case* sequels to receive the R rating. Although regrets, recriminations and battles with the ratings board often dogged directors' experiences on first sequels, the new opportunities and experiences afforded to them have undoubtedly aided or in some cases revived their directorial careers. Furthermore, it provided the opportunity to learn from previous experiences and produce a more accomplished feature than before if only in terms of the overall production process.

The extent to which Studios, stars and audiences had the propensity to influence the tone and content of future instalments is perhaps best illustrated in the case of Barker's *Hellraiser* franchise. According to *Hellbound* screenwriter Peter Atkins, it was Barker and Figg's "theory when the series started...that Julia would be the continuing character."⁸⁴ Consequently, the sequel's original ending depicted Julia "rising from the mattress as Queen of Hell."⁸⁵ However, test screenings reports demonstrated that "you can't knowingly create a villain"⁸⁶ since "the public had taken Pinhead to its heart"⁸⁷ instead. New World responded to this feedback by placing him at the forefront of their marketing campaign for the film. Coupled with actress Clare Higgins' reluctance to return for a third film and become their "Boris Karloff,"⁸⁸ the script was modified to accommodate Pinhead's resurrection and cement his position as franchise icon.

Similarly, Coscarelli found it "hard to hang on to (his) original concept because every person who sees either of the pictures has very definite opinions about who and what each person is – after all it was the audience who elevated our little tale into myth."⁸⁹ With this acknowledgment, Coscarelli has highlighted the role and importance of audiences in adapting any first film concept. In other words, once a first film becomes a franchise, returning directors must take into account and be accountable to the interpretations and expectations of audiences.

To propel the narrative forward, directors indulged audience curiosity and Studio imposed simplicity with the inclusion of contextual backstory and first film footage to summarise previous events. Through a combination of dream sequences, introductory voice-overs and flashbacks, Coscarelli was one such director who endeavoured to help the uninitiated and also introduce Mike's love interest. Similarly, Raimi virtually re-

shot scenes, after being denied access to first film footage, to “bring people up to speed,”⁹⁰ and examine the Book’s origins through a specifically-designed prologue. As expected and sometimes demanded, several first sequels explicitly left the door open for further instalments with shock epilogues that either left their protagonists in jeopardy or antagonists resurrected. Just as Henenlotter’s cliff-hanger not only brought his *Basket Case* narrative full circle by reuniting twins Dwayne and Belial and setting the scene for the Freaks’ revenge, Raimi’s open-ended *Evil Dead II* epilogue transported Ash through time to face the Deadites in his originally intended Medieval setting.

A notable exception to this type of Hollywood ending is Hooper’s much-maligned revisionist sequel *Texas Chainsaw Massacre 2*. Here the first film’s conclusion is subverted in favour of allowing triumphant final girl Stretch to survive, what Hanke has called “a massacre of her own making,”⁹¹ and succumb to the way of the (Chain)saw in the final shot. In keeping with the first film, Coscarelli’s follow up supposedly kills off characters and ends on an apocalyptic conclusion. Coscarelli’s episodic approach to the narrative not only remains true to the essence of the first film but also satisfies Studio requirements in propagating the potential continuation of the saga.

In much the same way Hooper’s sequel focused on its dysfunctional family “to the detriment of the film itself,”⁹² Cohen’s rationale that, “if people came back and paid another five dollars, they had the right to see a little bit more”⁹³ of what *Lives Again* saw him equally “trapped.”⁹⁴ The decision to follow this edict or preserve “some of the magic”⁹⁵ undoubtedly compromised the effectiveness of a Hollywood Horror franchise. The majority of directors adhered to audiences’ tastes and expectations with Coscarelli’s sequel proving no exception by taking audiences on an extended tour of the Tall Man’s dimension and revealing the unsightly visages of his Jawa-esque henchmen.

Following Mike's release from the sanatorium and reunion with Reggie, the pair take an extended road trip tracking the Tall Man. As the duo pass through numerous Ghost Towns until Mike is united with his 'dream' girl against an adversary whose henchmen and otherworldly weaponry are seemingly endless. Although Coscarelli's first sequel avoided the camp splattery excess of Hooper's and Raimi's films for the most part, it embraced Romero's action-orientated apocalyptic stance. However, by the time the director had signed on for a second sequel, black comedy was very much on his agenda and the director seized the opportunity to incorporate a variety of generic strands into the story within the relative security of his franchise.

Surviving the Franchise

Historically, first film directors refused to return to the franchise for a third time in favour of more distinctive projects forcing Universal to find replacements for Whale and Arnold on *Son of Frankenstein* and *The Creature Walks Among Us* respectively. Although Hammer was equally unsuccessful in securing Val Guest and Hammer stalwart Terence Fisher for third instalments *Quatermass and the Pit* and *The Evil of Frankenstein*,⁹⁶ a third official Dracula outing, *Dracula: Prince of Darkness*, saw Fisher become the first filmmaker to complete his own Horror trilogy in 1966. For those contemporary Horror franchises deemed worthy of a third film, a director's continuing involvement was guaranteed with a few notable exceptions.⁹⁷ Having succumbed to Studio pressure or the need for financial security once, many returned to the franchise and prevented another director from capitalising on or altering their creations.

Having failed to raise the necessary financing for other films both Cohen and Raimi fell back on their relationships with franchise financiers Warner Bros and De Laurentiis respectively and exploited the franchise as a means of continuing their careers. Raimi recalls that, when he “made the deal with Dino to make *Army of Darkness*...things were very bleak,”⁹⁸ in so far as “it was my only job opportunity at the time.”⁹⁹ Similarly, Cohen approached Warner Bros, “with the idea of sequelizing or remaking Andre De Toth’s *House of Wax*...or making *The Exorcist Part III*”¹⁰⁰ but, denied the opportunity to do either, Cohen suggested sequels to *Salem’s Lot* and *It Lives Again*. This proposal was met with more success - so long as they were made for the direct to video market – with reduced financial backing from Warner Bros.

With many directors falling back on the franchise to continue or further their careers, Coscarelli has since commented how, “the reality of the business is that you get a little bit of success in one area and that’s where your opportunities end up staying,”¹⁰¹ despite having “a lot of non-horror projects in mind.”¹⁰² After being approached by an independent production company to “make *Phantasm III* and *IV* back to back,”¹⁰³ Coscarelli’s career has highlighted the franchise’s function as a dependable commodity in an unpredictable market. In this respect, the franchise can be described as a director’s most faithful ally and a guaranteed property to fall back in times of financial insecurity.

Regardless of whether parts two and three appeared in quick succession or several years apart, a major factor for these directors was the amount of money made available with many concepts reworked in light of budget decreases. For example, Romero’s refusal to be bound to an R rating cost him the necessary financial backing to go ahead with *Day of the Dead* as written; described as his “most elaborate zombie film yet.”¹⁰⁴ A

similar back to basis approach characterised the production of many third films, *Phantasm III* included. Despite a significant reduction in budget, Coscarelli's marketing for the third film, six years after part two, assured audiences that this new film had allowed him to "tie some things up and deal with some character elements we never really explored."¹⁰⁵ According to the director, this was after consulting with fans to find "out what they wanted to see."¹⁰⁶ In this respect, the interactive evolution of the franchise through directors' consultation with internet fan sites and forums has been illustrated. This form of feedback allowed Coscarelli to incorporate feedback into the evolution of his Hollywood Horror franchise. After claiming he always "had a third *Phantasm* in mind,"¹⁰⁷ the director attempted to justify his return in creative terms."¹⁰⁸ Re-presenting the narrative as an intended trilogy, Coscarelli's misrepresentation was apparent when it was revealed that an open-ended finale was written into his contract for the third film¹⁰⁹ - although that footage was left on the cutting room floor. While Universal had first refusal on the film in terms of distribution, this third film saw no enforced casting or narrative coherence, and as such Coscarelli returned to a rubber-reality aesthetic and reverted back to his original casting of Mike.

Third films not only saw a sharp drop in budget but also heralded a shift in tone and content. Many directors emphasised or turned to slapstick, fantasy and political satire to keep the material fresh. Described by Raimi as "not so much a Horror film as it is an adventure film,"¹¹⁰ *Army of Darkness* was an extended homage to Harryhausen, fantasy and science-fiction in which flawed hero Ash must successfully complete an Arthurian quest in order to travel back to the future. Referencing *Superman III* and *Back to the Future Part III* in equal measure, Bruce Campbell is literally divided and forced to defeat his alter-ego and save a small community before entering into a Rip Van Winkle style finale.¹¹¹

Similarly, Coscarelli's declaration that it had "never been a slasher series,"¹¹² can be interpreted as a means of distancing the franchise from the negative connotations of other films. Featuring a trio of *Evil Dead II*-inspired ghouls as the Tall Man's stooges, the film also features several eye-catching special effects gags and devilish black humour. Despite continuing the road movie narrative of the second film, this third instalment also featured a post-Apocalyptic dysfunctional family with the thrust of Coscarelli's narrative lying in the formation of this nuclear family, complete with a homicidal MacCauley Culkin clone. Seeping into *Return of the Jedi* territory, this third chapter also explored the relationship between its adversaries, with the help of returning character Jody as a sometime-Spherical Spirit Guide, and the revelation that Mike was another vessel for the Tall Man's spheres and instrumental to his plan.

Returning third film directors also experienced further difficulties obtaining the desired rating. Just as Raimi appealed in person against his R Rating for *Army of Darkness*, Lustig, Henenlotter and Coscarelli all received X/NC-17 ratings for *Maniac Cop 3*, *Basket Case 3* and *Phantasm III* respectively, despite their satirical or comic tone. As a low budget independent filmmaker, Henenlotter has repeatedly argued that the difficulties his pictures experienced have resided in the board's attitude to blood, a substance that has often proven vital in obscuring "a multitude of sins."¹¹³ Having described the process as one in which "the first thing they consider is where the film is coming from and what studio is behind it,"¹¹⁴ Henenlotter harked back to Hitchcock's approach and allegedly resubmitted his film two weeks later "without anything cut...and it was given an R rating."¹¹⁵ As previously mentioned, this complaint, that the board favours the big budget Studio enterprises over their independent endeavours, is

made repeatedly throughout interviews with directors – even though all such charges have been fervently denied by the board through its then President Jack Valenti.

Having failed to negotiate another two-picture deal at SGE using *Basket Case 3* as an incentive after SGE allegedly “hated with a vengeance”¹¹⁶ every other idea he pitched, Henenlotter begrudgingly applied himself to a third *Basket Case* film based on the \$1.2 million budget available. Reportedly sick of his central characters and confident that so “long as you don’t disappoint the audience you can do whatever you want,”¹¹⁷ the director shifted the film’s focus onto Granny Ruth and her school bus of unique individuals complete with cartoon-ish gore-effects and an absurd sing-along sequence. Despite reports to the contrary, it was ultimately the dwindling schedule and limited budget that forced the director to “turn it into a comedy,”¹¹⁸ albeit “more of a comedy than I would have liked.”¹¹⁹

Unlike Coscarelli, who was contractually obliged to end *Phantasm III* on another cliff-hanger, *Basket Case 3*’s Henenlotter deliberately left his third film “on an up note”¹²⁰ to avoid any possibility of “doing *Basket Case 4*,”¹²¹ since “neither of the two sequels should have happened in the first place.”¹²² Disowned by their creators in retrospect and even referred to with regret in certain circumstances, filmmakers such as Henenlotter have since resisted the temptation and belief that he “could get money for *Basket Case 4* tomorrow.”¹²³

Although Coscarelli has made similar remarks about raising the financing for another *Phantasm* sequel “whenever I want to,”¹²⁴ he has yet to raise the necessary funds to shoot his most ambitious entry to date. In a marked departure to his previous attitude and approach, Coscaelli has actively embraced Oscar winning scriptwriter Roger

Avery's¹²⁵ *Phantasm* sequel script entitled *Phantasm 2012 A.D.* Furthermore, he has tried to secure the \$10 million it would take to put Avery's script up on the screen despite the fact that the first three entries were nomadic enterprises. Described as "*Phantasm* meets *The Stand*, with a dash of *Escape From New York*,"¹²⁶ this epic 'final' chapter sees the Tall Man take over the majority of North America. However, Coscarelli has found it "very difficult to gain respect from the people who finance movies"¹²⁷ and felt frustrated by these "suits and big-shots (who) just don't get it."¹²⁸

In his attempts to elevate the size and scope of his Hollywood Horror franchise in financial terms, Coscarelli has discovered a definite budgetary ceiling in so far as the future of the *Phantasm* franchise was concerned. Ultimately, the films hampered by his genre-based cult status even with an Academy Award winner attached as screenwriter. Faced with what seemed to be insurmountable limitations with regard to his status and potential to raise the necessary financing, the director chose to embark upon a comparatively less ambitious self-penned follow-up. Limited, at least in terms of its overall scope and scale, this new instalment was designed as a suitable "stop-gap"¹²⁹ that could be "produced for peanuts"¹³⁰ until his collaboration with Avery could be made.

Released in 1999 and admittedly "concocted for strictly commercial reasons,"¹³¹ Coscarelli's fourth entry was a time-travelling prequel and follow up to his unplanned trilogy. In combining prequel elements, flashbacks and unused footage to create a further franchise instalment, the film's narrative picked up from the climactic scenes of *Phantasm III*.¹³² As an epic yet low-key tale, Coscarelli's fourth chapter catapulted his characters through time to not only explore the paradoxical origins of the Tall Man but also flesh out their connections in preparation for Avery's take on the franchise.

Best described as a “Dickensian tour of the Tall Man’s past, present and future”¹³³ that belies its budget and status as a solely economic enterprise, *Phantasm Oblivion* eschews traditional cliff-hangers in favour of a decidedly subtle and understated final fade-out. Working with his lowest budget since the first film, financial necessity once again proved to be the mother of invention as Coscarelli justified his decision to “loop back to part one,”¹³⁴ and “pretty much finish off this story arc of *Phantasm*...the basic core story of Mike, Reggie, and the Tall Man.”¹³⁵ The director cited the demands for clarification on numerous fan sites and their feedback as the motivation behind this economically sound attempt at closure.

After publicising an altruistic agenda and with his role as creative filter defined, Coscarelli attempted to side-step the economic reality of the situation and the financial security the franchise has provided. Such an approach effectively echoes the rationale adopted by New Line’s Robert Shaye in Craven’s satirical *New Nightmare*. Cast as himself for the first time, Shaye’s stated impetus for further sequels was “the fans, God bless ‘em, they’re clamouring for more.”¹³⁶ With filmmaking distilled to a process of supply and demand, this franchise, like any other, could continue indefinitely in various forms and permutations. He has highlighted its function as a means by which audiences can immerse themselves “in the nightmarish world of horror, and experience these strange characters and bizarre situations over a substantial time period.”¹³⁷ Furthermore, Coscarelli has understandably praised the role of the Hollywood Horror franchise by stressing its longevity and importance as a fundamental part of the genre.

Although Coscarelli has reflected on his career without recriminations, he has expressed some regret regarding his attitude towards Studio-based offers and other sequels.

Unsure as to whether he should have focused his energies “on breaking into the system in a conventional way,” Coscarelli has confessed that “making movies with balls, dwarves, hearses and four-barrel shotguns”¹³⁸ has nevertheless been “a hoot.”¹³⁹ Keenly aware of the audience anticipation and financial success that surrounded franchise face-offs *Freddy Vs Jason* and *Alien Vs Predator*, Coscarelli has attempted to “combine the *Phantasm* and *Evil Dead* franchises”¹⁴⁰ and revive interest in Avery’s script by casting Bruce Campbell “to fight the Tall Man.”¹⁴¹ Similarly, New Line hoped to include Raimi’s flawed hero in a *Freddy Vs Jason* follow up. However, as co-owner of the *Evil Dead* franchise, Raimi has rejected both ideas and opted to remake the first film with his Renaissance partners as a Ghost House Pictures Production.

Having lost the opportunity to develop this franchise, New Line has refocused its energies on resurrecting Freddy, *Friday the 13th*, *Final Destination* and Leatherface as part of its genre line-up. Furthermore, the Studio has also announced its intention to resurrect and remake the *Phantasm* franchise with Coscarelli attached as producer. With this development, the director has benefited from Hollywood’s frenzy to remake seventies classics. Such a move also signals the director’s assimilation and highlights the power of the franchise to open doors so long as the director is willing to sign away his autonomy and creative control.

With plans for further instalments in the *Phantasm* franchise caught up in various stages of development, the director shifted his focus and shot his most ground-breaking feature since the first film in 1979. Based on the short story by Joe R. Lansdale, *Bubba Ho-Tep* featured Campbell as an aged Elvis Presley under threat from the undead in an unassuming retirement home. This off-beat adaptation has been embraced by audiences and critics and also featured Ossie Davis as JFK. The winner of National and

International Awards after successful screenings at such film festivals as Scotland's Dead By Dawn and defying traditional genre classification, *Bubba Ho-Tep* has reinvigorated Coscarelli's career, raised his Hollywood profile and caused him to reflect on his thirty-year career as a director. Indeed, this film represents a key point in his career in which literary adaptation has overtaken and then fused with his approach to the Hollywood Horror franchise.

Following *Bubba Ho-Tep*, the director has also adapted Lansdale's slasher-esque short story, *Incidents On and Off A Mountain Road*, for Showtime's *Masters of Horror* anthology series. Reminiscent of Hooper and Craven's films, Coscarelli's populist addition was one of the first season's highlights featuring a cameo from Tall Man Angus Scrimm. In keeping with his franchise history, the director intends to adapt the prequel to *Bubba Ho-Tep*, entitled *Bubba Nosferatu*, with Campbell's Elvis fighting off a coven of Southern she-vampires. Indeed, with Lansdale's work functioning as another reliable franchise, Coscarelli's attitude and approach has begun to echo Stuart Gordon's successful career-long affiliation with H.P. Lovecraft.

Whether acknowledged thematically, conceptually or numerically, a continuation of style, tone and content is vital in raising a director's profile in the collective minds of critics and audiences. A franchise or literary equivalent can increase directors' potential to raise the necessary financing and support for future projects. However, as can be seen in the case of Don Coscarelli, this approach cannot be successful in isolation and directors must be prepared to participate in Studio-based productions and politics if they are to prosper. Throughout Hollywood's history many directors have found that their greatest success has come from being associated with one particular genre just as many actors are celebrated and remembered for just one role.¹⁴²

In so far as Studios and audiences are concerned, certain directors indicate a particular type of film and together they have come to expect, and increasingly demand, a degree of predictability and certainty within a director's body of work that some have found constricting. Despite the dangers of career stereotyping and the challenge of directing sequels to your own film, many directors have exploited the franchise as a vital element in their creative and commercial development.

In spite of industry trappings, an increasing number of first film directors chose to direct sequels because of commercial and creative incentives. The rising trend for first film directors to commit to subsequent instalments has guaranteed some freedom and success. Increasingly, Studios are contractually binding first film directors to subsequent instalments before a single frame of the first film has been shot to negate the potential for negotiation. Studios and production companies have been keen to replicate the success of previous films and emulate the success of the *Elm Street* franchise. In this respect, first film directors like Coscarelli have placed themselves in the controversial position of propagating the continuation of the franchise and those single-minded policies that have relegated their output since the seventies.

However, as has been demonstrated in this Chapter, Coscarelli's attempts to control the tone and content of his contributions to the franchise over a twenty-five year period have demonstrated the extent to which the franchise can allow for a greater degree of experimentation and evolution than previously credited without the benefit of big budgets. Moreover, the role of audiences as critics has been elevated and incorporated into its evolution with the added benefit of new technology. In this respect, the Hollywood Horror franchise has demonstrated its ability to assume different forms and

provide a definite function for directors unable to escape or compromise yet keen to reassert some control over their careers.

End Notes

¹ McCarty, 1995: 117.

² Whilst Davenport has directed three *Xtro* films to date, Nicolaou, as part of the Full Moon family, has shot all four entries in the *Subspecies* franchise.

³ McCarty, 1995: 117.

⁴ John Wooley. 'Saw Man.' *Fangoria* 147. Oct 95. pp 48-51.

⁵ John A. Gallagher. 'From Michigan With Blood.' *Fangoria's Bloody Best* 6. 1987. pp 5-7 & 74. (p5).

⁶ In Raimi's case, the financing came about as a result of pitching the project to dentists and local businessmen who, upon watching Raimi's show-reel of *Into the Woods*, agreed to contribute towards the film's financing. Will Murray. 'Master of The Evil Dead.' *Fangoria* 64. June 87. p30.

⁷ Clover, 1992: 10.

⁸ Similarly Carpenter's *Halloween* began life as a sequel to Bob Clark's chilling *Black Christmas* before referencing such films as *I Saw What You Did* and *Fright* whilst Hickox's *Waxwork* harked back to the heydays of Hammer and Universal and Henenlotter's *Basket Case* fondly recalled elements of both *Freaks* and *Frankenstein*.

⁹ *Last House on the Left* Producer Sean S. Cunningham has commented how, "Blair Witch is like *Last House* revisited on a huge level." David Szulkin. 'Last House Mates.' *Fangoria* 200. March 2001. pp 56-60 & 98. (p60).

¹⁰ Raimi's first film also showcases the director's fondness for the Three Stooges and Tex Avery cartoons; demonstrating his outlandish comic book style and skill with the camera.

¹¹ Todd Doogan. 'Tall Tales: The Man Behind Phantasm: An Interview with Don Coscarelli.' <http://www.thedigitalbits.com/articles/coscarelli110399.html> (Downloaded: March 15th 2003).

¹² For a more detailed look at Romero and the *Living Dead* franchise see Chapter 3.

¹³ This group comprises director Sam Raimi, producer Robert Tapert and star Bruce Campbell.

¹⁴ McDonagh, 1991: 140.

¹⁵ Jeff Hayes. 'The Mysterious Mr Hiltzig.'

<http://www.angelfire.com/retro/officialsleepaway2/hiltzik2002.html> (Downloaded: February 20th 2003).

¹⁶ This saw the investors represented by Robert Kuhn who formed the corporation MAB to ensure that they would receive their initial investment plus a healthy return. In conjunction with Kuhn, co-writer Kim Henkel and Hooper formed Vortex - a separate production company that would control the production funded by the investor corporation. This arrangement saw to it that the creative control remained with Vortex and that, in theory, the investors would get "their original investments back and after that it was split 50/50." Tobe Hooper. 'Texas Chainsaw Massacre: The Shocking Truth.' *Texas Chainsaw Massacre* Special Edition DVD.

¹⁷ Todd Doogan. 'Tall Tales: The Man Behind Phantasm: An Interview with Don Coscarelli.' <http://www.thedigitalbits.com/articles/coscarelli110399.html> (Downloaded: March 15th 2003).

¹⁸ Derry, 1977: 118.

¹⁹ The film was eventually picked up by the relatively small, Walter Reade's Continental Films.

²⁰ Thus type of release by Avco-Embassy with *Phantasm* and Compass International with *Halloween* saw limited prints gradually enjoy a successful local release across the country whilst gathering hype and pre-publicity through positive word of mouth.

²¹ McDonagh, 1995: 88. Cunningham has stated how "prior to *Friday the 13th* the biggest release you might get would be with something like *Halloween*, where the distributor would go into town with 75 prints, buy some ads and hope for the best before moving on to the next town." Steve Biodrowski. 'Sean Cunningham: House Keeper.' *Gorezone*. 21. Spring 1992. pp 8-12. (p9).

²² McCarty, 1990: 103.

²³ Roger Ebert quoting Pauline Kael in his review of *Re-Animator* October 18 1985. <http://rogerebert.suntimes.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/19851018/REVIEWS/510180303/1023> (Downloaded: June 21st 2004).

²⁴ Anthony C. Ferrante. 'The Night HE made History.' *Fangoria* 138. November 1994. pp 12-22 & 90. (p21).

²⁵ McDonagh, 1995: 36.

²⁶ This promotional tag line accompanied the film's publicity and cemented the interest of Robert Shaye, head of New Line Cinema, in distributing the film. King had travelled to Cannes in order to help promote the film *Creepshow*, his EC-comics inspired collaboration with George Romero. Alex Worley. 'Dawn of the Deadites.' *Shivers* 79. July 2000. p8-11. p10.

²⁷ Roger Ebert. 'The Blair Witch Project.' *The Chicago-Sun Times*. July 16th 1999. <http://rogerebert.suntimes.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/19990716/REVIEWS/907160301/1023> (Downloaded: March 25th 2004).

²⁸ Todd Doogan. 'Tall Tales: The Man Behind Phantasm: An Interview with Don Coscarelli.' <http://www.thedigitalbits.com/articles/coscarelli110399.html> (Downloaded: March 15th 2003).

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ In singling out Siskel and Ebert's television programme the director has reportedly stated how, "there's nothing like struggling for a couple years to make a film, collaborating with talented actors and dedicated crew on a project you all believe has some kind of small merit, and then two loud clowns on national TV use your material to sell advertising, and then quickly dismiss you with two thumbs down." Ibid.

³² The deal saw the director agree to deliver five films with the option for more. In return for such a commitment Hitchcock was awarded a "lavish private compound situated close to the main studio gate" Once securely installed within the Universal studio system and arguably under its ever-watchful eye, Hitchcock sought to solidify his position by swapping all rights to *Psycho* and his TV series in return for "about 150,000 shares of MCA stock." which placed key facilities and trusted technical personnel close at hand. Rebello, 1990: 182. Such a shrewd move saw Universal acquire the rights to the title and, in some respects, the director whom they sought to direct and mould into an even more commercially viable brand name. Indeed, Hitchcock has been described as a 'franchise' unto himself – an argument at odds with the definition explicitly stated and adopted by this thesis

³³ David Howe. 'Don Coscarelli.' *Starburst*. Vol 11. No. 7. March 1989. pp 39-43. (p40).

³⁴ Author Andre Norton was similarly dissatisfied and had her name removed from the credits.

³⁵ Todd Doogan. 'Tall Tales: The Man Behind Phantasm: An Interview with Don Coscarelli.' <http://www.thedigitalbits.com/articles/coscarelli110399.html> (Downloaded: March 15th 2003).

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ David Hughes. 'David Cronenberg: Hall of Fame – The Maverick Series.' *Empire*. Issue 164. February 2003. pp 108-113. (p111).

³⁸ Winecoff, 1996: 451

³⁹ This was after the star's plan to direct Norman's story had been "flatly rejected," by the Studio on account of part three along with his other suggestion that he and *Psycho II*'s Richard Franklin "co-direct the new instalment together." Ibid.

⁴⁰ Despite attempting to revive these second sequels to *Halloween* and *Jaws* with fresh literary talent, Dante's efforts were diminished as the production process developed to the extent that both Nigel Kneale and Richard Matheson were reportedly dissatisfied with the finished films.

⁴¹ However, the director has half-jokingly confessed that he's "still hoping they'll throw me an *Alien* sequel someday." Ibid.

⁴² Marc Savlov. 'Sphere of Influence.' *The Austin Chronicle*. March 31 2000. http://www.auschron.com/issues/dispatch/2000-03-31/screens_feature.html (Downloaded: April 12th 2003).

⁴³ Rare examples where a director's proposed concept and consequent participation in a sequel has been rejected include John Landis and Neil Marshall with follow-ups to *An American Werewolf in London* and *Dog Soldiers*.

⁴⁴ For the history behind Whale's sequel see Curtis, 1998. *Black Lagoon* director Jack Arnold also agreed to direct the film's follow up; *Revenge of the Creature*.

⁴⁵ Fischer, 1991: 643.

⁴⁶ This period included such pictures as *God Told Me To* and *The Private Files of J. Edgar Hoover* or *The Crazies* and *Season of the Witch*. Romero did however release his underrated homage to the Vampire film, *Martin*, in 1977 which ranks amongst his strongest work to date.

⁴⁷ Marc Savlov. 'Sphere of Influence.' *The Austin Chronicle*. March 31 2000. http://www.auschron.com/issues/dispatch/2000-03-31/screens_feature.html (Downloaded: April 12th 2003).

⁴⁸ Having achieved fame as the home of Hollywood's Famous Monsters, Universal has not only developed sequels to *Psycho* and *Jaws* but also acquired franchises like *Halloween* and *Child's Play*.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ David Everitt. 'The Arresting Saga of *Maniac Cop 2*.' *Fangoria* 96. September 1990. pp 24-27 & 68. (p25).

⁵¹ Ibid, p25.

⁵² In a similar vein, directors such as Tacacs, Oullette and Tenney from *The Gate*, *The Unnameable* and *Witchboard*, approached the sequel as a chance to "make a better movie,"⁵² with Tenney in particular considering himself "a better director than I was 7 years ago, so in general the film will look better (since) there was a lot I couldn't achieve the first time because of budget, or my lack of knowledge of how to get around that type of budget." Steve Biodrowski. '*Witchboard 2; The Devil's Game. Board to Death*.' *Fangoria* 122. May 1993. pp 46-49 & 74. (p46).

-
- ⁵³ Steve Biodrowski. 'Sam Raimi's Evil Dead III.' *Cinefantastique*. Vol 22. No 5. April 1992. pp 4-5. (p4).
- ⁵⁴ Gregory Nicoll. 'Two For the Roadkill.' *Fangoria* 117. October 1992. pp 46-49. (p47).
- ⁵⁵ Hanke, 2000: 119.
- ⁵⁶ McDonagh, 1995: 135.
- ⁵⁷ Hanke, 1991: 120.
- ⁵⁸ Ibid, p132.
- ⁵⁹ McDonagh, 1995: 135.
- ⁶⁰ McBride, 1997: 258.
- ⁶¹ John Wooley. 'Leatherface in Love: On the Set of *Texas Chainsaw Massacre 2*.' *Fangoria* 57. Sept 1986. <http://www.geocities.com/leatherfacette> (Downloaded: January 20th 2003).
- ⁶² Nick Hasted. 'What A Carve Up.' *The Guardian*. 28th September 2001. <http://film.guardian.co.uk/features/featurepages/0,4120,559120,00.html> (Downloaded: January 27th 2003).
- ⁶³ Philip Nutman. 'Of Chainsaws, Cuts and Cannon.' *Shock Xpress*. Vol 2. No 2. Winter 1987. pp 28-29. (p29).
- ⁶⁴ Although Henenlotter fought to separate the new from the old and call *Basket Case 2* 'House of Freaks' and "sell it as an independent horror film where Dwayne and Belial just happen to be supporting characters," SGE had other ideas and it was they who controlled the way in which the film would be titled, marketed and distributed. McDonagh, 1995: 37.
- ⁶⁵ The film was promoted with this tagline.
- ⁶⁶ David Howe. 'Don Coscarelli.' *Starburst*. Vol 11. No. 7. March 1989. pp 39-43. (p40).
- ⁶⁷ Todd Doogan. 'Tall Tales: The Man Behind Phantasm: An Interview with Don Coscarelli.' <http://www.thedigitalbits.com/articles/coscarelli110399.html> (Downloaded: March 15th 2003).
- ⁶⁸ Brad Pitt originally auditioned for A. Michael Baldwin's role before it went to James LeGross. However, Coscarelli's main regret surrounding the franchise is his failure to stand up to the Studio's demands by calling their bluff over Baldwin's return.
- ⁶⁹ David Howe. 'Don Coscarelli.' *Starburst*. Vol 11. No. 7. March 1989. pp 39-43. (p43).
- ⁷⁰ Ibid.
- ⁷¹ Todd Doogan. 'Tall Tales: The Man Behind Phantasm: An Interview with Don Coscarelli.' <http://www.thedigitalbits.com/articles/coscarelli110399.html> (Downloaded: March 15th 2003).
- ⁷² Ibid.
- ⁷³ A policy employed by the franchise-friendly administration at Universal who, after acquiring the *Child's Play* franchise from United Artists, who were allegedly reluctant to continue their association with the killer doll, released *Child's Play 3* less than nine months after their first sequel had been in cinemas.
- ⁷⁴ David Howe. 'Don Coscarelli.' *Starburst*. Vol 11. No. 7. March 1989. pp 39-43. (p42).
- ⁷⁵ Ibid.
- ⁷⁶ Ibid.
- ⁷⁷ Norman England. 'An Interview With George Romero: Part2.' <http://www2.gol.com/users/noman/interv3.htm> (Downloaded February 18th 2002).
- ⁷⁸ Internet Movie Database: Dawn of the Dead: Alternate Versions. <http://us.imdb.com/AlternateVersions?0077402> (Downloaded: May 14th 2002).

⁷⁹ Hanke, 1991: 240.

⁸⁰ McCarty, 1990: 109.

⁸¹ While the majority of directors are contractually obliged to deliver the Studio or production company an R-rated picture, the alternative is to either accept the prohibitive NC-17 rating or proceed without any legitimate rating. The downside of such a distribution campaign is evident when publications, television stations, theatre owners and Blockbuster adopt a policy of not accepting advertisements for or copies of any films being released either Unrated or with the NC-17 label.

⁸² Paraphrased from Rebello, 1990: 145.

⁸³ In the wake of his negative experience with the MPAA over *Evil Dead 2* the director indicated that there was an inherent bias in the MPAA's attitude and approach to Horror. Citing "the fact that DEG was a small company and that I had rubbed the MPAA the wrong way in the past" as having "a great deal to do with the X for *Evil Dead 2*," Raimi felt that it was "not a level playing field" and that the board "might be swayed when they're dealing with multi-million dollar conglomerates where their friends work." McDonagh, 1995: 144.

⁸⁴ Peter Atkins. *Hellbound: Hellraiser II* DVD Commentary.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Tony Randel. Ibid.

⁸⁷ Peter Atkins. Ibid.

⁸⁸ Peter Atkins. Ibid.

⁸⁹ Todd Doogan. 'Tall Tales: The Man Behind Phantasm: An Interview with Don Coscarelli.' <http://www.thedigitalbits.com/articles/coscarelli110399.html> (Downloaded: March 15th 2003).

⁹⁰ Nigel Floyd. 'Speak No Evil.' *Shock Xpress*. Vol 1. No 6. Spring 1987. pp 6-9. (p7). Raimi has since stated how this epilogue has been misinterpreted by audiences and critics as a different story.

⁹¹ Halbertsam, 1996: 143. Parallels could possibly be drawn between the subversive feminist shift displayed here and the one Tim Burton adopts in the final frames of *Batman Returns* (1992).

⁹² Marc Savlov. 'The Texas Chainsaw Massacre.' *The Austin Chronicle*. November 2nd 1998. <http://www.filmvault.com/filmvault/austin/t/texaschainsawmass4.html> (Downloaded: January 6th 2003).

⁹³ Fischer, 1991: 194.

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ Ibid.

⁹⁶ However, Fisher did return for what could be considered parts four and five in Hammer's *Frankenstein* series.

⁹⁷ Although Hooper and *The Texas Chainsaw Massacre III* is the most significant example, other notable dropouts include Burton on *Batman Forever*, Spielberg on *Jurassic Park III* and Cameron on *Terminator 3*. However, Spielberg did return for *Indian Jones and the Last Crusade* after citing contractual obligations to George Lucas and atonement for the previous entry as his justification.

⁹⁸ McDonagh, 1995: 143.

⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰ Williams, 1997: 205. Although it took only three years for Morgan Creek and writer/director Blatty to shoot an *Exorcist* sequel it would be another eighteen years before *House of Wax* would be deemed worthy of an update.

¹⁰¹ Marc Shapiro. 'From Hell To Eternity.' *Fangoria* 130. March 1994. pp 41-45 & 81. (p43).

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ Ibid, p44.

¹⁰⁴ First announced under the title *Zombies in the White House* and budgeted at \$6.5million, Romero was resistant to compromise on his script's violent content and financiers United Film were only willing to offer \$3.5 million. Unable to progress to the final stage in his story, Romero ultimately "created an altered script" which "retained many of the basic ideas but was scaled down and (its) emphases were shifted" to take into account the lack of funds available. Fischer, 1991: 651.

¹⁰⁵ Marc Shapiro. 'Monster Invasion: Phantasm III.' *Fangoria* 125. August 1993. p10.

¹⁰⁶ Marc Shapiro. 'From Hell To Eternity.' *Fangoria* 130. March 1994. pp 41-45 & 81. (p45).

¹⁰⁷ Ibid, p43.

¹⁰⁸ Coscarelli explained that he has expanded "on the project a little...(to) make it a little more apocalyptic and final." David Howe. 'Don Coscarelli.' *Starburst*. Vol 11. No 7. March 1989. pp 39-43. (p43).

¹⁰⁹ In which the Tall Man's sphere is buried beneath the Arctic Ice Grand Grimoire-style (see Steve Miner's under-rated *Warlock*).

¹¹⁰ Bill Warren. 'Army of Darkness; They Want You.' *Fangoria* 115. August 1992. pp 40-45 & 77. (p41).

¹¹¹ However, an alternate ending depicting Ash versus the Deadites in a Supermarket was also demanded by the producers and used in some versions of the film.

¹¹² Marc Shapiro. 'Monster Invasion: Phantasm III.' *Fangoria* 125. August 1993. p10.

¹¹³ McDonagh, 1995: 44.

¹¹⁴ According to the director, the MPAA "went crazy and gave (*Basket Case 3*) an NC-17" whilst alleging that Heffner, as head of the board, had "called SGE and told them they were going to give the film an S rating. The person at the SGE office said S for Sex? And Heffner said, 'No, S for Shit.'" Ibid, pp40-41.

¹¹⁵ Alan Jones. 'The Wicker Basket Man.' *Shivers* 3. October 1992. pp 16-18. (p18).

¹¹⁶ Ibid, p17.

¹¹⁷ McDonagh, 1995: 36.

¹¹⁸ McDonagh, 1995: 43.

¹¹⁹ Ibid.

¹²⁰ Gregory Nicol. 'Maul in the Family.' *Fangoria* 108. Dcember 1991. pp36-40. (p38).

¹²¹ Ibid.

¹²² Alan Jones. 'The Wicker Basket Man.' *Shivers* 3. October 1992. pp 16-18. (p18).

¹²³ McDonagh, 1995: 37.

¹²⁴ Marc Shapiro. 'From Hell To Eternity.' *Fangoria* 130. March 1994. pp 41-45 & 81. (p42).

¹²⁵ Along with co-writer/director Quentin Tarantino, Avery had recently won the Oscar for Best Original Screenplay for *Pulp Fiction*.

¹²⁶ John W. Bowen. Look Back in Angus: Confessions of a Phantasm Phanboy.' <http://www.classic-horror.com/articles/lookbackangus.html> (Downloaded: January 12th 2003).

¹²⁷ Todd Doogan. 'Tall Tales: The Man Behind Phantasm. An Interview with Don Coscarelli.' <http://www.thedigitalbits.com/articles/coscarelli110399.html> (Downloaded: January 15th 2003).

¹²⁸ Ibid.

¹²⁹ John W. Bowen. Look Back in Angus: Confessions of a Phantasm Phanboy.' <http://www.classic-horror.com/articles/lookbackangus.html> (Downloaded: January 12th 2003).

¹³⁰ Ibid. Following the relatively recent success of such zombie-themes films as *28 Days Later*, *Resident Evil* (to which the director was once attached), the *Dawn of the Dead*

remake and *Shaun of the Dead*, the director was able to secure the financing and distribution deal for *Land of the Dead*.

¹³¹ Marc Shapiro. 'From Hell To Eternity.' *Fangoria* 130. March 1994. pp 41-45 & 81. (p43).

¹³² Reggie had been cornered by the Tall Man's silver spheres and Mike, having discovered one within his head, had fled into the wilderness to avoid a fatal encounter with his nemesis.

¹³³ Denise Dumars. 'Phantasm IV.' *Cinefantastique*. Vol 30. No 12. January 1999. pp 56-7. (p56).

¹³⁴ Ibid.

¹³⁵ Ibid.

¹³⁶ Robert Shaye playing himself in *Wes Craven's New Nightmare*.

¹³⁷ Todd Doogan. 'Tall Tales: The Man Behind Phantasm. An Interview with Don Coscarelli.' <http://www.thedigitalbits.com/articles/coscarelli110399.html> (Downloaded January 15th 2003).

¹³⁸ Ibid.

¹³⁹ Ibid.

¹⁴⁰ David Chute. 'Bubba Unites Cult Heroes.' *LA Times*. February 26th 2003. <http://www.bubbahotep.com/reviews/LATimes.htm> (Downloaded: May 17th 2004).

¹⁴¹ Ibid.

¹⁴² Anthony Perkins portrayal of Norman Bates throughout the *Psycho* franchise is a particular case in point.

Chapter 2:

Cursed? Wes Craven's Franchise Nightmares

“The necessity of making a profit will inevitably lead to questionable public relations exercises, to the taking of easy options and the exploitation and over-exploitation of what has been proved attractive in the past.”¹

– S.S. Prawer

Having addressed Coscarelli's experiences as sole director of the *Phantasm* franchise, this second Chapter will focus on Wes Craven's relationship with the Hollywood Horror franchise through a number of specific examples. Taking into account the experiences of fellow first film directors John Carpenter and Sean S. Cunningham, it will also consider the cumulative effect it has had on his career and the extent to which Craven has been successful in avoiding and accepting the limited options afforded to him within and outside of the Horror genre. By charting the director's creative development and professional relationships with several Hollywood Studios over a thirty-year period, this second chapter will also demonstrate the extent to which the Hollywood Horror franchise has been the critical and commercial backbone of his career as one of the genre's leading directors.

Ever since cannibalising Bergman's *The Virgin Spring* in his directorial debut *The Last House on the Left*, and referencing the Sawney Bean Case to create “two mirror families”² for *The Hills Have Eyes*, Craven has consistently turned to the tabloids when crafting screenplays; fusing his knowledge of psychology and literature with autobiographical elements.³ Relishing the opportunity to address socio-political issues

and the glamorisation of violence, Craven's first film at the age of thirty-two allowed him to take unprecedented risks and provide audiences with a vicious assault on the senses. Indeed, the film was constructed to challenge notions of entertainment with scenes of physical and emotional cruelty. The infamy and fervour afforded to *Last House*,⁴ and its status as a cult classic thereafter, successfully saw to it that Craven, along with producer Cunningham, became associated with a specific type of film. This was despite his best efforts to develop a range of scripts and potential projects far removed from the gritty exploitation feel of this first film. However, a few years after this first taste of commercial success and several failed attempts to raise the financing for other films, the director was contacted by producer Peter Locke who wanted to finance Craven's second film – so long as he stayed within the confines of the genre and allowed the producer to capitalise on his *Last House* notoriety to promote the film.

Similarly, Cunningham “kept getting phone calls from people wanting to do a really disgusting ugly film”⁵ while attempting to develop endless non-genre projects. Professing not to like or enjoy “brutal ugly horror movies,”⁶ Cunningham's return to the genre as producer and director was inspired by the phenomenal success of Carpenter's *Halloween*. Apparently using the “tail end of his savings,”⁷ the producer placed full page ads in *Variety* and *The Hollywood Reporter* to promote his next project: *Friday the 13th* - a film only intended “to be a pot-boiler, to keep me afloat until the TV series or kid's movies took off.”⁸ The money raised by this effective publicity stunt led to commissioning a writer, Victor Miller, to collaborate on the script before receiving the backing from his theatre-based *Last House* financiers.

The enduring legacy of *Friday the 13th* on the genre, a film Kermode credits with having “brought Bava and H.G. Lewis into the American mainstream,”⁹ was through

the ground-breaking way in which it was unleashed. Cunningham has since recalled how he had Paramount, United Artists and Warner Bros “bidding against one another.”¹⁰ However, Paramount clinched the deal by vowing to break exploitation film tradition “treat it like an A title;”¹¹ an appealing alternative to the system known as bicycling prints.¹² However, when Cunningham’s film was rated R in 1980 with Paramount’s logo and support, it set an industry standard for liberal violence that the MPAA regretted in retrospect. Courting controversy and condemnation from censorship groups across the country, the high profile release sparked a heated debate surrounding violence in cinema and set in motion an escalating depiction of graphic murder in mainstream cinema. Ultimately this led to increasing censorship problems as the franchise progressed and the title was scrutinised and reviled as the epitome of exploitation by critics and campaigners across the board.

For Craven, *The Hills Have Eyes* not only continued his familial theme but also continued *Last House*’s dramatic reversal of fortune with apparently ‘civilised’ characters harbouring more monstrous tendencies than their antagonists. A relatively simplistic and clichéd story by modern standards, in which two families collide against the backdrop of a desolate landscape, *The Hills Have Eyes* featured attractive teen protagonists and charismatic villains. Encompassing elements of Hooper’s *Texas Chainsaw Massacre* with its cannibalism subtext and expose of alternative American family values, Craven’s second feature found a receptive audience. It also cemented his reputation and abilities as an effective genre director capable of receiving solid critical reviews.

Similar in both tone and content to *Last House*, yet with significantly higher production values, *Hills* firmly established the fledgling director’s trademark characters and

narrative techniques. The combined effect of these two features raised Craven's profile and allowed him to build on his success within a relatively narrow framework. Having accepted Locke's genre-specific support and added a more shocking conclusion at his request, Craven demonstrated an individual style by conforming to the type of genre stereotyping that limited the assignments offered to him.

In switching sub-genres with such TV terrors as *Stranger in Our House* (aka *Summer of Fear*) and *A Deadly Blessing* Craven injected a more subtle and supernatural element into his resume. Furthermore he encountered resistance and producer politics with regard to a film's climax. Attempting to broaden his experience outside of the Horror genre, Craven, like many of his contemporaries, Coscarelli included, relied upon a tried and tested concept from another medium. An adaptation of the comic book cult classic *Swamp Thing* was a shrewd choice in terms of crossover potential despite the finished film being marred by poor production values, a less than engaging script and far from trouble free production. A second return to television resulted in an *Invitation to Hell*; a desperately average production in which the dark secrets of an idealistic suburbia (read: Stepford) are exposed through the justified paranoia of its protagonists. In this respect, Craven has attempted to combat issues of generic stereotyping and firmly established his ambivalent yet long-standing relationship with television that has reoccurred throughout his career to varying degrees of success.

Craven's First Franchise

Despite the soft-core content and decidedly luke-warm reception to these early small screen films, Craven remained relatively free to flex his directorial muscles outside of

the exploitation arena. As such he attempted to move away from his early reputation for rape revenge exploitation films and moniker as the Sultan of Slash. However, Craven's next project was a follow up to his second film – a *Hills Have Eyes* sequel that reunited surviving cast members and resurrected others. For his first sequel, the director indulged the worst excesses of the Hollywood Horror franchise to produce an unworthy follow up that was similar to *Silent Night Deadly Night Part II* and *Boogeyman 2*. With an unhealthy overuse of first film footage to pad out the running time, via flashbacks and nightmares from key survivors (including Beast, the family dog!), the film embraced the standard trappings of a sub-standard slasher film devoid of subtlety, scares or narrative cohesion.

The director has since confessed that his prime motivation in directing a *Hills* sequel was a severe lack of alternatives, in that he “hadn't worked for three years”¹³ (to the extent that he would even have directed “*Godzilla Goes to Paris*”¹⁴ by that point in his career). Nevertheless, the film damaged his reputation and continues to be heralded as one of the worst examples of self-sequelisation to date. In his own defence, Craven has maintained that the film “was not completed”¹⁵ nor “intended to be released as it was”¹⁶ and is therefore a misrepresentation.¹⁷ However, as writer and director, Craven must accept responsibility for the finished product, irrespective of the form it was released in, and waived his right to apply to the DGA for an ‘Alan Smithee’ credit.

In spite of the haphazard nature of production and disappointing end result, the *Hills* sequel served its purpose – it provided the director with money in the bank and apparently helped him regain his confidence. Born of desperation as opposed to directorial inspiration, the *Hills Have Eyes Part II* proved to Craven, and confirmed the industry's belief, that the franchise could provide financial and job security in an

unstable and competitive market. Even though Craven had not yet achieved independent brand name status, his name coupled with a recognisable title was enough to secure financing and shop pet projects to Studios, independent production companies and potential investors. One such project was *A Nightmare on Elm Street* – one he was pitching as “a fantasy, an impressionistic thriller,”¹⁸ rather than a Horror film, as a potential way of distancing himself from his reputation. In this respect, Craven has repeatedly reinforced Hollywood’s hypocrisy towards the genre with his adherence to a narrow and negligent definition of its parameters and potential.

Craven’s script was developed through a fruitful combination of news reports and personal fears and with the uncredited assistance of Cunningham protégé Steve Miner. It was inspired by a series of unrelated articles in the *L.A. Times* in which several Cambodian immigrants, all young men, died in the middle of severe nightmares after desperately trying to stay awake.¹⁹ Similar to Coscarelli’s experience with *Phantasm*, Craven’s personal experiences, real and imaginary, played a part in the film’s evolution. For example, the *Elm Street* antagonist’s name was “inspired by Craven’s least favourite person in junior high school, a boy who always wanted to fight with Wes during their daily paper routes.”²⁰

A tale of vigilantes and revenge, whereby the sins of the parents are paid for by their ‘innocent’ children, Craven’s film featured four teen protagonists united in their experience of familial dysfunction and nightmarish encounters with a sinister scarred dream demon. A classic coming of age story and fable for its target audience, *A Nightmare on Elm Street* celebrated the self-sufficiency and independence of Final Girl Nancy and introduced the genre’s most prolific contemporary icon.

However, the script had been passed over by all the major Studios²¹ and the director was forced to borrow money from close friend Cunningham just to pay his taxes. Similarly, Bob Shaye's independent distribution company, New Line Cinema, was struggling to survive in an evolving and fiercely competitive market. Having made a genre-specific name for itself boldly (re)distributing such classics as John Waters' *Pink Flamingos*, Hooper's *Texas Chainsaw Massacre* and later picking up Raimi's *Evil Dead*, Shaye was searching for a new project to take to Cannes and set up for a lucrative Halloween release. In backing Craven's script and agreeing to arrange the financing, both parties entered into a mutually beneficial relationship of financial and creative interdependence, and what Shaye later referred to as their "last big shot."²²

Whereas Carpenter shrewdly negotiated 10% of the film's profits in addition to his \$10,000 fee to write, direct and compose music for *Halloween*, Craven faced a series of creative and economic compromises that included script approval and property rights in perpetuity. Cut out of the potential to financially benefit from the film's success, profit participation became a key issue as the franchise developed. This played a part in the deterioration of the director's professional relationship with the company and later became a focal point in future negotiations to secure his return. Nevertheless, Craven has since conceded how "when you're starting out in this business, you've almost got to expect to give up most or all of your rights to get something done. It's business reality."²³

After being shot on the tightest of budgets²⁴ and under threat of bankruptcy and closure, Craven and the New Line production team finally made it into the editing room and it was there, according to Craven, that the film "was made as much...as anywhere else."²⁵ Operating under Shaye's supervision, Craven, who had already added a *Carrie*-esque

jolt to *The Hills Have Eyes*, was once again forced to compromise on his apocalyptic conclusion in favour of one more in keeping with dominant sequel ideology. Shaye's suggested ending was designed to fit in with audience expectations and lent itself to a potential sequel. For Craven, this third attempt at an imposed ending caused a great deal of post-production contention. The dispute was to some extent mediated and resolved by bringing in the jury, that is the audience, by shooting "three endings and testing them all."²⁶ With no single ending working for test audiences, the decision was made to include aspects of all three but not, to Shaye's dissatisfaction and Craven's insistence, have Freddy driving the car at the final fade out.

Having appeased the producers of previous films, Craven later commented how "the ghost of *Carrie* haunts us all unfortunately. There's hardly a producer alive that will allow a film to end classically— you must have that final shock."²⁷ The final shock for Craven however, was the extent to which New Line would deviate from his original premise, and openly contradict the first film's conceit within the first five minutes of *Freddy's Revenge*. Indeed, the importance of these final moments cannot be overestimated, with *Friday the 13th*'s Cunningham maintaining that the "real success of the film had to do with those last few minutes... (they) made the film work."²⁸ Despite being an extension of the shock epilogue, writer Miller has since argued that the ending was "never intended to be the precursor for what came afterwards."²⁹ This discrepancy between directorial intention and cinematic reality in the collective minds of Studios and audiences has become a veritable constant in the development of the Hollywood Horror franchise.

According to Shaye at least, the production process detracted from any form of singular authorship or auteurist sentiment, with even the film's title an issue for discussion. Just

as *Last House* was tested under three separate titles, several other first films have undergone significant title changes to attract the widest possible audience.³⁰ According to Schoell and Spenser, Shaye was even considering changing the title to *Bad Dreams* to “class it up”³¹ a little and avoid any association with exploitation films. As for Shaye’s support of Craven’s vision and development as an auteur, and indeed auteur filmmaking in general, the producer has since contradicted any such notion and explicitly described New Line’s feature films as “the creative children of a real complicated, complex gene pool.”³²

This power play between producers and directors within this gene pool is contentious and filmmakers have often charged that their concepts have been compromised in favour of a more commercial vision or aesthetic. As a producer, *Re-Animator*’s Brian Yuzna similarly adopted Cunningham’s encompassing definition and belief that the producer is “responsible for everything from the time the idea is hatched to the time the film reaches theatres.”³³ In transforming an overtly artistic black and white series transformed into a commercially viable film script Yuzna also took control during postproduction on the film. However, the tendency for producers to relegate directors during production is also a serious issue and one that saw director turned producer Steven Spielberg reprimanded by the DGA (Director’s Guild of America) following his over involvement with Hooper’s direction of *Poltergeist*.³⁴

In light of such concerns and conflicts, Shaye has also stated how “any belief in auteur filmmaking, I think, does a disservice to the process because it’s too hermetic and way too inbred.”³⁵ With such a remark stressing the collaborative process of filmmaking, it also calls into question Craven’s legitimacy as creator of the franchise. As the author of his movies, Carpenter has rejected such a statement in Craven’s defence despite his

personal feeling that *A Nightmare on Elm Street* was “the beginning of the end”³⁶ for 1980’s Horror.

Following *Elm Street’s* success on Home Video, Craven’s status as an established and celebrated director of Horror and franchise founder was secure, as was his ability to pursue other projects and infiltrate the major Hollywood Studios. After an association with independent Avco-Embassy following *Halloween*,³⁷ Carpenter returned to the franchise as the writer and producer of for Dino De Laurentiis and Universal Pictures – a decision which granted him the support and financing for his ill-received remake of *The Thing*. Having relinquished the directorial reins of the sequel to film school graduate Rick Rosenthal,³⁸ Carpenter assumed an active role in shaping the sequel convinced that audiences only wanted to see “the same movie again.”³⁹ However, in the wake of *Friday the 13th’s* success and splattery excess, the director was concerned that Rosenthal’s rough-cut would prove unpopular with contemporary audiences looking for a faster pace and more gore. Consequently, he shot additional footage and violent scenes in time for its release.⁴⁰

With Carpenter willing to use the franchise to further his career despite his contempt for the process and end product,⁴¹ Cunningham was similarly content to walk away from Paramount’s plans for a *Friday the 13th* sequel. He dismissed their offers to let him direct it as he readily signed off in favour of a percentage of the profits. Although Cunningham made “a ton of money,”⁴² he disagreed with Paramount’s decision to establish Jason as the antagonist and saw the title as “just a generic name for a kind of movie”⁴³ and a vehicle for the same anthology-themed format Carpenter later applied to *Halloween III*. Moreover, the director considered Jason’s resurrection “stupid”⁴⁴ and “laughable”⁴⁵ since it undercut the first film in favour of replicating Carpenter’s

franchise. Despite his contempt for this classic example of cross-franchise cannibalism, the director regrets the way in which he failed to understand or take advantage of the ability his success gave him, “generate (his) own projects”⁴⁶ and fully exploit his association with the Hollywood Horror franchise.

Similarly, Craven turned down the chance to direct *Nightmare 2* once New Line had balked at the suggestion of making significant changes to former publicist David Chaskin’s script. From this point, New Line prioritised style and special effects over content and coherency by commissioning a sequel that so openly contradicted a first film’s premise. As producer, Shaye drafted in *Alone in the Dark*’s Jack Sholder on the basis of his star-studded first feature and prior association with the producer who, according to Craven, wanted “to make Freddy like...a good hamburger and sell it all over the world.”⁴⁷ Despite harbouring a dislike of horror movies, from Chaskin’s point of view,⁴⁸ Sholder reportedly found it “very necessary”⁴⁹ that he conform to Shaye’s vision, particularly when it came to shooting his ending for the first film as an opening sequence. This sequence then, in which Freddy became the driver of the stereotypical High School Bus, is emblematic of Shaye’s attitude and approach to the Hollywood Horror franchise following Craven’s departure.

In direct contrast to Franklin’s reverential approach on *Psycho II* – a dissertation on Hitchcock’s first film, Sholder’s *Nightmare 2* clearly “lost the dream side of the story.”⁵⁰ Replaced with an androgynous yet romantic tale of possession and exploding parrots in the “style of *Beauty and the Beast*,”⁵¹ Horror’s function as a modern fairy tale came to the fore and the film was daring only in its contentious portrayal of “a teenage bisexual male virgin.”⁵² With reference to *Nightmare 2* and the *Friday the 13th*

franchise, it is understandable why McDonagh has argued that this process “almost invariably debases the initial idea”⁵³ often against the intentions of its creators.

Having marketed Kruger “as if he was a rock and roll band”⁵⁴ after an intense test screening process that led to numerous re-shoots and re-editing, Sholder’s sequel was a commercial success for New Line. Specifically, it made a huge impact on the Home Video market as the fan-base grew to encompass mainstream viewers highlighting the concept and character’s crossover potential. Nevertheless, criticisms from audiences and critics have since seen producer Shaye fall in line with popular opinion and recently refer to Sholder’s sequel as a “misstep”⁵⁵ and “wrong-minded foray.”⁵⁶ For Craven, the sequel as a source of disappointment inadvertently elevated his first film and its status as a contemporary classic was highlighted by the overall failure of this ineffective companion piece.

Craven’s conspicuous absence from the second instalment, coupled with his well-publicised criticisms and condemnation of it, saw New Line actively campaign for the director’s involvement on the third film. Despite their overtures, the director turned them down in the hope that Warner Bros, with whom he had just completed *Deadly Friend*,⁵⁷ would allow him to direct *Superman IV*. This high profile mainstream picture would allow him to break out of previous genre stereotyping and, despite the film’s sequel status, into a different league. However, according to Craven, title star Christopher Reeve “felt I couldn’t handle a big picture”⁵⁸ and, with director approval a part of his contract, vetoed any chance Craven had. Retreating back into the franchise, the director agreed to co-write a third *Elm Street* film, with partner Bruce Wagner, as a means of renegotiating percentage points in this and future sequels. This exploitation of the Hollywood Horror franchise as a means of strengthening financial security also

demonstrated Craven's intention of regaining some of the creative control he had signed away on the first film.

Returning to Elm Street

After choosing to “discount”⁵⁹ the disappointing first sequel, the director originally hoped to reject the current trend for sequel narratives⁶⁰ with a prequel that went “back to Freddy’s birthplace.”⁶¹ Unfortunately, the notion was rejected by New Line who preferred his subsequent idea of bringing Nancy back to lead a squad of surviving ‘dream warriors.’ Successfully combining elements of Kruger’s back-story and returning characters with an innovative direction, Craven’s populist script exposed the franchise’s potential for development and special-effects sequences. By accepting an executive producer credit, Craven thought he could “patch up old differences”⁶² and take “a real creative part in the picture.”⁶³

According to the disgruntled director, New Line had a different take on his role and “all they wanted was to have my name on the script.”⁶⁴ Ignored and cut out of the production process, Craven has stated that *Dream Warriors* “was ultimately not made to my satisfaction.”⁶⁵ To make matters worse, Shaye employed *Dreamscape* scripter Chuck Russell⁶⁶ to take Craven’s place. With the script rewritten by Russell and Frank Darabont, the pair took a screenplay credit and this situation spiralled into a Writer’s Guild dispute; one which supported the sequel director’s significant changes.⁶⁷ Having exploited Craven’s name as a means of legitimising their third film, New Line expanded their audience and appeased the critics of *Freddy’s Revenge* and captured the attention of the first film’s core audience.

During his overwhelmingly negative experience with Warner Bros on *Deadly Friend*,⁶⁸ a film chosen because of the networking Studio-based opportunities it would provide, Craven lost out on *Beetlejuice* and a mainstream sequel maker with Warner's flagship franchise, *Superman IV*.⁶⁹ Just as his professional relationship with Warner's was failing to work out as hoped, the director also had to contend with a civil lawsuit stemming from an *Elm Street* copycat crime. Furthermore, tabloid headlines connected the third film with a rise in teen suicide and the film's alleged glamorisation of it. These professional trials were confounded by his being "raked over the financial coals"⁷⁰ in a divorce. The cumulative effect of these events intensified the director's need to escape the industry, its trappings and geographical locale and take on another project.

In this respect, Craven has recalled how *The Serpent and the Rainbow* "was good because it got me out of the country awhile and onto a big picture."⁷¹ Relocating to Haiti for this adaptation of Wade Davis' autobiographical tale of politics, voodoo and modern medicine, Craven's cast and crew confronted real-life horrors. In many ways this politically unstable environment added to the authenticity of the piece. Made for Paramount Pictures, who had previously offered Craven the chance to direct their *Friday the 13th* clone *April Fool's Day*, this film was a further attempt to broaden his resume⁷² and provide him with an opportunity to integrate other genres into his work. For Craven, *Serpent* had real crossover potential in that "it had all the things I'm known to be strong at...but also things I wanted to demonstrate I could do – a love story, political content."⁷³ Indeed, the finished film was an authentic addition to the voodoo/zombie sub-genre which received solid reviews upon its release. It was also dependable in its inclusion of all the hallmarks associated with a Wes Craven film –

nightmares and hallucinations followed by a climactic confrontation featuring a protagonist and horrible scarred villain whose power comes from previous victims. Although parallels with *Elm Street* are undeniable, this decision to adapt a literary text as an alternative to the Hollywood Horror franchise or imitations echoes that of Coscarelli.⁷⁴

As if to consolidate the fact that there was no escaping Freddy or the franchise, Craven was contacted by New Line regarding a fourth *Elm Street* film. So far the franchise had “defied the law of diminishing returns”⁷⁵ but, according to Shaye, Craven’s proposed time-travelling narrative within dreams “was not workable”⁷⁶ with the company preferring Kotzwinkle’s *Dream Master* proposal. Without a finished script throughout production, New Line drafted in at least four other writers to impose some form of coherency upon the special-effects laden proceedings. Despite the chaotic schedule, and seemingly disparate approach to the formulaic narrative structure, *Nightmare 4* met its mid August release date. Furthermore it succeeded Carpenter’s *Halloween* as the most successfully independent film at that time. Whereas New Line allegedly contacted Craven as a matter of creative courtesy, *Halloween* financier Moustapha Akkad was unable to exploit his stake in the franchise without Carpenter’s active support. Consequently, he began applying legal pressure for Carpenter to “put up or shut up,”⁷⁷ regarding Michael Myers’ resurrection.

Regarding *Elm Street*’s success in New Line’s growth and expansion, Shaye has publicly drawn a line at his company being called ‘The House that Freddy Built.’ Nevertheless, the producer has conceded that the franchise certainly “catalysed”⁷⁸ the company and allowed it “to gain some sales momentum”⁷⁹ in the marketplace. In keeping with its over-exploitation of the franchise with the syndication of *Freddy’s*

Nightmares,⁸⁰ New Line prematurely threw itself into a fifth film to accompany a multitude of official merchandising agreements.

Having replicated part four's recruitment strategy and over-complicated a dictated script development period, New Line's *The Dream Child* was astutely likened to an old MGM musical "built around huge production numbers, slick high-tech dream sequences featuring Freddy dancing around and cutting into slower moving partners."⁸¹ With Kruger's iconic success inspiring independent production companies and Studio sources alike to compete and create their own franchise-friendly serial killers,⁸² Shaye was attempting to pre-empt the competition within a dwindling window of commercial opportunity. And so, with the 1980s drawing to a close, the genre was over-populated with a myriad of slavishly designed and poorly executed Kruger-clones.

Following his foray into voodoo territory, Craven returned to Hollywood with a vengeance. Like Carpenter, the director signed a genre-specific deal with Universal/Alive films that guaranteed "complete autonomy"⁸³ and the opportunity to create a rival franchise to Freddy on his own terms.⁸⁴ Perceived as bankable commodities and franchise creators, Craven and Carpenter were attractive to Alive on account of their profile and association with the Hollywood Horror franchise. Craven's first picture was a self-conscious attempt at creating the next great anti-hero for American audiences. *Shocker: No More Mr. Nice Guy* however, was an ambitiously flawed variation on a common theme which bore more than a passing resemblance to Cunningham's *The Horror Show*⁸⁵ which featured its own wisecracking serial killer Max Jenke. The resurrection of serial killers sent to the electric chair functioned as a springboard for both these special effects laden narratives. Whereas Cunningham's film placed the family at the heart of its police procedural narrative, Craven's was the more

successful of the two with its channel-hopping premise and high school protagonist. Irrespective of directors' intentions, the franchise predominantly depends upon a first film's success and, in these cases, box office and video rental receipts have failed to justify a return to the material— at least for the time being.⁸⁶

Craven's failure to consciously create the next Freddy Kruger led to a retreat of sorts into his news-related research files along with classic fairy tale narratives and archetypes. Also inspired by his previous attachment to an adaptation of Virginia Andrews bestseller *Flowers in the Attic*, itself the first in a long-running literary franchise and family saga, *The People Under the Stairs* conspicuously dropped Craven's signature dream sequences and imposed shock epilogues. Nevertheless, it sharpened his focus on dysfunctional family values with an added socio-economic subtext.

Even though this second project fared better with audiences and critics on account of its claustrophobic setting and fable-like qualities, Craven returned to the relative confines of television horror with the short-lived *Nightmare Café* in 1992. This fondness for diversification to facilitate career development has been a staple of Craven's career in conjunction with the franchise. In much the same way that Carpenter sought to emulate Hitchcock anthology series with Showtime's *Body Bags*, Craven's concept co-starred a post-*Freddy's Dead* Robert Englund as Blackie, the enigmatic proprietor of a *Twilight Zone*-esque last stop for lost and disconcerted souls. As mediator and franchise star, Englund suggested that Shaye should and could contact Craven if they were indeed intent on cheating audiences with a seventh *Nightmare* after the 3-D disappointment of *Freddy's Dead*.

Although first film directors Scott, Verhoeven and Carpenter have been tempted to return to the franchise in the wake of numerous sequels,⁸⁷ only Craven has returned to the franchise that cemented his reputation.⁸⁸ Prior to Craven's return, New Line had similarly approached *Friday the 13th* creator Cunningham about reacquiring the rights to his franchise, with the ultimate goal being *Freddy vs Jason*. Previously unable to compromise with Paramount on this project, New Line was keen to secure Cunningham's support and participation as part of a lucrative negative pick-up.⁸⁹ Having failed to create or participate in franchises for Universal, Warner Bros or even Paramount, Craven's decision to reinvent the *Elm Street* franchise was a solid business decision. His participation provided New Line with the necessary hook to sell the sequel to audiences and gave the director the opportunity to show Shaye and Studio executives how the sequels should have been done.

When asked to reflect on their treatment and evolution of the franchise, Craven has since remarked how:

"I would have hoped that the *Elm Street* films would have been treated with absolute respect all along the way. That's not a snipe against New Line, but I would have liked to have seen somebody sit down each time they set out to make one of the sequels and really get into the philosophy and the heart behind it. My first film was about some very serious and important subjects. I felt that with 2 they immediately threw all the important issues out the window and made it a series of strange, freaky events and the same old raunchy teenagers. I tried to wrestle it back with 3 and then the series tended to wander, depending on the talent of the directors and the commitment of the writers. Sometimes I had the feeling that they just went with somebody who could knock out a

script rather than somebody who had a true vision...I'd be a very wealthy man right now if I'd done them all but I really don't know if I could have done it."⁹⁰

Despite questioning his creative ability to sustain the franchise throughout five sequels, Craven is nevertheless aware of the financial incentives involved and, at that point, publicly more diplomatic towards New Line. Under their supervision however, continued association with the franchise meant supporting the company's mainstream aspirations and Shaye's formulaic framework. According to Craven, the conditions of his return revolved around "being satisfied with the deal and my demands being met"⁹¹ "in both an artistic and business sense."⁹² Indeed, it was in the wake of a diplomatically termed "very frank discussion"⁹³ with Shaye that "significant payments and a very uniform and predictable accounting of profits"⁹⁴ took place where New Line "made good on many things."⁹⁵ Armed with an excellent lawyer, Craven found it "attractive to come back from a position of strength,"⁹⁶ whereby he could not only insist on a bigger budget than previously allocated, but could also redirect the Hollywood Horror franchise on his own terms.

With the financial side addressed and redressed to the director's satisfaction, Craven had the task of creating "a way to bring Freddy back without violating the nature of the story or offending the audience"⁹⁷ with no "idea of what kind of film to make."⁹⁸ In reassembling key cast members and fusing key elements of the franchise with real-life events and a film-within a film framework, Craven shot the film as a "documentary in both look and concept."⁹⁹ Attributing his film with an added depth during publicity interviews, Craven stated that the film owed "more to films about Hollywood than traditional horror films."¹⁰⁰ Pitched as a multi-layered look at the violence in film, our

culture and how it affects audiences and filmmakers, Craven's *New Nightmare* was the "first almost unintentional deconstruction of the horror film."¹⁰¹

With a premise similar to King's *The Dark Half*,¹⁰² this self-conscious examination of the Hollywood Horror franchise was carved from an insider's perspective and expanded on the first film's conceit. A reactionary return to the character's "darker origins"¹⁰³ was accompanied by several satirical swipes at New Line's approach which "watered (it) down...to make it an easier sell."¹⁰⁴ Furthermore, the casting of Shaye and co-producer Sarah Rischer as themselves allowed Craven to comment on their exploitation and mismanagement of the franchise. And so, in returning to the Hollywood Horror franchise, Craven was able to re-establish himself as its on and off-screen creator, address some of his own concerns and respond to critics of both the franchise and the genre within his effective fairy tale premise.

With the film completed under budget and on schedule, test screening results saw New Line allocate extra funds to "punch up"¹⁰⁵ its final act. Nevertheless, Craven was ultimately reminded of past experiences in the form of suggestions from Shaye's executives as to the film's tone, title and marketing campaign.¹⁰⁶ This situation brought Craven's involvement with the franchise full circle and confirmed his need to "say goodbye to it."¹⁰⁷ In terms of reception, this seventh instalment created a dramatic discrepancy between audiences and critics. Whereas the box office gross failed to live up to expectations and marked the lowest for the series, mainstream reviewers responded favourably to the self-referential plot and fairy tale analogy and the director receiving "some of the best reviews"¹⁰⁸ he'd ever had. Consequently regarded as a commercial misstep, Craven nevertheless subverted and experimented with the formula to re-evaluate his first film concept and concerns. Furthermore, this film demonstrates

the distance that exists between a first film director's diverse intentions and audience's formulaic demands which constrict the versatility and potential of the Hollywood Horror franchise.

After leaving New Line and his *New Nightmare* behind, Craven was approached by writer/producer/star Eddie Murphy to direct his latest Horror/Comedy *Vampire in Brooklyn*, a project the star had been developing with his brother at Paramount. This as an opportunity for Craven to work with a high profile cast on a relatively bigger budget. Moreover, it would allow him to demonstrate his flair for comedy by collaborating with Murphy; a star who was in need of a hit at this point in his career. This situation was similar to the way in which Carpenter had courted mainstream credibility with the comic assistance of Chevy Chase in 1992's *Memoirs of an Invisible Man*.

Conceived as a homage to such early Blaxploitation Horrors as *Blacula* and its sequel *Scream*, *Blacula*, *Scream*, *Vampire in Brooklyn* emerged as a desperately inconsistent Horror-Comedy hybrid in which Vampirism and culture clash comedy were unevenly combined. Unfortunately for Craven, the chances of success were untenable from the outset. Creatively compromised and caught between meeting the needs of the Star or the Studio, Murphy's determination to escape his own stereotyping saw him push for a more terrifying film than Paramount, and perhaps even Craven, wanted. None too surprisingly, and in light of such production in-fighting, the film suffered a similar fate to Carpenter's special effects extravaganza and fell flat between the two genres, achieving little in the way of laughs or screams.

Completing the Trilogy

First written as a 25-page script by Kevin Williamson, and based on an idea he had watching a Barbara Walters TV special on the Gainesville murders,¹⁰⁹ this *Scary Movie* was intended to be “sold to Roger Corman for \$5000.”¹¹⁰ However, a bidding war involving Universal, Paramount and Morgan Creek saw Williamson accept a \$500,000 offer from Miramax whose Dimension label was in need of a flagship property. More importantly, the writer also submitted a five-page treatment for *Scream 2* and *3*, shrewdly suggesting that, “if they bought this script they would have a possible franchise on their hands.”¹¹¹ Aware of the project’s franchise potential, Bob and Harvey Weinstein aggressively courted Craven to direct, despite his deliberate attempts to escape such projects and the trappings of genre filmmaking. Currently involved in developing a remake of Shirley Jackson's *The Haunting* with them at Miramax, a remake with a more mainstream feel, Craven passed on *Scream* at this stage.

After the search went from Robert Rodriguez and Danny Boyle to Anthony Waller and George Jung, Dimension put Craven’s project into turnaround and immediately offered him *Scream* for the second time. By this point, the film was in production with star Drew Barrymore attached. With no other projects on the immediate horizon, Craven warmed to the film’s tricky mix of horror and humour aware that he, and many others, had done it badly in the past. Nevertheless, the director was understandably reluctant to re-embrace the genre having struggled for so long to diversify his interests and enhance his mainstream reputation. Due to the combination of a strong script, rising star and a stalled project Craven committed to making the film and, in some respects, a return to his *Last House* roots.

Scream's basic prerequisite is the knowledge and familiarity of its audience with the rules, formulas and conventions of the genre. Its success lies in the playful subversion of these rules, explicitly stated by the virgin Randy,¹¹² to manipulate the audience. “Never meant to be anything but a wicked film,”¹¹³ *Scream* was a self-referential homage to *Terror Train* (1980), *Prom Night* (1980) and, of course, *Halloween* (1979). United through 'Scream Queen' Jamie Lee Curtis, these films provided the blueprint for this fresh take on a previously exhausted formula. From the expertly executed opening that borrows heavily from *When a Stranger Calls*, a movie conspicuously not acknowledged yet recently remade, through to its blood soaked climax the film is littered with references for the cine-literate. Furthermore *Scream* juggled shocks and scares more effectively than any other film that preceded it.

Craven's return to the intensity of his earlier films also paved the way for further controversy. Despite early conflicts with the Weinsteins over their need for consultation, further pressures emerged when the Santa Rosa City School District Governing Board withdrew permission to shoot at the local High School at the eleventh hour. The situation escalated when the local media incited the community to protest and jumped on the bandwagon with complaints, petitions and letters to the editor singling Craven out and attacking the director personally. Despite receiving no such complaints or negative comments from test-screening reports regarding intensity and gore, Craven recalls how the MPAA classified the movie as being “a wonderful example of an NC-17;”¹¹⁴ adding that it would “probably never be able to get an R rating.”¹¹⁵ Submitted to the board several times, a protracted battle over intensity, imitation and the movement of innards resulted in the removal of twenty seconds of footage. In addition, the film's soundtrack was similarly targeted for complaints,

leaving the director frustrated that his best work was not allowed to find his audience as intended.

Following impressive test-screenings, after which the film “scored in the 80’s and 90’s for everything,”¹¹⁶ the Studio offered Craven a two-picture deal stipulating one other horror picture, *Scream 2*, and the opportunity to select one of the non-genre projects they had in production. Confronted with the opportunity to finally experiment outside the confines of his career-long genre stereotyping, Craven agreed. His eventual selection was 1999’s *Music of the Heart* with Madonna originally set to feature in the starring role. Previously known as *Fifty Violins* and *Fiddlefest*, the \$7 million movie was based on an award winning short film. The director had connected with its focus on classical music and depiction of schoolteachers, divorce and a broken home. Eventually starring Meryl Streep, the film was based on the inspiring true story of a teacher battling for the right to teach music in a tough Harlem school. For Craven then, it took a deliberate return to the genre and the Hollywood Horror franchise for him to finally break out of it; demonstrating its role and potential to provide filmmakers with new opportunities.

Further exploiting his association with a critically and commercially successful franchise, Craven has supported the next generation of fear filmmakers by using his name to endorse specific projects as the genre’s answer to Steven Spielberg.¹¹⁷ Propagated by the likes of Spielberg, and taken up by directors like Cunningham, Carpenter and Craven, the role of industry-based mentor has allowed those directors with marquee names to use their brand name value as a means of publicising and promoting films involving fresh talent. This trend has increased in recent years and, as

we will see in Chapter 3, the Hollywood Horror franchise has played a vital role in its development.

It began by experienced genre directors like Craven and Carpenter having their names incorporated into film titles as part of the marketing campaign¹¹⁸ and producer Cunningham has used both the *House* franchise and more recent instalments in New Line's *Friday the 13th* franchise to "try out directors and writers I'm interested in."¹¹⁹ Indeed, from *Friday the 13th* directors Steve Miner and Adam Marcus through to *House* screenwriters Ethan Wiley and Lewis Abernathy, Cunningham has actively supported directors debuts through his franchise ownership.¹²⁰ Initiated by Craven under the guise of nepotism on 1995's *Mindripper*,¹²¹ this new stage in his career has since extended to several titles.¹²² Although a second experience as Presenter / executive producer involved supporting Special Effects artist Robert Kurtzman's directorial debut *Wishmaster* in 1997,¹²³ it was not until Adam Grossman's misguided and much-maligned *Carnival of Souls* remake in 1998 that Craven described his new found function as a "mixed experience."¹²⁴

Also in 1998, Craven's production company, Craven/Maddalena films followed *Scream 2* by branching out into Television and co-producing Larry Shaw's *Don't Look Down*¹²⁵ and signed an agreement with Dimension which saw his name used to promote in-house projects and acquisitions alike. Dimension exploited the director's name in promoting Harmon's *They* in 2002¹²⁶ and falsely advertised it as 'A Wes Craven film' in the UK. Such dishonest and misleading tactics are in danger of displacing, if only for publicity purposes, the role and responsibility of the director.

More recently, Craven has been a producer on Affleck and Damon's screenwriting talent contest Project Greenlight. This third season deliberately focused on the Horror genre for its commercial potential a means of guaranteeing a return on its investment with *Feast*. Similarly, the director has supported and executive produced first features by long-serving crew members Patrick Lussier and Nicholas Mastandrea¹²⁷ and mentored Vince Marcello's second feature – an adaptation of the musical *Zombie Prom*. Having supported Alexandre Aja's selection as the director of a *The Hills Have Eyes* remake after viewing *Haute Tension*, Craven has also committed to producing his next film *The Waiting*. However, in this role of mentor, Craven is admittedly “at the mercy of (directors) and how well they can do it”¹²⁸ with varying levels of participation in these projects dragging his reliability as a marketable brand name into disrepute.

Passing the \$100 million mark, *Scream* evolved into a modern Hollywood phenomenon that saw the major Studios green-light a slew of imitations and similarly themed films.¹²⁹ Consequently, the Weinsteins were equally keen to cash in on its success and rushed into its loosely outlined sequel. Forced to put his werewolf opus, *Bad Moon Rising*, on hold, Craven once again returned from a position of strength without a fleshed out script from Williamson. According to the writer, *Scream 2* “should have sucked for the way we made it (but) Wes did a phenomenal job – a better job than he did on the first...it was a nightmare,”¹³⁰ one that Craven recalls involving “a lot of collaboration.”¹³¹ Nevertheless, this situation allowed him to develop the material in keeping with his own interests and concerns as well as Romero's *Dawn of the Dead* experience. Shrouded in secrecy and dogged by eager fans desperate to discover the latest plot twists, the shoot consisted of many embellishments, amendments and additions throughout the rushed schedule. Publicised by Craven and the Studio as the second part of a trilogy, despite the absence of a ‘cliff-hanger,’¹³² Craven once again

used the Hollywood Horror franchise to address his critics and redress the balance in the film/media/violence debate.

Departing from standard slasher sequel conventions by focusing on a trio of core protagonists, as opposed to the literal resurrection of the first film's killers, *Scream 2* brought Horror back to its theatrical roots. The film's structure focused on spectatorship within society with each of the three acts and slasher set-pieces played out on one kind of stage or another. Swiftly re-establishing old characters and introducing new ones, the film referenced college-based splatter films¹³³ before settling on *Friday the 13th* for its true inspiration. In terms of thematic approach and 'message', Craven satirically responded to the genre's critics but lacked conviction on the merits of the Hollywood Horror franchise.

For its final act, the director has since recalled how Mickey's motivation and dialogue was "done in conference,"¹³⁴ to encapsulate the filmmakers' collective response. Indeed, Mickey's seemingly absurd and calculated plan to blame the movies is smothered with irony as he highlights his trail's potential for celebrity, notoriety and media frenzy. Contrary to its predecessor however, Craven's final cut of *Scream 2* was left untouched by the censors. Whether this was the result of Craven learning to work within the system, a studio playing it safe or a censor reluctant to 'take on' a high profile release is debatable.

Debuting with a box office weekend of \$32.9 million just one year after the first film, *Scream 2* soon outstripped the financial success of its predecessor. It also earned what John Muir has deemed a "'grudging respect"¹³⁵ from critics despite Clive Barker's warning that "if you make a picture that has some real originality in the market place

you're gonna get kicked hard on the second picture whatever happens critically.”¹³⁶ However, the price for this success was the standard tabloid controversy, moral panic and industry-wide repercussions. In this respect Craven's *Scream* franchise was no exception. A worldwide media backlash associated the franchise with a series of alleged copycat crimes and killings in various countries. The Columbine Massacre emerged as a catalyst to potential political intervention and a nationwide discussion of violence in the media and this placed the franchise in the spotlight. Nevertheless, as Craven's third attempt at directing the Hollywood Horror franchise, *Scream 2* revealed the extent to which a concept could evolve and encompass cultural and thematic concerns in conjunction with the expectations of audiences and critics.

Craven's chance to complete the trilogy was secured once scriptwriter Williamson declined the assignment in favour of pet project *Killing Mrs Tingle*.¹³⁷ In direct contrast to his relationship with New Line's *Nightmare* franchise, Craven maintained his commitment and even compared the trilogy to Coppola's *Godfather* films. Williamson's departure provided Craven with an ideal opportunity to create *Scream 3* in accordance with his own vision and this meant a “complete page-one rethinking of everything”¹³⁸ rather than the proposed *Return to Woodsboro*. Despite his willingness to complete the trilogy, intense media speculation and scape-goating of the franchise caused Craven to reconsider his role in an “increasingly chancy business.”¹³⁹ With the combined threat of a Congressional Witch-Hunt and potential legal action looming on the horizon, Craven later confessed to a “moment of introspection”¹⁴⁰ prior to shooting. As a key member of the DGA's Task Force on Violence and Social Responsibility, the director nevertheless drew the line at the Studio's suggestion he shoot the sequel “bloodless, with no violence at all.”¹⁴¹ With both its script and schedule in a perpetual state of flux and multiple versions, sub-plots and scenarios entertained, shot but ultimately

discarded,¹⁴² Craven was once again placed under the intense pressure of conflicting schedules, media speculation and a high profile Christmas release date.¹⁴³

Similar to the way in which *Scream* referenced *Halloween* and its sequel homaged *Friday the 13th*, the third film evoked Franklin's *Psycho II*; itself a variation of the 1964 film *Straitjacket* scripted by Robert Bloch. Presenting Sidney as a potential latter-day Norman Bates, the movie dared the audience to question her sanity with Mother's voice and image pushing her closer to the edge. A double mystery drives the narrative with Sidney as the fundamental link between them. In contrast to the first two films, *Scream 3* turns duplicity into duality as characters confront and interact with their cinematic counterparts. In presenting a concise and coherent defence from within, Craven sought to pre-empt criticism with comedy and satire. He also offered audiences alternative theories and explanations by holding society to account and stressing the notion of personal/parental responsibility. However, in blatantly ignoring its 'super trilogy rules,' *Scream 3* shied away from dispatching its core trio and built towards a relatively satisfying yet predictable climax. Here, Sidney functions as the Final Girl and returns to the role of Laurie Strode by coming face to face with her own half-brother. Furthermore, by stabbing him in the back with an ice pick in true Hollywood fashion she becomes a better Sharon Stone than her mother ever was.

With a budget increase to \$40 million and yet another large publicity campaign, *Scream 3* exploded across 3,467 US cinema screens on February 4 2000. Thanks to Miramax's market saturation strategy the film took almost \$35 million in its first three days. Whether a reflection of the current climate, numerous imitations or less than enthusiastic reviews from audiences and critics, *Scream 3*'s takings dropped in subsequent weeks and the film failed to top the \$100 million mark. That the film plays

so well despite its fraught production and revisionist scripting is a testament to both cast and crew with some exceptionally sharp dialogue and strong set pieces offering audiences something fresh in and amongst the familiar codes and conventions. Shying away from the explicit 'knowingness' of the previous entries but retaining the use of cameo roles (with Carrie Fisher as standout), the franchise's tonal shift from cutting edge post-modern slasher to romantic murder mystery clearly betrayed a more mainstream sensibility at work, one the director had been cultivating long before *Scream*. In this respect, Craven's success with the *Scream* trilogy has demonstrated the extent to which a director can fuse personal concerns with mainstream profitability through directing the Hollywood Horror franchise.

Having sufficiently distanced himself from New Line's *Freddy Vs Jason* after a decade in development hell, Craven's initial post-*Scream* output was hampered by a series of unfortunate set-backs, stalled projects and closed doors despite the creatively shrewd choices he made. From a video game adaptation of *Alice* through to a remake of the Japanese success story *Pulse*,¹⁴⁴ the director sought to capitalise on the latest crazes and follow up his franchise success with a suitable crossover project. Similarly, attempts to raise support for an adaptation of his first novel, *Fountain Society*, have yet to reach fruition despite the project finding a more supportive home at Dreamworks after Dimension failed to meet the script's budgetary requirements.

Having considered *Scary Movie* a lesson in "how quickly Hollywood can render you obsolete"¹⁴⁵ and openly rejected any possibility of directing *Scream 4*, Craven experienced a profound sense of déjà vu as the Weinsteins once again pulled out of the director's proposed remake of *Pulse* to push for a reunion with screenwriter Williamson on *Cursed*. A werewolf project following the UK's *Dog Soldiers* and Canada's *Ginger*

Snaps,¹⁴⁶ *Cursed* initially saw the Weinsteins predict *Scream*-like success, mistakenly setting their sights and expectations, along with those of the industry and audiences, exceptionally high from the outset.

However, what began as a relatively high concept film featuring Hollywood werewolves, in the same vein as Dante's *The Howling*, altered over the course of two years. According to Craven the film underwent "four major shoots"¹⁴⁷ as it transformed into a soft-core adaptation of Mike Nichols' analogous *Wolf* for a teen audience. Arguably reminiscent of the director's experiences on *Deadly Friend*, the final straw was the Weinsteins' decision to edit the film for a PG-13 rating,¹⁴⁸ by which point Craven had fulfilled his contractual obligations to the project and chose to walk away.¹⁴⁹

Having experienced extreme levels of interference from New Line, Warner Bros and now the Weinsteins,¹⁵⁰ Craven sought to immerse himself in a new project and has pointedly commented how he was "treated with more respect"¹⁵¹ by Dreamworks on *Red Eye*. A claustrophobic conspiracy thriller with mainstream potential this late summer release addressed Craven's specific structural and thematic concerns. With survival, self-sufficiency and the home invasion integral aspects of the production, *Red Eye* was a calculated return to form that was safe formulaic fun yet featured a third act that was classic Craven complete with false scares and knife-wielding Final Girl. Despite the film's mainstream potential and PG-13 rating, Dreamworks deliberately emphasised the director's reputation and role as the creator of *Scream* and *A Nightmare on Elm Street* throughout its promotional material; thereby highlighting the continued importance and exploitation of the Hollywood Horror franchise.

Following the relative success of *Red Eye* and having survived the debacle that was *Cursed*, Craven continued to exploit his back catalogue and the Hollywood Horror franchise as he embarked on the next phase of his career – one that brought him full circle. Indeed, the success of *The Hills Have Eyes* remake not only led to demands for a sequel a year later¹⁵² but also revived interest in redoing *Last House on the Left*. Arguably it was this product in conjunction with Craven’s brand name marquee status that facilitated a deal with Rogue Pictures – the genre division of Universal’s Focus Features which also owns the rights to *Shocker* and *The People Under the Stairs*. With Craven and his producing partner brought into the fold as Midnight Pictures, this deal will ensure Craven’s association with the genre and the Hollywood Horror franchise.

In Hollywood Craven has found an industry where, “everything is so short-term, dependent on the whim of the public and business things you have no control over, like how the economy is going, and how well your film is distributed, or what ad campaign they come up with, or even what the title is.”¹⁵³ Nevertheless, the director has emerged as one of the most influential directors working in the genre despite several attempts to distance himself from it. In scripting a second *The Hills Have Eyes* sequel with his son, Jonathan, the director has continued to combine his franchise exploitation with a fondness for nepotism. In taking on the mantles of mentor through numerous film and television projects, Craven has undoubtedly exploited and capitalised on his success and that of the Hollywood Horror franchise. Furthermore he has weathered the limitations and controversy that invariably accompany such accolades and has repeatedly stressed how Horror has been a “a lonely watch”¹⁵⁴ at times.

Working with and against such stereotyping at various junctures in his career, Craven has exploited his critical and commercial status. Moreover he has temporarily broken

out from under the Horror banner and supported the next generation of genre filmmakers and consistently attempted generic diversification despite an ambivalent attitude towards it. Although the demands of Studios, audiences and censors are paradoxical, Craven has survived, and indeed thrived, by negotiating a difficult path through these potential pitfalls in the Hollywood film industry. In this respect, and during the course of thirty-five years, Craven has not only made many of the classic mistakes associated with the genre, but also participated in some of its most recognisable advances and achievements, particularly within the Hollywood Horror franchise.

End Notes

¹ Prawer, 1980: 46-7.

² David Szulkin. 'The Hills Were Alive.' *Fangoria* 132. May 1994. p12-19 & 82. (p15).

³ Prior to his film career, Craven had been a College Humanities teacher and fathered two children. By 1970 however, Craven was separated from his family and working as a taxi driver before his post-production experiences with Cunningham.

⁴ The film was tested under a number of titles including *Krug & Company* and *Sex Crime of the Century* until an experienced 'ad man' suggested the unrelated yet effective title *Last House on the Left*.

⁵ Although Craven had returned to the genre Cunningham had up to this point resisted industry pressure to return to Horror. Steve Biodrowski. 'Sean Cunningham: House Keeper.' *Gorezone*. 21. Spring 1992. pp 8-12. (p8).

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid, p9.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Mark Kermode. *Scream and Scream Again: A History of the Slasher film*. 2000. Abbott and Leven.

¹⁰ McDonagh, 1995: 91.

¹¹ Steve Biodrowski. 'Sean Cunningham: House Keeper.' *Gorezone*. 21. Spring 1992. pp 8-12. (p9)

¹² McDonagh, 1995: 88. Cunningham has since stated how "prior to *Friday the 13th*, the biggest release you might get would be with something like *Halloween*, where the distributor would go into town with 75 prints, buy some ads and hope for the best before moving on to the next town." Steve Biodrowski. 'Sean Cunningham: House Keeper.' *Gorezone*. 21. Spring 1992. pp 8-12. (p9).

¹³ Kim Newman. 'The Truth About Zombies.' *Shock Xpress*. Vol 2. No 4. Summer 1988. pp 32-33. (p32).

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Kim Newman. 'Interview: Wes Craven.' *Shock Xpress*. Vol 1. No 2. Sept/Oct 1985. pp1-3. (p2).

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ This sentiment was echoed only a few years later by returning director Hooper. His much maligned follow up fell foul of Cannon's interference yet depicted a daring shift in tone and content. However, it received mixed receptions from first film fans. Tobe Hooper Interview. 'Texas Chainsaw Massacre: The Shocking Truth.' Texas Chainsaw Massacre: Special Edition DVD.

¹⁸ Robb, 1998: 66.

¹⁹ Taken from Interviews with Craven in *Scream and Scream Again*.

²⁰ Iaccino, 1994: 173. The characters surname harked back to the director's first film and the character of Krug Stillo. While Craven drew the forename of this ultimate bad father from his past, the concept dated back to Germanic folklore and Kermode has rightfully pointed out how we "only have to look at a picture of Heimrich Hoffman's Straw Peter or Lon-legged Scissorman to know who Freddy Kruger's parents really are." *Scream and Scream Again: A History of the Slasher film*. 2000. Abbott and Leven.

²¹ Disney expressed some interest but wanted to dilute it for a family audience. Paramount Pictures passed on the project due to its similarity to *Dreamscape* – a film they had been developing for director Joe Ruben with writer Chuck Russell. This script bore a striking resemblance to Craven's and according to the director such an experience which "hurt me a lot, mentally and financially." Robb, 1998: 67-8.

²² Dan Scapperotti. 'New Line Cinema: The House That Freddy Built.' *Cinefantastique*. Vol 20. No 1/2. Nov 1989. pp 89 & 124-5. (p89).

²³ Marc Shapiro. 'Is Wes Craven Still Scared?' *Gorezone* 11. Jan 90. pp 44-7. (p47).

²⁴ The film shot for 32 days on a budget under \$2 million.

²⁵ Wes Craven. *A Nightmare on Elm Street* Commentary.

²⁶ The three endings included Shaye's, with Freddy at the wheel, Craven's apocalyptic original, and "an ending with which we both had toyed, where Nancy's mother is grabbed by Freddy." Schoell and Spenser, 1992: IX.

²⁷ Fischer, 1991: 261.

²⁸ Sean Cunningham Interview. *Scream and Scream Again*. Documentary.

²⁹ Royce Freeman. 'Interview: Victor Miller.'

<http://www.pitofhorror.com/main/miller.html> (Downloaded: May 20th 2002).

³⁰ For example, what were once the *Night of Anubis*, *Headcheese*, *The Babysitter Murders*, *The Never Dead*, *Book of the Dead*, *God's Army* and *The Black Hills Project* later became known as *Night of the Living Dead*, *The Texas Chainsaw Massacre*, *Halloween*, *Phantasm*, *The Evil Dead*, *Prophecy* and *The Blair Witch Project*.

³¹ Schoell and Spenser, 1992: ix.

³² Dan Gire. 'Bye, Bye Freddy!' *Cinefantastique*. Vol 18. No 5. July 1988. pp8-10. (p11).

³³ McDonagh, 1995: 89.

³⁴ Many critics and industry insiders accused Spielberg of taking over the film at Hooper's expense. The Director's Guild awarded Hooper \$15, 000 damages finding that the trailer 'denigrated the role of director' and made MGM take full page ads in three trade publications apologizing to Hooper and the DGA. Spielberg later made his own public apology and confessed how, "I thought I'd be able to turn *Poltergeist* over to a director and walk away, I was wrong," before adding how, "I won't put someone else through what I put Tobe through, and I'll be more honest in my contribution to a film." (paraphrased from McBride:1997 pp338-339)

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Anthony C. Ferrante. 'Memoirs of an Invisible Director.' *Fangoria* 110. March 1992. pp42-45. (p45).

³⁷ In this respect Carpenter had some success with his ghost story *The Fog* and the action-orientated *Escape from New York*.

-
- ³⁸ Rosenthal had impressed Hill and Carpenter with his short film *The Toyer*, and was offered the assignment after collaborator and protégé Tommy Lee Wallace had turned the director down on the basis of the Carpenter's over-involvement.
- ³⁹ Cumbrow, 2000: 68.
- ⁴⁰ During a shoot for additional scenes to create the first film's Television version, Carpenter's scenes and inserts for Rosenthal's sequel included two murders (with a knife and then a hammer) and a close up of the hypodermic needle murder.
- ⁴¹ Despite his involvement in the first sequel, Carpenter concurs with star Curtis that the movie stinks and should never have been made.
- ⁴² Chuck Crisafulli. 'Mr Friday Night.' *Cinefantastique*. Vol 24. No 3/4. Oct 1993. pp 118-119. (p119).
- ⁴³ McDonagh, 1995: 92.
- ⁴⁴ Ibid.
- ⁴⁵ Ibid.
- ⁴⁶ Steve Biodrowski. 'Sean S. Cunningham: House Keeper.' *Gorezone* 21. Spring 1992. pp 8-12. (p9).
- ⁴⁷ Wes Craven Interview. '*Scream and Scream Again*.' Documentary.
- ⁴⁸ John Gallagher. 'I, Director, I Screenwriter, I Madman.' *Fangoria* 80. February 1989. pp 44-47. (p45).
- ⁴⁹ Laurent Bouzereau. 'Elm Street: Freddy's Revenge. The Man Behind the Mask; Director Jack Sholder.' *L'Ecran Fantastique*. No 66. March 1986. pp 46-49. (p49).
- ⁵⁰ Kim Newman. 'Englund's Nightmare.' *New Musical Express*. November 7th 1987. p20.
- ⁵¹ Robb, 1998: 92.
- ⁵² Kim Newman. 'Englund's Nightmare.' *New Musical Express*. November 7th 1987. p20. For a detailed examination of this homoerotic reading of the film see Benschhoff, 1997.
- ⁵³ McDonagh, 1995: 189.
- ⁵⁴ This was New Line's director of licensing and promotions at the time, Kevin Benson, commenting upon the Kruger phenomenon in Robb, 1998: 83.
- ⁵⁵ Schell and Spenser, 1992: 199.
- ⁵⁶ Ibid.
- ⁵⁷ Craven has referred to his first Studio picture as "one of my worst films." David A. Szulkin. 'Last House Mates.' *Fangoria* 200. March 2001. pp 56-60 & 98. (p98).
- ⁵⁸ Marc Shapiro. 'Is Wes Craven Still Scared?' *Gorezone* 11. January 1990. pp 44-47. (p46).
- ⁵⁹ Dan Gire. 'Bye, Bye Freddy!' *Cinefantastique*. Vol 18. No 5. July 1988. pp8-10. (p9).
- ⁶⁰ With the exception being Damiano Damiani's *Amityville II: The Possession* (1982).
- ⁶¹ Marc Shapiro. 'A Nightmare on Elm Street 3: Dream Warriors' *Fangoria* 62. pp 35-39 & 66. (p66).
- ⁶² Ibid.
- ⁶³ Dan Gire. 'Bye, Bye Freddy!' *Cinefantastique*. Vol 18. No 5. July 1988. pp 8-10. (p9).
- ⁶⁴ Marc Shapiro. 'A Nightmare on Elm Street 3: Dream Warriors' *Fangoria* 62. pp 35-39 & 66. (p66).
- ⁶⁵ Marc Shapiro. 'Wes Craven's Psycho-Analysis.' *Fangoria* 138. pp 32-36. (p35).
- ⁶⁶ The irony of Russell's appointment was not lost on Englund who remarked how, "If you think about it, Wes has always blamed *Dreamscape* for ripping him off and suddenly the writer of that is the director here." Alan Jones. 'A Nightmare on Elm Street 3: Dream Warriors.' *Starburst*. Vol 10. No 3. November 1987. pp 16-21. (p21).
- ⁶⁷ For a clear contrast between Craven and Wagner's script and Russell's film, see the novelisation.

⁶⁸ Studio interference in terms of a shock epilogue, re-shoots and ratings problems saw this *Frankenstein* story with a *Terminator* twist become was an uneven and misleading misadventure at best and the director's name and association with the *Elm Street* franchise used to mis-market the film.

⁶⁹ In retrospect, this second title could be considered a narrow escape given Cannon's half-hearted approach to the material, and the controversy surrounding the finished film.

⁷⁰ Marc Shapiro. 'Is Wes Craven Still Scared?' *Gorezone* 11. January 1990. pp 44-47. (p46).

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² In addition to Paramount's slasher spoof, Craven also turned down Palace Pictures' request he direct *Dream Demon* another *Elm Street* clone.

⁷³ Warren, 2000: 32.

⁷⁴ This technique had previously been exploited by Carpenter when filming Stephen King's *Christine* in 1983.

⁷⁵ Frederick S. Clarke. 'A Nightmare on Elm Street: The Phenomenon.' *Cinefantastique*. Vol 18. No 5. July 1988. pp 6-7. (p6).

⁷⁶ Frederick S. Clarke. 'New Line Cinema on Working with Wes Craven.' *Cinefantastique*. Vol 18. No 5. July 1988. p 11. New Line's decision to reject Craven's proposal was by no means the last time a first film director was overruled. Carpenter intended to send Michael Meyers into outer space for *Halloween 6* – a concept which seems slightly less absurd, yet no less disastrous, in light of *Leprechaun in Space*, *Pinhead in Space (Hellraiser Bloodline)* and New Line's *Jason X*.

⁷⁷ Dennis Fischer and Eric Gilmartin. 'Halloween 4.' *Cinefantastique*. Vol 19. No 1. January 1989. p28.

⁷⁸ Schoell and Spenser, 1992: 199.

⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁸⁰ Televised in 1988 with a pilot directed by Hooper, it was designed as both an introduction to series and prequel to the feature films. *Freddy's Nightmares A Nightmare on Elm Street: The Series* ran for two seasons over forty four episodes and attracted a wide range of directorial talent from the aforementioned Hooper through to franchise star England – who had his directorial demands written in his contract.

⁸¹ Thomas Doherty. 'Review: Freddy's Dead.' *Cinefantastique*. Vol 22. No 4. February 1992. p57.

⁸² Examples of which include Flynn's *Brainscan*, Smith's *Trick or Treat* and Danny Coto's atrocious *Dr Giggles* for Universal.

⁸³ Steve Biodrowski. 'Wes Craven on the Politics of Horror.' *Cinefantastique*. Vol 22. No 5. April 1992. p58.

⁸⁴ Similarly, Carpenter completed his own two-picture deal with Alive films following the Satanic slime-fest *Prince of Darkness* in 1987 and *They Live* in 1988; an adaptation of Ray Nelson's short story *Eight o' Clock in the Morning* which homaged the paranoid invasion narratives of the 1950s.

⁸⁵ Produced by Cunningham, the film was released as *House III* outside the US to capitalise on the franchise's higher profile.

⁸⁶ The tendency to explicitly approach a first film as a potential franchise also seized Barker's imagination when adapting *Cabal* in 1989. Released in 1990, after a series of additional shoots under the title *Nightbreed*, Barker's film was somewhat betrayed by a bewildering marketing campaign and truncated running time.

⁸⁷ Whereas Scott and Verhoeven have indicated a willingness to explore the darker side of the *Alien* and *Robocop* films respectively, *Halloween: H20's* driving force and original Scream Queen Jamie Lee Curtis fought to secure Carpenter's services for her twentieth anniversary return. However, a combination of creative and financial misgivings, in

which Dimension were reluctant to sufficiently feather Carpenter's nest and increase the film's budget, prevented the director's return since he was guaranteed to receive a passive payment irrespective of his participation. Joe Mauceri. 'A Final Halloween.' *Shivers* 25. January 1996. pp 28-30. (p28).

⁸⁸ More recently Stuart Gordon has begun work on the fourth *Re-Animator* film entitled *House of Re-Animator*. Previously a staunch objector to sequels and returning to the franchise, the director has returned after a twenty year absence. Complete with the first film cast and crew in attendance and starring William H. Macy as the President, the project began in true Charles Band fashion- as a one sheet poster featuring a shot of the White House with a telling neon green glow coming from one of the windows.

⁸⁹ A change of administration at Paramount paved the way for Cunningham to step in on behalf of New Line after dwindling profit margins, the cancellation of the TV series and the poor reception of *Jason Takes Manhattan*.

⁹⁰ Marc Shapiro. 'Wes Craven's Psycho Analysis.' *Fangoria* 138. November 1994. pp 32-36. (p36).

⁹¹ Dale Kutzera. 'Wes Craven's New Nightmare.' *Cinefantastique*. Vol 25. No 4. June 1994. pp 6-7 & 61. (p6).

⁹² Marc Shapiro. 'Wes Craven's Psycho Analysis.' *Fangoria* 138. November 1994. pp 32-36. (p32).

⁹³ Robb, 1998: 155

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ Marc Shapiro. 'Wes Craven's Psycho Analysis.' *Fangoria* 138. November 1994. pp 32-36. (p36).

⁹⁶ Robb, 1998: 157

⁹⁷ Dale Kutzera. 'Wes Craven's New Nightmare.' *Cinefantastique*. Vol 25. No 4. June 1994. pp 6-7 & 61. (p6).

⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁹ Marc Shapiro. 'Wes Craven's Psycho Analysis.' *Fangoria* 138. November 1994. pp 32-36. (p32).

¹⁰⁰ Dale Kutzera. 'Wes Craven's New Nightmare.' *Cinefantastique*. Vol 25. No 4. June 1994. pp 6-7 & 61. (p7).

¹⁰¹ Wes Craven Interview. *Scream and Scream Again* Documentary.

¹⁰² King's novel featured a fictional antagonist exacting revenge on those who supposedly created him and then killed him off. With the malevolent entities' desire to enter into our reality providing the narrative backbone, it soon becomes apparent that, in order to achieve their aims each must attack their detractors at their weakest point – that is, through their families – and partake in the inevitable showdown.

¹⁰³ Director Wes Craven speaking in *Wes Craven's New Nightmare* (1994).

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

¹⁰⁵ Robb, 1998: 162

¹⁰⁶ Whilst the film was briefly subtitled *The Real Story* and Englund wished they'd kept *Freddy Unbound*, Craven wanted to use the number seven and call it "*A Nightmare on Elm Street 7: The Ascension*". However, the director recalls that New Line were shy about using the number and opted to capitalise on his return to the franchise and his fresh approach by calling it *Wes Craven's New Nightmare*.

¹⁰⁷ McDonagh, 1995: 189.

¹⁰⁸ Robb, 1998: 164

¹⁰⁹ Hearing a strange noise and discovering an open window he was sure had been closed, Williamson armed himself with a butcher knife and called his friend Dave on a cordless phone for moral support. Dave's support included phrases such as 'Freddy's gonna get you,' and 'Michael's behind you' and before long the two were arguing over

which killer was the scarier. Thus the opening sequence of *Scary Movie* was born.

¹¹⁰ Lawrence French, 'Wes Craven's *Scream*' *Cinefantastique*. Vol 28. No 7. 1997. p 34.

¹¹¹ According to Producer Marianne Maddalena, Williamson originally expressed interest in directing the film and shot his own screen test based on the bathroom scene with the killer wearing the mask from *Halloween*. However, in keeping with Hollywood's overall reluctance to allow unproven writers into the director's chair, the studio passed on the proposal. Marc Shapiro, 'Super Secret *Scream*' *Fangoria* no. 169, p. 22.

¹¹² The virgin Randy is also presented as the film's randy Virgin – a quality which ensures his survival.

¹¹³ Kevin Williamson, "Scream Commentary" *Scream* Trilogy DVD: Special Edition, 2001.

¹¹⁴ Wes Craven, "Scream Commentary" *Scream* Trilogy DVD: Special Edition, 2001.

¹¹⁵ Ibid. Among other minor elements, the board objected to Steve's guts, Tatum's head and Billy and Stu's lack of control at the movie's climax. Additionally, Kenny's throat slashing and Casey's hanging were also targeted with the shot of her hanging compressed from real time to 50% by removing every other frame. Ignoring the director's letters of protestation and defence, in which *Rambo III* and *Romeo and Juliet* were presented as comparison pieces, the board cited imitability and intensity as their prime concerns and criteria in denying an R rating.

¹¹⁶ Lawrence French, 'Wes Craven's *Scream*.' *Cinefantastique*. Vol 28. No 7. 1997. p. 46.

¹¹⁷ Throughout his career, Spielberg has supported and sponsored films to varying degrees of involvement and success ranging from the infamous case of over-stepping the mark on Hooper's *Poltergeist* through to Dante's *Gremlins*.

¹¹⁸ For example *John Carpenter's They Live* and *Wes Craven's New Nightmare*

¹¹⁹ Steve Biodrowski. 'Sean Cunningham: House Keeper.' *Gorezone* 21. Spring 1992. pp 8-12. (p11).

¹²⁰ In addition, James Issacs not only rescued *House III* following David Blythe's departure but later directed the special effects heavy *Jason X*.

¹²¹ *Hills Have Eyes* producer Peter Locke originally intended to produce a third film, with Craven directing, using an alien planet setting. Eventually based on a script written by Craven's son Jonathan, and directed by Joe Gayton with genre veteran Lance Henrickson starring, the film was later titled *The Outpost* before appearing as *Wes Craven Presents Mindripper*.

¹²² Similarly, Carpenter operates a "John Carpenter Presents" program under the Storm King production banner (which he runs with his wife/long-time producer Sandy King).

¹²³ Put together by Pierre David, the Canadian Producer of Cronenberg's early work, *Wishmaster* spawned an Artisan-sponsored franchise of its own.

¹²⁴ Anderson, Phil. 'Wes Craven Interview.' <http://www.kaos2000.net/interviews/wescraven00.html> (Downloaded: 12th July 04).

¹²⁵ Craven's production company later co-produced his son, Jonathan Craven's directorial debut, *They Shoot Divas Don't They?* in 2002 with a plot reminiscent of Curtis Hanson's *The Hand That Rocks The Cradle*.

¹²⁶ Following its acquisition of the film, Dimension's in-house director Rick Bota was brought in and the film re-edited.

¹²⁷ Lussier worked with Craven as editor and directed *Dracula 2000* whereas Mastandrea has been his second assistant director prior to *The Breed*.

¹²⁸ Ibid.

¹²⁹ Including *I Know What You Did Last Summer*, *Urban Legend* *Cherry Falls* and *Valentine* with the first two later receiving sequels of their own.

- ¹³⁰ Stephen Rebello. 'Fear and Trembling.' *Movieline*. Vol 10. No 4. Dec/Jan 1999. pp78-81 & 96. (p80).
- ¹³¹ Lawrence French, "Scream 2" *Cinefantastique*. Vol 29. No 9. Jan 1998. pp8-9. (p8).
- ¹³² However, as John Muir rightfully points out, this presentation of *Scream 2* as the second instalment in a proposed trilogy is problematic at best. Rather than leaving the audience suspended on a cliffhanger and deliberately leaving loose ends as in *Back to the Future II* (1990), *The Empire Strikes Back* (1980) or even *Damien: Omen II* (1979), *Scream 2* "gives no hint of where the third film will lead." (Muir, 1998: 217).
- ¹³³ This includes such films as *The Dorm That Dripped Blood*, *The House on Sorority Row*, *Splatter University* and *Sorority House Massacre*.
- ¹³⁴ Wes Craven, "Scream 2 Commentary" *Scream Trilogy DVD: Special Edition*, 2001.
- ¹³⁵ Ibid.
- ¹³⁶ Clive Barker. 'Lost in the Labyrinth.' Documentary. *Hellraiser*. Limited Edition DVD.
- ¹³⁷ The film's title was eventually changed to the alliterative *Teaching Mrs Tingle* to avert any potential controversy in a post-Columbine climate.
- ¹³⁸ Lawrence French. 'Wes Craven on Scream 3.' *Cinefantastique*. Vol 31. No 10. February 2000. pp 12-15. (p12).
- ¹³⁹ Cam Winstanley. 'The Final Cut.' *Total Film*. 40. May 2000. pp 44-54. (p54).
- ¹⁴⁰ Lawrence French. 'Wes Craven on Scream 3.' *Cinefantastique*. Vol 31. No 10. February 2000. pp 12-15. (p14).
- ¹⁴¹ Ian Spelling. 'Joining the Scream Team.' *Fangoria* 190. March 2000. pp 19-22. (p21).
- ¹⁴² The most interesting of which saw Emily (*Stab 3*'s Sidney) being in on Roman's plans as his girlfriend and accomplice but the director apparently couldn't sell this incestuous twist to the Studio.
- ¹⁴³ When this date was put back to February 4th 2000, Craven seized the opportunity to reshoot and restructure the opening and closing scenes of the film.
- ¹⁴⁴ The *Pulse* remake eventually reached the screen under director Jim Sonzero and the video game *Alice* was eventually adapted by Marcus Nispel with Sarah Michelle Gellar in the title role.
- ¹⁴⁵ Wes Craven. *Scream and Scream Again*. Documentary
- ¹⁴⁶ A sequel to *Dog Soldiers* is set for an October release and a superior *Ginger Snaps* sequel and average prequel have been released on DVD.
- ¹⁴⁷ Marc Shapiro. 'The Cursed is Over?' *Fangoria* 241. March 2005. pp 34-36 & 38. (p36).
- ¹⁴⁸ In this respect Dimension is continuing its, and Hollywood's, current appetite for such PG-13 Horrors as *The Ring* and its sequel, *The Grudge* and *Boogeyman* by cutting up R-rated films *They*, *Darkness* and now *Cursed*.
- ¹⁴⁹ Although Craven has publicly described *Cursed* as, "a solid little film" with a "terrific" look, the director has vowed that that he would not be involved in any form of follow up. Marc Shapiro. 'The Cursed is Over?' *Fangoria* 241. March 2005. pp 34-36 & 38. (p34).
- ¹⁵⁰ The director has since vowed only to consider a return to Dimension and the Weinsteins with the assurance that he would have "final cut, a definite budget" and that the Studio "would go away and let me make my film." Ibid, p38.
- ¹⁵¹ Ibid, p34.
- ¹⁵² The sequel was written by Craven and his son Jonathan and directed by Martin Weisz.
- ¹⁵³ McDonagh 1995: 185.
- ¹⁵⁴ Marc Shapiro. 'Wes Craven's Psycho Analysis.' *Fangoria* 138. November 1994. pp 32-36. (p33).

Chapter 3:

Tom Savini and William Peter Blatty: They Came From Within

“Basically, sequels mean the same film. That’s what people want to see.

They want to see the same movie again”¹

– John Carpenter

Like Carpenter, many first film directors were reluctant to indulge in what was often dismissed as cinematic regurgitation, repeating iconic moments, murders and tricks of manipulation. Instead, they seized the opportunity to promote and recommend trusted crew members and production assistants maintaining various degrees of involvement.² Having survived the rigours of low budget filmmaking, production assistant Steve Miner for example was Cunningham’s “logical choice”³ for *Friday the 13th Part 2* in much the same way that Carpenter turned to close friend and production assistant Tommy Lee Wallace for *Halloween II*. However, Wallace rejected the offer on the grounds that such a project amounted to little more than “hack work.”⁴ Nevertheless, Wallace’s decision to decline Carpenter’s offer, on the basis that it would provide little room for individuality or invention, was later rewarded when Joe Dante’s departure from *Halloween III* allowed him to create a separate film for his directorial debut.

Rather than recruit from outside the pool of talent that had produced the first film, Studios actively supported first film directors’ selections and similarly promoted various members of the production into the director’s chair prior to Carpenter and Cunningham’s generous overtures.⁵ Since these early examples of Studio-imposed sequel nepotism, various members of a first film’s cast and crew have sought to put their own indelible stamp on the material irrespective of their practical filmmaking

experience.⁶ This fourth chapter then will address the success with which the Hollywood Horror franchise has been used as a career-shifting incentive to retain and reward the creative loyalty of cast and crew members.

Keen to recreate the spirit and financial success of the first film, the promotion of literary creators and other key production personnel was often considered to be a logical progression on both sides. As producer, financier and key collaborator on *Re-Animator*, Yuzna exploited his relationship with the franchise to ensure the longevity of his career and secured a three-picture deal with fledgling production company Wild Street Pictures who stipulated a sequel to Gordon's first film but allowed Yuzna to direct his first feature prior to it.⁷ Similarly, 2003's *Beyond Re-Animator* allowed Yuzna to set-up the Hammer inspired Barcelona-based Fantastic Factory label using the franchise as a recognisable commodity to give the label a marketable "credibility"⁸ factor from the outset. More recently, Yuzna has returned to America and formed Halcyon International Pictures with plans for a whole new series of films starting with *House of Re-Animator*. In this respect, the Hollywood Horror franchise has not only launched the career of its first film director but also spear-headed and supported the career of an independent franchiseer.

With many instalments subjected to dwindling budgets and increased expectations in terms of impressive and expensive special effects, the continuation of the Hollywood Horror franchise has often dictated that special effects artists⁹ have been similarly approached to take on the role of director. According to McDonagh, the success of the Hollywood Horror franchise has "made the careers of a generation of effects artists."¹⁰ As their fortunes flourished, their interdependence reached a seemingly natural conclusion in which the roles of Special Makeup effects artist and director have been

fused together to create Horror's first official Goreteurs. The aim of this first section is to chronicle the rise of the modern Goreteur and their function as economically viable brand names before addressing their selection and experience at the hands of producers, Studios and audiences.¹¹ In order to illustrate this trend, and highlight the problems experienced by these fledgling directors, this chapter will first focus on the career of Tom Savini and his association with Romero's *Dead* franchise.

With a focus on the way in which the Hollywood Horror franchise has highlighted and facilitated alternative approaches, the second section of this chapter will address William Peter Blatty's relationship with the *Exorcist* franchise. It will also consider the extent to which he, as author, screenwriter and producer of the first film, has propagated a revisionist approach to the franchise and exploited his association with it.¹² To place Blatty's experiences within an appropriate context, I shall also be referring to Universal's *Psycho III*, *Halloween III* and *Jaws 3-D* and the experiences of such screenwriters as David Goyer, Don Mancini and Ethan Wiley who directed sequels to *Blade*, *Child's Play* and *House*. By taking into account franchises' relationships with their literary creators, this second section will also begin to consider the extent to which franchisors, financiers and fans of the previous films have been allowed to impact upon the creative process and dictate the direction of future films.

The Rise of the Goreteur

In 1915, a twenty-nine year old Willis H. O'Brien impressed Hollywood with two innovative shorts – *Morpheus Mike* and *The Dinosaur and the Missing Link: A Prehistoric Tragedy* - and arguably introduced the industry to this pioneering and

profitable concept. Serving as an effective precursor to his work on RKO's *King Kong*, O'Brien secured his legacy as mentor to Ray Harryhausen. Similarly, Cecil Holland is considered to be "the Father of the Make-Up Profession"¹³ just as Chaney would be remembered as 'The Man of 1,000 Faces.' Cast in the dual role of creature and creator, Chaney contorted his features and appearance to fit a range of tragically disfigured characters. However, such a marriage of performance, and what would later become prosthetics, was frowned upon by makeup artist Jack P. Pierce whose "crowning achievement"¹⁴ was the conception and construction of classic creatures like Frankenstein's Monster, the Wolfman and the Mummy. As Universal's chief monster maker in the thirties and forties who sketched, sculpted and supervised their application, Pierce strictly advocated that make-up's sole purpose was "not to proclaim the skill of the artist, but to help tell the story."¹⁵

By the mid-1950s, science fiction was one of the decade's most dominant cinematic trends.¹⁶ The combined success of *The Thing From Another World*, Universal's *Creature From the Black Lagoon* and *Invasion of the Body Snatchers* paved the way for further monsters and mutations in *The Blob* and *The Fly*. However, the fondness with which audiences looked back on Universal's films was due to Forrest J. Ackerman; the man responsible for coining the term 'sci-fi' in 1954. As an avid fan and literary agent hooked on the *Amazing Stories* magazines since childhood, Ackerman single-handedly established the magazine that would come to attract and inspire a new generation of special effects artists.

Beginning in 1958, *Famous Monsters of Filmland* contained a mixture of lightweight features, interviews, reviews and retrospectives that also introduced fans to William Castle's latest gimmick-laden shockers. Refusing to wallow in mere publicity and

promotion, *Famous Monsters* also revealed how stop motion and the new split screen¹⁷ technique allowed filmmakers to depict what were incredibly realistic effects sequences at the time. As one of the pioneers of this technique, stop-motion specialist Harryhausen built on O'Brien's success with *The Beast From 20,000 Fathoms*, *The 7th Voyage of Sinbad* and his most popular special effects showcase, *Jason and the Argonauts* in 1963, before ending his career on the classic *Clash of the Titans* in 1981.

However, in 1963 the concept of special effects had splintered into two distinct segments. On the one hand it was Oscar's first year to present an Academy Award for Best Visual Effects,¹⁸ while on the other Pittsburgh-born director and special make-up effects artist H.G Lewis was busy cementing his cult status and reputation as 'The Godfather of Gore.'¹⁹ By revelling in its amateurish origins and outrageously over-the-top sequences, *Blood Feast* has, with the help of John Waters, famously been dubbed "the *Citizen Kane* of Gore Movies."²⁰ However, according to Bissette, *Famous Monsters*, and the more adult *Castle of Frankenstein*, "usually vilified or simply ignored"²¹ Lewis' films and actively "went out of their way to warn readers away from (them and)...the gutsier European Horrors"²² of the day. Five years after Lewis' landmark film, another Pittsburgh native, George A. Romero, directed the *Night of the Living Dead*; specifically designed to appeal to the drive-in audience and released without the recently established MPAA's seal of approval. In eschewing mainstream standards and practices, Romero's debut film, with its explicit violence and shocking finale, garnered "scathing reviews,"²³ which secured the interests of exhibitors and audiences alike.

Having confessed to being "a person who's not fond of blood and gore,"²⁴ Dick Smith nevertheless delivered a series of controversial effects sequences in *The Exorcist* almost

five years later.²⁵ Released under a storm of controversy with tales of curses, faintings, walk-outs and scandal, the film became the biggest box office draw to date and “gave birth to”²⁶ the Blockbuster era. The phenomenal success and media frenzy surrounding *The Exorcist*, which saw the MPAA come under attack for awarding the film an R rating, inevitably spawned such imitations as Donner’s *The Omen* in 1976 which, according to McCarty, was one of the first Studio-based “splatter”²⁷ films. As another entry in the Satanic cycle,²⁸ *The Omen* was elevated above mere exploitation by Studio support and an all-star cast. However, what really set Donner’s derivative film apart was its introduction of what McCarty has called “the device of the creative death;”²⁹ an instrumental feature at the heart of every splatter movie.³⁰ Indeed, this Grand Guignol approach to filmmaking was adopted by independent and Studio productions transforming films into virtual showcases for Special Effects artists to create breathtaking and stomach-churning illusions to shock the viewer.

In this decade dedicated to the trampling of taboos, Romero returned to his zombie roots with a satirical “comic book”³¹ sensibility. Described by Fischer as “the first American horror film with a substantial budget to really paint the walls red,”³² Romero’s sequel also issued “a clear illustration of the dawning trend in which the makeup effects would replace the story as the show.”³³ The work of such rising stars as Tom Savini³⁴ saw the amateurish effects that dogged many first films replaced in favour of an array of fantastic yet anatomically correct depictions that proved problematic for the MPAA. Categorized in a similar way to hardcore porn with the X rating, Romero, Rubinstein and distributor United Film Distribution ignored the MPAA and released the film unrated with a disclaimer notifying patrons of the film’s spectacularly violent content. With Savini’s ground-breaking special effects singled out by audiences and critics, *Dawn of the Dead* introduced Savini’s work to audiences and producers alike. This first

point of fusion between the Horror franchise and the special makeup effects artist resulted was an important step towards Goreteurism with Savini providing an early commentary track for the film.

Although Romero satirised mass consumerism in a mall setting and painted an “epic view of a civilisation in decline,”³⁵ it was Savini who shocked and educated audiences on the mechanics of Special Effects filmmaking and the experimentation behind numerous ‘gags.’ Prevented from participating in Romero’s first film because of his involvement in the Vietnam War as an army photographer, Savini later confessed that his exposure to extreme images of murder and mayhem during this period, influenced and informed his approach to creating increasingly realistic effects. Indeed, with the battlefield and mass media a desensitizing training ground, special effects artists like Savini created an array of fantastic yet anatomically correct depictions of death and dismemberment which eschewed the amateurish look of Lewis’ films. This led to their elevated status as role models and made them the subject of interviews, profiles and reverence in the pages of *Fangoria* magazine.

Accurately described by Kermode as the “new bible of hard-core Horror fandom,”³⁶ Dick Smith has commented how since its inception in 1979, *Fangoria* has become “one of the leading factors in spreading the gospel of special make-up effects.”³⁷ Indeed, the favourable reception given to an article on *Alien* and a shot of an exploding head from *Dawn of the Dead* in its first issue, strongly indicated the direction the magazine would increasingly adopt, particularly in the pages of its spin-off magazine *Gorezone*. Nurtured through its infancy by a range of interviews with and profiles of established and emerging special effects artists, *Fangoria* found its audience and capitalised on the

success of films like *Friday the 13th* which introduced mainstream cinema-goers to Savini's cutting edge techniques.

Having impressed the director through *Dawn of the Dead*, Savini recalls how Cunningham "didn't believe we could achieve some of the stuff"³⁸ with murders going off like "fireworks, one effect after another."³⁹ Returning to the impact of *Fangoria*⁴⁰ on his career, Savini argued that it was "clearly the magazine (which) made me famous. It got my name out – even though it was as The King of Splatter."⁴¹ With industry stereotyping and a restrictive appellation the standard price to pay for rising popularity, profile and success, Savini's career has been entwined with the development of the Hollywood Horror franchise from the outset.

With splatter lavishly spread across magazines and cinema screens, the combined big budget efforts of Spielberg and Lucas, with the exception of *King Kong (1976)* and *Alien (1979)*, continued to dominate the category for Best Visual effects. This has been the Academy's way of simultaneously appeasing and acknowledging the success of Box Office giants with advances in makeup effects notoriously overlooked save for two Honorary Awards.⁴²

However, in 1981 a category for Best Makeup Effects was permanently adopted by the Academy, with the first winner being Dick Smith protégé Rick Baker for *An American Werewolf in London*. As an artist who went on to a productive career in designing increasingly realistic primates and lycanthropes,⁴³ Baker credited *Fangoria* as being "the *Famous Monsters* of the '90s,"⁴⁴ that has "really helped popularise the art of special make-up effects."⁴⁵ Ron Bottin was behind the early eighties' second werewolf extravaganza, *The Howling* and moved on to the Universal Lot in his tireless bid to

realise *The Thing* the following year. Even though Carpenter's FX-laden update was forgotten at the box office, Bottin's special effects threw down the gauntlet to his contemporaries – a challenge picked up by Chris Walas in Cronenberg's reworking of *The Fly*, a film for which he received the coveted Academy Award.

Savini's Living Nightmare

Whereas this accolade convinced Mel Brooks to back Walas for Fox's *Fly* sequel, a combination of Oscar recognition⁴⁶ and second unit experience previously enabled Cameron protégé Stan Winston to direct *Pumpkinhead*, a.k.a. *Vengeance the Demon*. With Winston the only FX artist to start a franchise until Kurtzman's special effects-laden *Wishmaster* in 1997, special effects artists were shrewdly promoted into the director's chair on a series of films whose origins were single-mindedly economic. Walas, for example, confessed that Fox's motivation for commissioning *The Fly II* was purely a way of filling "an available release slot."⁴⁷

In the case of Savini's remake, Romero similarly revealed that the new *Night of the Living Dead* was designed "to just lockdown the title and the copyright"⁴⁸ and compensate those "twenty six original investors who had gotten ripped off by the original."⁴⁹ Even though the first film was a huge financial success, very little money made its way back to the financiers and the company went bankrupt. Moreover, a reorganisation at Continental Pictures saw an all-important copyright notice line left off the picture, with many video companies assuming and taking advantage of the fact that the film was in the public domain. Indeed, the long-term effects of this lesson have

been costly and led to many different permutations of this unregulated Hollywood Horror franchise.⁵⁰

After turning down the chance to direct the remake in favour of adapting King's *The Dark Half*, Romero agreed to rewrite the script and executive produce the film on the condition that Savini directed. As an established director within the genre, Romero had already exploited his role as mentor through his association with the Hollywood Horror franchise by recommending cinematographer and sound editor Michael Gornick to a "very nervous"⁵¹ Stephen King as the director of *Creepshow 2* in 1987. Although this was his first feature-length film, Gornick had, like many first time directors, acquired invaluable experience on genre-based television work. Due to the episodic nature of the anthology format he was regarded as a "safe bet."⁵²

Similarly selected on the basis of his status and relationship with Romero and the franchise, Savini's experience also included second unit work and the 'Inside the Closet' episode of TV's *Tales From the Darkside*.⁵³ However, in using his limited participation in the project as a bargaining tool to ensure Savini's appointment, Romero inadvertently sowed seeds of resentment in the eyes of his fellow investors keen to reassert their control and ownership over the title in the wake of Romero's singular success.

As another Goreteur who cut his directing teeth on TV Horror,⁵⁴ *Hellraiser IV*'s Kevin Yagher credited the *Elm Street* franchise and "the pages of *Fangoria*"⁵⁵ with having a significant impact on his career. Just as Yagher negotiated second unit directing duties on the *Child's Play* sequel as a means of ensuring his participation as the doll's designer and puppetmaster, Full Moon stop-motion animator Allen also traded on his pivotal role

as puppet creator and operator to direct *Puppetmaster II*. However, Charles Band's support of this was, according to executive producer David DeCoteau, his shrewd way of securing "a dozen or two more movies worth of special effects"⁵⁶ out of the experienced stop motion supervisor. As the only Goretuer with previous feature film experience,⁵⁷ Empire Pictures alumnus Buechler was similarly targeted by Paramount Pictures for *Friday the 13th Part VII*. With such reciprocal and exploitative strategies supported by Buechler's account,⁵⁸ it is clear that many Studios and production companies sought to save money by combining two roles and focusing on the more sensational aspects of the sequel.

According to Yagher, who accepted the *Hellraiser: Bloodline* assignment at the eleventh hour, part of his motivation lay in a profound sense of frustration, similar to that experienced by writers like Blatty, at having "so many of my ideas...stifled or changed...as I began working with as many bad directors as good ones."⁵⁹ Advocating the way in which special effects artists were more efficient directors within the Horror genre, in that they could "get the angles that translate into the audience getting more out of the effects,"⁶⁰ Yagher's extensive second unit work fuelled his aspirations.

Walas on the other hand traces his aspirations back even further in stating how "most effects people today started out making little Super-8 movies just so they could stick their bloody heads in front of a camera. It's the next logical step to direct."⁶¹ Whether born of frustration or a sense of natural progression, the majority relied upon a combination of support, coercion and mutual exploitation to ensure their directing ambitions were fully realised through the Hollywood Horror franchise.

Having seized the directorial reins of relatively high profile releases, many of these filmmakers had strong ideas as to how they wanted their instalment to develop. Although Romero had side-stepped directorial involvement, his role as scriptwriter gave him the opportunity to update his and Russo's screenplay for contemporary audiences. According to Savini however, it was his idea to revamp the characterisation of Barbara, perhaps in keeping with Clover's Final Girl theory, and keep "the zombie explanation nebulous."⁶² Despite proclaiming that Romero gave him "a lot of freedom"⁶³ on his "remake plus a sequel,"⁶⁴ Savini was not allowed to deviate too far from the first film with black and white subjective camera shots or many of the director's impressively storyboarded sequences. Indeed, Savini deferred to Romero as the leading authority on the sub-genre and franchise and this included "cutting stuff before we started shooting"⁶⁵ for reasons of practicality thereby curtailing his plans for the film.

Whereas Savini experienced some collaboration, in that Romero's revised script subverted the first film in line with cultural changes, many other sequel directors were far less fortunate with regard to scripting. Based on Barker's idea and guided through an endless series of rewrites by scriptwriter Pete Atkins, the *Bloodline* script⁶⁶ which initially attracted Yagher to the franchise was, according to Atkins, "a classic case of too many chiefs and not enough Indians."⁶⁷ In this case conflicting ideas and budgetary concerns left little room for a first time director's input.

Similarly, and in spite of their alleged protestations, Walas and Buechler were equally disappointed by Studio decisions to take the least adventurous options and settle for either a "nearly verbatim remake"⁶⁸ or "moments of standard stalk and slash."⁶⁹ Subjected to round table rewrites and production in-fighting from the outset, scripts were the main source of conflict for many special effects artists with Walas recalling

how he tried to “quit the picture”⁷⁰ before a single frame had been shot. Issued with scripts that were either deemed crowded and formulaic, unrealistic and over ambitious or simply clichéd and condescending,⁷¹ directors nevertheless abided by contractual obligations since the alternative would end their directing careers before they had even begun.

For Savini, filming was the catalyst for a range of professional and personal issues. This period saw the director caught up in a custody battle for his daughter and distracted by sabotage on the part of envious on-set detractors. Moreover, the director’s version of events traces the trouble back to Columbia’s purchasing of the film half way through the shoot and a deal⁷² which saw the editing time reduced. Combined with a series of meetings in which Romero was allegedly “told many lies”⁷³ about what was happening, the first film director eventually appeared on set to help consolidate shot lists and keep the picture under control. Since plagued by rumours that the film was taken away from him, Savini has refuted such claims and maintained his position that, “no one ever came in and took over the reins.”⁷⁴ With internal and external conflict characterising the production process, from Savini’s perspective at least, directing failed to live up to his expectations as protective producers and mixed agendas characterised these filmmakers’ experiences with the Hollywood Horror franchise.

Despite being hired on the unspoken understanding that special effects were increasingly the star, many first time directors attempted to rebel and dared to try and defy Studio and audience expectations. After stating how “effects guys like me spoiled people, the more we showed them the more they wanted to see,”⁷⁵ Savini adopted a more holistic approach to filmmaking. In creating his deconstructive commentary on the first film by playing with and upon the audience’s entrenched expectations, Savini

hoped to challenge the stigma and criticism directed at his debut by dispensing with the first film's storyline "in sixteen minutes"⁷⁶ and filling the remainder of the running time "with action...twists and turns and a lot of different effects."⁷⁷ Consequently, Savini's conclusion dramatically deviated from what we might expect with Ben actually becoming one of the Living Dead and Barbara emerging as Harry's executioner; a move that destroys any sense of moral superiority yet sustains some element of shock for jaded audiences.

Keenly aware of audience expectations surrounding a Romero/Savini collaboration, the director was nonetheless adamant that his first feature was not a splatter film during the obligatory promotional tour. He insisted that, "as a director I have aspirations that go beyond gore and splatter,"⁷⁸ even though it was "that background that gave me chance to direct"⁷⁹ in the first place. Similarly, Yagher attempted to publicly take a step back from the "makeup FX extravaganzas"⁸⁰ that were *Hellraiser II* and *III* and abide by Jack Pierce's edict.

Despite pledging to show less and focus on the actual techniques involved in crafting "a truly suspenseful film,"⁸¹ Savini's film suffered a similar fate to the Russo-produced *Children of the Living Dead* and was taken away prior to the ratings process where it was subjected to further scrutiny and restrictions under the MPAA. Initially branded with a solid X rating in keeping with previous entries this was a move indicative of the franchise's controversial ratings history. Contractually bound to deliver an R rated picture however, the producers slavishly removed all offensive shots without appeal. According to Savini, this final lack of support resulted in a "sterile film"⁸² despite his intended emphasis on action and suspense that was out of synch with previous entries.

Indeed, the onset of post-production often heralded greater demands for compromise, particularly in relation to *Bloodline*'s Yagher, whose first cut failed to impress the same Miramax executives who had approved the script.⁸³ For Yagher, the Studio-dictated changes were understandable but difficult to carry out and, rather than see it change into something unrecognisable, the director opted to leave the project.⁸⁴ This decision paved the way for Miramax to demand even more drastic changes under the direction of *Halloween 6*'s Joe Chappelle.

Although Isaac's serial killer thriller *House III* experienced a similar fate to Savini's film, with many of its most graphic scenes relegated to the cutting room floor, Buechler's *Friday the 13th Part VII* suffered more as a result of its reputation than actual content. Effectively castrated to such an extent that almost all of the visceral impact was diluted, if not removed, the promised *New Blood* was reduced to no blood.⁸⁵ Having captured a more realistic representation of their work on screen, special effects artists as first time directors were removed from or frustrated by the post-production process. And so, like the very footage for which they had become famous, these Goreteurs found themselves excised from the Hollywood Horror franchise.

Ratings battles aside however, Buechler considers his entry in the *Friday the 13th* franchise to be "flawed in those predictable aspects which are standard in this genre" and, rather than criticise the MPAA, the director has accused Paramount of being "ashamed of their Horror labels."⁸⁶ Nonetheless, the director is proud of his Jason design, the range of effects audiences were not permitted to see and his sequel's opening and closing sequences which, for Buechler, made the film "worth making."⁸⁷ Whereas Buechler is one of the few Goreteurs able to reflect favourably on the experience, Walas has candidly pointed out that *The Fly II* "got made the wrong way for

all the wrong reasons,”⁸⁸ and “never quite recovered from the reason it was being made.”⁸⁹

Alternatively, *Hellraiser IV*'s Kevin Yagher disengaged from the process and successfully petitioned the Director's Guild of America to have his name removed from the troubled sequel's credits. As a direct result of such restructuring and reshoots, the director left the film with the infamous Alan Smithee credit rather than his own. In light of such experiences and troubled relationships, the Goreteurs have consistently singled out their respective Studios and producers as the main source of frustration and their film's comparative critical and commercial failure.

Indeed, with his presence resented, his picture subject to sabotage and denied any semblance of the support he had enjoyed on *Tales From the Darkside*, Savini has since described his debut as “one of the worst experiences of his life.”⁹⁰ With the finished film representing only “forty percent of what I originally envisaged on over 700 storyboards,”⁹¹ the director claims to be baffled as to why directing his first film under Romero's guidance was not “the most wonderful situation.”⁹² Instead the experience severely affected the pair's personal and professional relationship for many years afterward.

However, now that responsibility has been taken on both sides, the director has lamented that all he ever “wanted was to keep (Romero's) respect.”⁹³ Having survived the franchise, Savini has continued to cement his status as a genre icon through a combination of acting,⁹⁴ stunt work and special effects jobs with the most recent being Steve Miner's *Day of the Dead* remake. In addition to his personal development in the industry, Savini has also secured his reputation in much the same way as O'Brien,

Pierce and more recently Smith. In the role of teacher and mentor, by establishing an accredited special make-up effects programme for aspiring effects artists, Savini continues to influence the potential Goreteurs of tomorrow.

The Writer's Cut

In an interview with Dennis Fischer in 1990's *Faces of Fear*, Blatty cited *Psycho* scribe Robert Bloch as being the one who inspired him to begin writing. However, having already found fame working alongside Blake Edwards in the 1960s, Blatty was much better prepared than Bloch to take on the Hollywood Studios when it came to negotiating a deal for the rights to his novel *The Exorcist* – one which was similarly inspired by newspaper reports and an actual case.⁹⁵ After being contacted by Producer Paul Monash in New York as he completed his manuscript, Blatty gave the producer an exclusive six-month option in exchange for \$400,000. Although Monash was successful in securing a deal with Warner Bros, his plans to significantly alter aspects of Blatty's text did not sit well with the author and as such Blatty arranged for Warner Bros to buy Monash out leaving him on board as sole producer.⁹⁶ And so, even from the outset, it is clear that Blatty refused to be overruled or relegated as author and would be involved in all aspects of production from completed script to casting choices.⁹⁷

To pre-empt issues of fidelity and interference, Blatty entered into further negotiations with the Studio to ensure he was attached to the project as sole scriptwriter and producer. He also negotiated a 10% cut of the film's profits and mutual directorial approval before agreeing to take the project any further. After compiling an agreed list of seven Hollywood directors, ranging from Stanley Kubrick to Mark Rydell, Blatty

was reportedly dissatisfied with Warner's preference, and has since stated that, "had I the technical expertise to be a director at that time, I would have asked to direct it"⁹⁸ - a request the Studio would have rejected outright as a result of his inexperience.

Consequently, the writer held out and even threatened legal action on account of Warner's negotiations with Rydell, championing the less established Friedkin on account of his honesty and documentary realism. The Studio finally supported Blatty following the critical and commercial success of Friedkin's *The French Connection* for which he became the youngest director to win the Academy Award for Best Director. With Friedkin proclaiming that, "Blatty was always my first audience for this movie. It was him I had to please first and foremost,"⁹⁹ the writer had seemingly secured a faithful adaptation of his novel and found a creative and collaborative ally in the guise of Friedkin.

However, fresh from his Academy Award-winning triumph, Friedkin was not afraid to challenge Blatty on his scriptwriting capabilities and any initial reverence did not prevent the director from rejecting Blatty's first draft outright.¹⁰⁰ As such the writer revised his script in accordance with the source novel and Friedkin's concerns. With cinematic success and Studio indulgence on his side, Friedkin embarked upon an exhaustive casting call and physically demanding shoot with Blatty acting as an efficient buffer between him and an anxious Studio. Retiring to the editing room behind schedule and over budget, the director edited the picture up until the last minute in time to qualify for Oscar consideration while trying to select a suitable score.¹⁰¹ During postproduction, Friedkin shifted loyalties and sided with the Studio in describing Blatty's ending as "a lame way to end this movie...a pastiche of *Casablanca*...and anticlimactic."¹⁰² Furthermore, his ruthless approach to editing saw the director delete

several sequences to reduce the running time in keeping with concerns regarding audiences' attention spans.

Reportedly omnipresent throughout the production process, Blatty has consistently argued that he witnessed a masterpiece reduced to a 'mere' classic as Friedkin trimmed key exchanges and the conclusion. The writer has since accused the director of removing the "moral core"¹⁰³ of the story and "leaving gaping holes in the carpentry."¹⁰⁴ Speaking years later about their tumultuous relationship around this time, Friedkin recalls how their collective and combative arrogance led to both men being "given over to a lot of pettiness in those days...(and being) completely full of ourselves."¹⁰⁵

Despite engineering the film's evolution and shepherding the project throughout its production history, Blatty's agenda and thematic aspirations were thwarted in these final stages by Friedkin who, as director, was permitted to submit his final cut to the board for rating and for some time after maintained that he "ultimately prevailed...for the good of the film."¹⁰⁶ Indeed, it was this incident in the history and making of the film that the writer has consistently returned to in his writings and a matter he intended to pursue throughout his career and association with the Hollywood Horror franchise.

Released in December 1973, and breaking Box Office records on the back of censorship controversy, *The Exorcist* exploited reports of a manufactured curse, over-zealous audience members and ten Oscar nominations. Blatty also benefited from a higher media profile in time for him to publicise his autobiography *I'll Tell Them I Remember You*. After winning the Academy Award, Golden Globe and Writer's Guild Award for his *Exorcist* screenplay, Blatty continued to cash-in on his new found notoriety by publishing *William Peter Blatty On The Exorcist: From Novel to Film* in 1974. This

text not only contained his original screenplay but also a brief introduction in which the writer put forward his criticisms and concerns.

Eager to embark on more 'original' projects like first film director Friedkin, who spent the next seventeen years exploring film adaptation across various genres,¹⁰⁷ Blatty was quick to turn down Warner's sequel requests. Distancing himself from Warner's follow up, Blatty attended a public screening of Boorman's film in Georgetown and later likened the experience to watching Mel Brooks' *The Producers* in which he was the first to reinterpret the film as a comedy. Such an unfavourable critical reception paradoxically dragged *The Exorcist* franchise, and thereby Blatty's name and association with it, into disrepute while elevating the iconic status and stature of its predecessor. In response to the overwhelming backlash directed at Boorman's sequel and elevation of the first film, Blatty exploited this second opportunity to expand and elaborate upon his 1974 text and publish *If There Were Demons Then Perhaps There Were Angels: William Peter Blatty's Own Story of the Exorcist* in 1978.

As writer and producer of *The Exorcist*, Blatty's extensive account of his experiences researching and writing the novel further contributed to the author's attempts at repositioning himself, in the minds of audiences. He capitalised on Warner's publicity for the follow up yet abhorred Boorman's revisionist approach. Because of its box office failure, the author experienced difficulty raising the financing for his pet project *The Ninth Configuration*. Like many authors and scriptwriters,¹⁰⁸ Blatty felt spurned and spurred on by the frustration he felt and sought to exert control over future adaptations as director. However, Hollywood has reluctantly allowed inexperienced directors behind the camera, particularly when the budget exceeds a certain level. Having proven himself as a screenwriter and established his name in the minds of

audiences, Blatty was able to exploit the success of *The Exorcist* and audiences' obsession with it. He persuaded Pepsi to finance a loose reworking of his 1966 novel *Twinkle Twinkle Killer Kane* under the title *The Ninth Configuration* after previous attempts to set up a deal with the recently burned Warner Bros fell through.

Reportedly "terrified at first,"¹⁰⁹ Blatty effectively paved the way for such literary figures as King and Barker to adapt their own novellas and short stories for the screen with *Maximum Overdrive* and *Hellraiser* respectively. King's first and only directorial experience to date involved working under Dino De Laurentiis while battling drug and alcohol addiction; a series of events which not only marred the director's recollection of events but the overall quality of the finished film.¹¹⁰ Barker on the other hand successfully adapted his *Hellbound Heart* novella as "a show-reel...made for a small amount of money to show people I could write and direct movies and turn their investment into a profit."¹¹¹

For Blatty however, *The Ninth Configuration* was designed to be the second in his self-appointed faith trilogy; thus eclipsing Boorman's numerical follow up in favour of a thematic and theological connection. Indeed, Blatty's presentation and framing of the film suitably pre-empts *Psycho* scriptwriter Joseph Stefano's declaration that Russell's *Crimes of Passion*, featuring Perkins as an outsider infused with sexual hang-ups and a penchant for voyeurism, was "the real sequel"¹¹² to Hitchcock's *Psycho*.¹¹³ Although thematic continuations are not exclusive to the Hollywood Horror franchise but hallmarks of directors like Craven, Blatty's theological reappropriation of the first film was part of the writer's sustained attempt to rewrite cinematic history.

Released in 1980 and featuring a tenuous character link to *The Exorcist*, *The Ninth Configuration* focused on military service-induced madness. Through increasingly experimental forms of therapy and a solitary act of redemption, Blatty's theological concerns were given ambiguous expression. For other writers turned directors, the possibility of helming a relatively high profile franchise film meant proving yourself on a low risk property. Though their knowledge of and affinity for the material was indisputable, Hollywood sought proof and basic assurances that they were technically competent.

Whereas Goyer and Lafia directed such comparatively low budget pictures as *ZigZag* and *The Blue Iguana* before taking the directorial reins of the *Blade* and *Child's Play* franchises respectively, Blatty's high profile association with *The Exorcist* franchise left him bereft of interference as writer, producer and director. Location shooting in Budapest provided Blatty with a suitable shelter from interference in much the same way as Friedkin's Georgetown shoot. Blatty's editing room experience saw him assemble a three-hour rough cut from which he had to fashion a coherent film. With two different cuts assembled from Blatty's three hours of footage and the film ultimately released under two different titles with little financial backing what remained was a clearly exploited connection to the first film. Moreover, and quite ironically, the film's controversial yet comparatively low key release paralleled that of Boorman's official *Exorcist* sequel in this respect.

Blatty's Franchise Film

During this time, Blatty had begun working on an *Exorcist* follow up inspired by a Priest's experiences on a Disturbed Ward. Set in the aftermath of the first film, without contradicting, rewriting or even referring to the events of Boorman's sequel, this script was firmly in keeping with his previous work. By concentrating on the concept of multiple possession in a psychiatric hospital-setting, Blatty resurrected his beloved Lieutenant Kinderman for an investigation into a series of murders entwined with the fate of Damian Karras and the non-fictional Gemini Killer.

Featuring a clear generic shift, Blatty's script was strong enough to temporarily secure the interest of producer Jerry Weintraub and first film director Friedkin. However, despite significant Studio interest, Friedkin ultimately backed out of the proposed sequel citing a myriad of concerns. In the wake of this disappointment, Blatty temporarily gave up on his plan for a theatrical follow up, rejected the low budget independent route,¹¹⁴ and transformed his screenplay into the novel *Legion*; one which became a bestseller in 1983. Indeed, with little control over the cinematic future of their creations, writers have often attempted to regain creative control and some degree of proprietorship over the Hollywood Horror franchise. Consequently, they returned to these characters and stories to rewrite and sometimes even contradict cinematic history.

Prior to Blatty's retreat into literary Horror, Bloch exercised his literary rights to *Psycho* in two savagely satirical sequels – *Psycho 2* and *Psycho House* in 1982 and 1990. These texts were specifically designed to express “his feelings about splatter films,”¹¹⁵ sadistic film directors and Hollywood Studios with their sensationalist theme parks and

keen eye for marketing and merchandising opportunities.¹¹⁶ Not surprisingly, Bloch's novels were rejected by Universal yet remain fascinating pieces of pointed pulp fiction.

Similarly, *Night of the Living Dead* co-scripter John Russo published *Return of the Living Dead* in the wake of Romero's superior sequel. This novel was then rewritten, re-released and adapted by Dan O'Bannon to create the first alternative zombie franchise. Much like Blatty, Russo also returned to the first film and wrote *The Complete Night of the Living Dead Filmbook* in 1985 which celebrated and highlighted his role in the film's production and success. Ira Levin has also written a literary sequel to *Rosemary's Baby*, entitled *Son of Rosemary*, in 2000 which substantially deviated from O'Steen's TV sequel.

Moreover, Benchley has spent the latter half of his career redressing the environmental repercussions of *Jaws* with a series of ecologically sound yet similarly themed underwater monster stories entitled *The Beast*, *Great White* and *The Creature* along with several non-fiction accounts of shark behaviour. More recently, Barker has written his final *Hellraiser* story, which kills off franchise icon Pinhead, as a means of drawing a creative line underneath his association with the character and on-going film franchise.

The literary success of Blatty's mutated script led to the potential resurrection of the film franchise at Lorimar in the mid-eighties. Blatty characteristically returned to *The Ninth Configuration* in time for its 1985 re-release through New World Pictures. Although the film had achieved some nominations and awards and some level of cult status, the first time director seized this opportunity to clarify ambiguities in the film's conclusion, and subtly reframe the final act as an act of self-sacrifice rather than suicide.

in a 11 / minute 5 / second approved Director's Cut.¹¹⁷ Although post release editing, restructuring and re-shoots were not uncommon in Hollywood,¹¹⁸ Blatty's revisionist approach five years after release pre-empted the more sensational Special Editions and Director's cuts that became a Hollywood staple after *Aliens*, *The Abyss* and *Terminator 2*.¹¹⁹ As a creative opportunity to rewrite history and commercial ploy to sell more units, this re-releasing of films in and on different formats has provided directors like Blatty with the opportunity to revise their films in the wake of media criticism, acclaim or, more recently, a change in classification policy.

As literary creators of the Hollywood Horror franchise directors like Blatty, Goyer and Mancini were seemingly in a position to reassert their intentions and reshape the nature and content of the franchise in line with their own concerns. However, such assumed authority and affinity for the material did not go unchallenged or overruled by Studios and production companies eager to preserve longevity and satisfy perceived audience expectations. Although Goyer's aim was to redress an alleged lack of action in previous films, his concept for an apocalyptic conclusion to the franchise was rejected outright by New Line early in pre-production. Similarly, Mancini's gender-bending plans for a follow up to *Bride of Chucky* were met with strong resistance from Stacey Snider at Universal.¹²⁰

Previously pursued by Cohen and allegedly turned down by Carpenter, Blatty's *Exorcist III* finally elicited financial support from Coralco and Morgan Creek. However, this was after the author had sufficiently rewritten the climax in favour of a more visually satisfying conclusion in which Kinderman saves Karras with a single gunshot to the head. When Carolco suggested a new plot twist - that "Kinderman's daughter should become possessed"¹²¹ - Blatty walked and the project found a permanent home at

Morgan Creek. With the courage of his convictions and willingness to walk away with the project as literary creator, Blatty's enviable position is the exception within the Hollywood Horror franchise.

Whereas some directors opted for a change of location, others adhered or returned to the iconic settings of previous films. Just as Maddock's *Tremors 3*'s title explicitly informed renters that this third chapter would go *Back to Perfection* in terms of location and cast, the second of Blatty's stipulations, besides being attached as director, was that he shot the film in Georgetown and not on any Studio backlot. Indeed, Blatty's initial shoot was a marked contrast to Perkins' who had little choice but to shoot *Psycho III* on the Universal back-lot;¹²² thus placing him and the production under the watchful eyes of the Black Tower. Despite McCarthy's assertion that Perkins had assumed a logical and inevitable process in directing *Psycho III*,¹²³ the director had little leverage when it came to convincing Universal of "his idea to film *Psycho III* entirely in black and white."¹²⁴ Negotiating from a position of relative strength as the author, Blatty on the other hand was seemingly able to direct the tone, content and location of the film to escape the prying eyes of Fox and Morgan Creek. Like Perkins, he too adopted a thorough and comprehensive approach by extensively storyboarding the film and focusing on (re)casting the key roles in keeping with his own attitude and approach to the franchise.

Having acknowledged Hitchcock and Russell's influence, Perkins proclaimed to the press that his follow up would "be a little more unreasonable and a little more off the wall,"¹²⁵ in much the same way that Blatty brought his sequel closer in line with his "idea of terror."¹²⁶ Consequently, subtle manipulation, dialogue and disorientation were the tools with which this director sought to terrify audiences as "opposed to turning

heads and all the rest. HIS switch from splatter and shock effects to suggestion and surrealism is most evident in the suspenseful build up and subsequent dream sequence surrounding Father Dyer's murder. Blatty's confident style during this section alone, whereby the camera is kept perfectly still in homage to Hitchcock's *Psycho*, and Kinderman encounters the recently deceased Dyer, in a "fantasy depiction of heaven in terms of a bad 1940s Hollywood musical,"¹²⁸ elevates the film above standard genre fare. However, Blatty still faced gentle pressure from the producers to move the camera during this highly effective sequence, heralding the first signs of interference that plagued the remainder of production.

After apparently canvassing the opinions of potential audiences, Morgan Creek persuaded Blatty to recast and reshoot the Patient X scenes with Jason Miller, who was now available, reprising his role from the first film to ensure continuity. This was despite Brad Dourif having already been cast and shot these scenes back in Wilmington.¹²⁹ With Dourif about to be excised from the film, Blatty solved his casting conundrum by presenting audiences with a visual representation of "the schizophrenic nature of Patient X, cutting randomly between the two and evoking a psychological battle between Damien Karras and the Gemini Killer."¹³⁰ This left room for both actors to take on the role although Dourif had to reshoot his scenes over an intense two-day period.

In another instance, Blatty resisted external pressure and internal temptation when it came to not zooming in on a scheduled subliminal "shot of the decapitated priest holding his head in his lap"¹³¹ since he, like Perkins, was "meticulous about not making it a bloodbath."¹³² However, according to Winecoff, Perkins put up little resistance when the studio demanded that he "gore-enhance the murder scenes to appeal to a jaded

teenage audience, and tone down the “wild and sexual”¹³⁴ aspects of his film. Successfully thwarted in respect to any form of final cut, Perkins succumbed to Universal pressure and curtailed his original concept to fall in line with their preconceptions of what audiences wanted from this third instalment.

For Blatty, who was contractually entitled to one preview before Morgan Creek could “go and do what they want with the picture,”¹³⁵ the invited audience played an integral part in the film’s fate. With Studios embarking on both qualitative and quantitative studies throughout the test-screening process, Blatty’s creative input as an authority on the *Exorcist* franchise was silenced in favour of, what the director has since described as, “the lowest end preview audience I have ever seen in my life. They dragged in zombies from Haiti to watch this film. It was unbelievable.”¹³⁶ According to producer De Haven, Studio head Robinson’s demand for an exorcism, “no matter how small,”¹³⁷ was based on the assumption that it would “keep the audience from being disappointed.”¹³⁸ Not content with recasting the picture in postproduction, Robinson graciously gave Blatty the option of restructuring and re-shooting the climax to incorporate a “graphically gory final exorcism”¹³⁹ or being replaced. With the project essentially complete and Blatty’s name contractually attached for publicity and promotional purposes, the Studio sought to legitimise their sequel as part of the franchise in terms of specific set-pieces and shocking scenes.

Faced with such a decision, Blatty attempted to turn this metaphorical “pig’s ear into a silk purse.”¹⁴⁰ This necessitated the shooting of additional scenes to introduce Nicol Williamson’s character Father Morning to justify this new conclusion. At a cost of over \$4 million and four months after principal photography, director, producer and production company attempted to present a united front to promote the film’s new and

improved FX-laden finale. This featured Williamson's character being skinned alive and Scott's character flung around the cell as lightning bolts, flames, an army of previous victims and a sea of snakes emerged from a Hellmouth beneath. Blatty publicly declared that his new ending "repeated everything that was in *The Exorcist*"¹⁴¹ but his real distaste for the entire spectacle has since been documented, along with the saving grace that he persuaded the producers to drop the classic obscenities imposed on the film's soundtrack throughout these "ultimately unnecessary"¹⁴² scenes.

The cumulative effect of this interference saw to it, for the second time in the franchise's three-film history, that Blatty's approved version was systematically gutted and the emphasis unduly shifted; except this time the writer-director was co-opted into performing the postproduction operation himself. And so, although Blatty could apparently stall, if not overcome, Studio misgivings, he eventually found it impossible to dismiss the demands of Studio heads and audiences who demanded convention and conformity in the test-screening process.

Just as the Studio/producer's perception of audience expectations shaped the casting and conclusion of *Exorcist III*, Alves' aspirations for *Jaws 3-D*, having rescued the concept from self-parody, came under threat from a dramatically reduced budget and the sequel's relegation as an Alan Landsberg production.¹⁴³ According to screenwriter Carl Gottlieb, Alves' difficulties were compounded by Landsberg's meddling, which included producer Rupert Hitzig shooting "a montage of effects that break the screen."

¹⁴⁴ Included to ease Universal's anxiety, this two minute sequence apparently had "all the 3-D delights everyone (was) crying out for without stopping the dramatic action."¹⁴⁵

Despite his franchise experience, Alves' technical experience was exploited without any concession to his creative concerns. Similarly, even Blatty's experience mirrored many

quels whose sequels were either overshadowed by the unwelcome spectre of previous films or a targeted teen demographic. Nevertheless, Blatty has consistently defended his sequel in interviews with such heavy-handed bias that he considers his instalment to be a “superior film... (and) more frightening film than *The Exorcist*.”¹⁴⁶

A final cause of contention for these directors was in relation to Studio mis-marketing. Whereas Cochran’s scheme in *Halloween III* was “a joke on the children,”¹⁴⁷ Universal’s marketing of the film was similarly perceived as such by audiences. Their refusal to address the film’s alternative approach as “a pod movie...instead of a knife movie”¹⁴⁸ in their advertising was a sin of omission that left those fans in their search of the Shape, a sharp knife or even Jamie Lee Curtis severely dissatisfied. Regarded by fans as more trick than treat, director Wallace blamed the Studio’s decision to “play it safe...(and) get their money back in the first week-end,”¹⁴⁹ for the overwhelmingly negative response.

Similarly motivated to “cash-in on the title,”¹⁵⁰ Blatty has since recalled how he “begged them...not to name it *Exorcist* anything because *Exorcist II* was a disaster beyond imagination.”¹⁵¹ Preferring the source novel’s title of *Legion*, complete with its Biblical connotations, Blatty’s expectation that the Studio would not exploit the film’s franchise history was unrealistic. Indeed, its association with the internationally renowned first film, and status as the next instalment in the Hollywood Horror franchise, was the corner stone of their marketing campaign.

Having predicted a poor box office response on account of Fox’s titling, Blatty presented this situation as a pre-emptive defence for critical and commercial failure. Furthermore, the sequel also had to contend with Bob Logan’s PG-13 rated *Exorcist*

παύου *repossesseea* starring franchise veteran Linda Blair. In keeping with Hollywood's reactionary approach to popular concepts, whereby rival Studios and Production Companies green-light similarly themed projects and rush them through the production process to meet a release date, Logan's timing was fortuitous at best. However, first film star Linda Blair has since claimed that Morgan Creek and Fox were capitalising on her profile and accused the companies of attempting to confuse potential audiences at the multiplex.¹⁵²

As the third instalment in a Horror franchise with a tumultuous past up against a film specifically designed to ridicule its overall concept, *Exorcist III* ran the risk of market saturation and audiences' inability to take it seriously. When Blatty's follow up indeed failed to inspire audiences and many critics, the director was ironically informed that the lack of success could be attributed to enduring memories of Boorman's sequel and an association with that film. In light of this, the Hollywood Horror franchise demonstrated the potential to orchestrate its own downfall due to the success and failings of previous instalments or misleading marketing campaigns. In this respect, both Blatty and Wallace's experience is similar to Walas' since many films were unable to recover from the reasons they were made.

Surviving the Franchise

With his interest in furthering the *Exorcist* film franchise stunted, Blatty returned to his literary roots and channelled his frustration with Hollywood, the Horror franchise and Studio politics into a new work of fiction entitled *Demons 5, Exorcists 0: A Fable* published in 1995. An analogous satire sprinkled with thinly veiled elements of

autobiography, Blatty's text echoed Altman's *The Player* in its keenly observed expose of Hollywood's insider trading. Having further mined his association with the Hollywood Horror franchise and the industry in literary terms, Blatty was nevertheless recruited by Fox TV with the promise of adapting his original *Exorcist* text into a four-hour mini-series. Once again, Blatty seized the opportunity to try and rewrite franchise history and resurrect his theological concerns in an alternative format that advocated further exposition at the expense of the novel's more sensationalist or shocking elements. Although Blatty's hopes of challenging Friedkin's first film adaptation failed to reach fruition, King was able to adapt *The Shining* in 1997 using this four-hour format for Warner Bros.

However, such an artistic endeavour ultimately proved unnecessary for Blatty once Friedkin agreed to re-edit and restore the all-important footage to the first film after a sustained 25 year campaign. According to Blatty, Friedkin had cited the audience's limited attention span as the reason why he had trimmed his first cut. In keeping with Hollywood's fondness for exploitation and returns, the director has since conceded retrospectively in several interviews that he did in fact make a mistake and "would redo all of my films if I had the chance, because to some extent I've changed my attitude about a lot of the way I used to make"¹⁵³ them.

Promoted as *The Exorcist: The Version You've Never Seen*, Warner's high profile 25th Anniversary re-release offered audiences an updated and enhanced version which, although certainly not a 'Director's cut' in the strictest sense, fulfilled Blatty's need for a 'Writer's Cut.' Similarly, *Night of the Living Dead* co-writer Russo had released a revisionist version of that first film two years previous.¹⁵⁴ For Blatty however, such a dramatic and unabashed turnaround signalled a significant creative and commercial

unhappy. AS CO-OWNER OF the rights to the first film, Blatty has recently fought to keep the franchise under his control. By joining together with Friedkin in 2003 and filing a lawsuit stipulating that Warners had tried to cheat them out of profits they had been promised, their relationship has come full circle.

Nevertheless, Blatty remains a singular authority on the franchise and was privy to an early screening of Schrader's prequel. Despite being vocal as to the superfluous nature of another prequel, especially after the significant flashbacks of Boorman's film, Blatty described Schrader's spiritual entry as both "well directed"¹⁵⁵ and containing some "exceptional performances."¹⁵⁶ With an aesthetic more in keeping with his own sensibilities, Blatty was perhaps relieved that Schrader's prequel subverted the first film's narrative and "stayed away from everything identifiable with the Friedkin blockbuster."¹⁵⁷ However, this vision also differed from Morgan Creek's, who had failed to communicate their mainstream intentions from the outset.

After effectively scrapping Schrader's version and hiring established sequel maker Harlin, Morgan Creek's explicit remit specified that this version should sufficiently incorporate key images and scenes reminiscent of Friedkin's film along with a more action-orientated approach. Endowed with what Kermode has called the "dubious distinction of being one of the very few movies to be remade before it even opened,"¹⁵⁸ the fourth film in the franchise continued the reactionary tradition. Indeed, Harlin's take on the prequel was followed by Schrader's version almost a year later finally giving audiences the chance to compare the two.

With such issues of (mis)interpretation and adaptation surrounding the development of the *Exorcist* franchise over a thirty year period, Blatty has remained steadfast in his

attitude and approach. Furthermore, franchise family members have demonstrated the franchise's ability to regenerate or degenerate depending upon the intentions and interference of those involved. Having exploited the title's money-making potential in film and literature and been exploited by Morgan Creek in their continuation of it, Blatty is more optimistic since the production company has finally agreed to search their vaults for *Legion's* alternate footage. Just as Savini told several interviewers that he wished they "could have seen the movie I wanted to make,"¹⁵⁹ Blatty has potentially been given an opportunity to reconstruct a genuine 'Director's Cut,'¹⁶⁰ and allow audiences to once more decide for themselves. Furthermore, Blatty could then join the ranks of his fellow franchise directors in being a part of the most revised Horror franchise in Hollywood history.

Although Blatty has all but retired from the industry, Savini's directorial career has been characterised by a series of stalled projects and short-lived forays into television; despite ongoing success with acting roles, stunt co-ordinator work and special make-up effects programme. They have been united in their experiences with the Hollywood Horror franchise in that both filmmakers were forced to follow in the footsteps of an industry phenomenon. They had to contend with and a first film's place in popular culture they were forced to compete with and against previous entries. Moreover, they faced the challenge of contradicting subsequent representations of possession or zombies in sequels, spin-offs. In other words, both Blatty and Savini were charged with having to make the concept scary again after outright parodies *Repossessed*, Jackson's *Thriller* and Russo's *Return of the Living Dead* franchise. As a Goreteur and member of the franchise family, Savini has rightly described how he and his contemporaries were captives of their own success.

in much the same way that Savini's reputation conjured up outrageous special effects and a proliferation of blood and gore, Blatty's name brought up the most iconic scenes from the first film in *The Exorcist* franchise. Both professionals have been stereotyped and exploited as a result. They were targeted by Studios and production companies that narrowly saw the special effects artist as a means of guaranteeing graphic or fantastic content and the writer as a dependable commodity upon which to continue the franchise.

As aspiring filmmakers they were frustrated by experiences despite their status and standing within the industry. Indeed, despite being celebrated by directors, the industry and fans in the pages of magazines like *Fangoria*, authors and Goretuers were similarly seduced by these projects and willingly exploited their status to advance their careers. In this respect alone, the Hollywood Horror franchise has played an important role within the industry as a vehicle whereby cast and crew members can realistically aspire to the director's chair.

Nevertheless, Studios continued to assert their ownership of the Hollywood Horror franchise after a first film director's absence. Moreover, the attitudes of modern audiences were prioritised and seen as paramount and their role in the success, failure or formulaic nature of any franchise instalment cannot be ignored. Characterised by intense conflict and in-fighting, these and other such franchise families were arguably condemned from the outset, with many members caught in a crossfire involving audiences, critics and the industry. Consequently, many franchises have only served to disenfranchise their new directors at various stages throughout the production process. As showcases for their talents, the Hollywood Horror franchise frequently disappoints yet demonstrates some potential if only financiers could prevent themselves from transforming these literary creators and monster makers into mere puppets.

¹ Cumbrow, 2000: 68.

² Previously addressed in Chapter 3, the first film director as mentor to potential new talent has continued to develop.

³ Kris Gilpin. 'Interview: Sean Cunningham.' *L'Ecran Fantastique*. No 67. April 1986. pp 12-17. (p15).

⁴ Richard Holliss. 'Tommy Lee Wallace on Halloween III.' *Starburst*. Vol 4. No 11. July 1983. pp 14-17. (p15).

⁵ As one of Horror's lesser known and even lesser respected sequels, *Look What's Happened to Rosemary's Baby* saw Paramount Pictures promote Sam O'Steen, the Emmy Award-winning editor of the first film, into the director's chair for a 1976 TV-bound follow up.

⁶ In this respect, both Perkins, as the iconic star of the *Psycho* franchise, and Joe Alves, as an established production veteran and Second Unit director of the *Jaws* franchise, exploited their affinity with the source material as means of securing their appointment. Whereas Perkins offered to direct the third instalment for free, Alves used his advisory role to recommend the more manageable sea park concept and pitch his idea of shooting the film in 3-D.

⁷ The result, *Society*, was an outrageously surreal and special effects laden foray into sex, snobbery, and 'shunting' in the suburb of Beverly Hills courtesy of make-up effects maestro Screaming Mad George.

⁸ Alan Jones. 'Brian Yuzna and the Fantastic Factory.' *Shivers* 73. January 2000. pp 34-37. (p37).

⁹ Whether crew members in charge of special make up effects should be considered artists or technicians is open to interpretation and derives from whether filmmaking should be considered an art or a science.

¹⁰ Maitland McDonagh, 'The State of the Horror Nation', *Fangoria*, no. 103, (June 1991), p. 23.

¹¹ The following films also saw Special effects Artists graduate into the director's chair: John Carl Buechler's *Friday the 13th Part VII: The New Blood*, Chris Walas' *The Fly II*, Jim Isaac's *House III: The Horror Show*, Dave Allen's *Puppetmaster II*, Kevin Yagher's *Hellraiser: Bloodline* and most recently Phil Tippett's *Starship Troopers 2: Heroes of the Federation*.

¹² Other pertinent examples include E Wiley's *House II*, Stern's *Amityville 4: The Evil Escapes*, Lafia's *Child's Play 2*, Henkel's *Texas Chainsaw Massacre: The Next Generation* and most recently Mancini and Goyer with *Seed of Chucky* and *Blade: Trinity*.

¹³ The evolution of monster make-ups and their creators has been well chronicled from the performer's point of view in Bradley, 1996: 52.

¹⁴ A career retrospective of Pierce's work can be found in Doug Norwine's article, 'Universal's Monster Maker', *Fangoria* 134 (July 1994), p. 14.

¹⁵ *Ibid*, p15.

¹⁶ A detailed study of these Cold War / Invasion narratives can be found in Biskind, 1983.

¹⁷ This new technique involved rear projection on overlapping miniature screens.

¹⁸ And the award went to *Cleopatra* with Hitchcock's *The Birds* passed over in favour of this all-star remake.

¹⁹ As seen with Chaney, and Lewis, the appearance of an eye-catching moniker, self-styled or otherwise, was pivotal in establishing a specific reputation in Hollywood.

Later examples include Craven as ‘The Sultan of Slash’ and Cronenberg as ‘The King of Venereal Horror.’

²⁰ This accolade appears in Waters’ *Serial Mom* (1994).

²¹ Stephen R. Bissette, ‘Fango’s Family Tree’, *Fangoria* 100 (March 1991), p. 88.

²² Ibid.

²³ Hollywood bible *Variety* labelled Romero’s first feature ‘an unrelieved orgy of sadism.’ McCarty, 1990: 103.

²⁴ Tim Ferrante, ‘The Fangoria Hall of Fame: Dick Smith’, *Fangoria* 100 (March 1991), p. 54.

²⁵ Having established the first make-up department in television at NBC in the 1950s and aged Marlon Brando in *The Godfather*, Smith was the perfect choice to prematurely age Von Sydow as Father Merrin.

²⁶ McCabe, 1999:138.

²⁷ McCarty, 1984: 106.

²⁸ Arguably this cycle began when William Castle was persuaded by Robert Evans at Paramount Pictures to pass on the film in favour of Polanski.

²⁹ McCarty, 1984:106.

³⁰ For a comprehensive discussion regarding the roots and definition of what constitutes a splatter movie see McCarty, 1984.

³¹ Norman England, ‘An Interview with George Romero Part 3: Press Conference Transcript’, <http://www2.gol.com/users/noman/interv4.html>, (21 August 2002).

³² Fischer, 1991: 644.

³³ Ibid, p. 645.

³⁴ Savini officially began his career in make-up effects working on the Ed Gein-inspired *Deranged* and *Dead of Night for Children Shouldn’t Play With Dead Things* creator Alan Ormsby.

³⁵ McCarty, 1995: 119.

³⁶ From Conrich’s examination of Cronenberg’s career in his article, ‘An aesthetic sense: Cronenberg and neo-horror film culture’ in Grant, 2000: 44.

³⁷ Tim Ferrante, ‘The Fangoria Hall of Fame: Dick Smith’, *Fangoria* 100 (March 1991), p. 54.

³⁸ Tom Savini as interviewed in the documentary *Scream and Scream Again*.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ *Fangoria*’s short-lived sister magazine *Gorezone* increasingly concentrated on foreign films and special effects artists.

⁴¹ David Kuehls, ‘The Fangoria Hall of Fame: Tom Savini’, *Fangoria* 100 (March 1991), p. 53.

⁴² Honorary Awards were given to William Tuttle and John Hanbers for their outstanding work on the *7 Faces of Dr Lao* (1963) and *Planet of the Apes* (1967) respectively.

⁴³ Baker’s subsequent credits include *Greystoke*, *Gorilla’s in the Mist* and *Planet of the Apes*.

⁴⁴ Bill Warren, ‘The Fangoria Hall of Fame: Rick Baker’, *Fangoria* 100 (March 1991), p. 44.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Winston was part of the FX team who won Best Visual Effects for *Aliens* in 1986.

⁴⁷ Marc Shapiro, ‘Chris Walas Works Out the Bugs’, *Gorezone* 16 (Winter 1990), p. 50.

⁴⁸ Norman England. ‘An Interview with George Romero Part 3: Press Conference Transcript’, <http://www2.gol.com/users/noman/interv4.html> (Downloaded August 21st 2002).

⁴⁹ Ibid.

-
- ⁵⁰ The most recent incarnation is a 3-D re-imagining of the film directed by Jeff Broadstreet.
- ⁵¹ Jones, 2001: 51.
- ⁵² Ibid.
- ⁵³ Savini was also approached by De Laurentiis to direct Heavy Metal Horror film *Trick or Treat* but lost out to Charles Martin Smith.
- ⁵⁴ Yagher was responsible for *Tales From the Crypt's* Crypt keeper segments and the episode *Lower Berth*.
- ⁵⁵ Marc Shapiro, 'The Fangoria Hall of Fame: Kevin Yagher', *Fangoria* 100 (March 1991), p. 55.
- ⁵⁶ Maitland McDonagh, *Filmmaking on the Fringe: the good, the bad, and the deviant directors* (New York: Carol, 1995), p. 106.
- ⁵⁷ After receiving partial credit on *Dungeonmaster* (1985) and full credit on the FX-heavy fantasy film *Troll* a year later – the first film to feature a young boy by the name of Harry Potter as its heroic protagonist – Buechler had recently completed *Cellar Dweller* before starting work on *Friday the 13th Part VII*.
- ⁵⁸ Apparently, this was because they were in negotiations with New Line to make *Freddy Vs Jason* until substantial disagreements over distribution rights sent the makers of both franchises went back to the drawing board. Paramount swapped Freddy for an ESP-wielding Carrie-clone. Royce Freeman, 'Interview John Carl Buechler', <http://www.pitofhorror.com/main/buechler.html> (Downloaded: April 15th 2002).
- ⁵⁹ Marc Shapiro, 'Kevin Yagher: Puppetmaster', *Fangoria* 98 (November 1990), p. 47.
- ⁶⁰ Ibid, p. 49.
- ⁶¹ Eric Niderost. The Fly II: Chris Walas Gets His Wings. *Fangoria* 81. April 89. pp 22-25 & 64. (p23).
- ⁶² Alan Jones. 'George Romero Speaks Out.' *Starburst*. Vol 12. No 7. pp 16-19. (p19).
- ⁶³ The Caretaker. 'Tom Savini Interview.'
<http://www.houseofhorrors.com/tsinterview.html> (Downloaded: June 19th 2002).
- ⁶⁴ Alan Jones. 'George A. Romero Speaks Out.' *Starburst*. Vol. 12. No. 7. March 1990. pp 18-21 (p19).
- ⁶⁵ Mike Watt, 'Night of the Living Dead 90', *Cinefantastique*, vol. 34, no. 3 / 4 (June 2002), p. 118.
- ⁶⁶ Atkins' lavish script was a self-contained trilogy that covered three distinct generations and explored the origins of the box.
- ⁶⁷ Anthony Tomlinson, 'Peter Atkins: Hell's Scribe', *Shivers* 53 (May 1998), p36.
- ⁶⁸ Ibid.
- ⁶⁹ This was despite the producer's reassurances. John Carl Buechler, 'Stories from the director', <http://www.johncarluechler.com/fl13.html> (Downloaded: 15 April 2002).
- ⁷⁰ Eric Niderost, 'The Fly II: Chris Walas Gets His Wings', *Fangoria* 81 (April 1989), p. 23.
- ⁷¹ Just as Walas was persuaded by Brooks to concede to shoot the Studio's movie, Buechler alleges he was repeatedly overruled by the associate producer in favour of a more conservative and conventional approach. Yagher similarly endured Miramax's retrospective cost-cutting exercises of removing set-pieces and pages from the script.
- ⁷² Despite an alleged budget of \$4.7 million, Savini later discovered that the production manager had made "some deal...where he'd get a huge bonus if he brought it in for \$2 million." Alan Jones. 'Reliving Night of the Living Dead.' *Shivers* 4. December 1992. pp 24-26. (p26).
- ⁷³ Ibid.
- ⁷⁴ Mike Watt. 'Night of the Living Dead 90.' *Cinefantastique*. Vol. 34. No 3 / 4. June 2002. p119.

- ⁷⁵ Michael Frasher, 'NOTLD: Zombie Director Tom Savini', *Cinefantastique*, vol. 21, no. 3 (December 1990), p. 18.
- ⁷⁶ Alan Jones. 'George Romero Speaks Out.' *Starburst*. Vol 12. No 7. pp 16-19. (p19).
- ⁷⁷ Frederick C. Szebin. 'Night of the Living Dead.' *Cinefantastique*. Vol 21. No 7. September 1990. pp 8-9. (p8).
- ⁷⁸ Ibid.
- ⁷⁹ Ibid.
- ⁸⁰ Michael Beeler, 'Hellraiser IV: Bloodline', *Cinefantastique*, vol. 26, no. 3 (April 1995), p. 35.
- ⁸¹ Frederick C. Szebin. 'Night of the Living Dead.' *Cinefantastique*. Vol 21. No 7. September 1990. pp 8-9. (p9).
- ⁸² Tom Savini. *Night of the Living Dead*. Commentary.
- ⁸³ A key cause for concern was in relation to the lack of screen time afforded to the franchise front-man and icon Pinhead.
- ⁸⁴ Yagher left to focus on his script for *Sleepy Hollow*, an adaptation he was set to direct until the project's high profile saw it become a Tim Burton film.
- ⁸⁵ The majority of murder scenes in Buechler's sequel suffered trims and/or deletions by the MPAA.
- ⁸⁶ Royce Freeman, 'Interview John Carl Buechler', <http://www.pitofhorror.com/main/buechler.html> (15 April 2002).
- ⁸⁷ John Carl Buechler, 'Stories from the director', <http://www.johncarlbuechler.com/fl3.html> (15 April 2002).
- ⁸⁸ Marc Shapiro, 'Chris Walas Works Out the Bugs', *Gorezone* 16 (Winter 1990), p. 50.
- ⁸⁹ Ibid.
- ⁹⁰ Alan Jones. 'Reliving Night of the Living Dead', *Shivers* 4. December 1992. p26.
- ⁹¹ Mike Watt, 'Night of the Living Dead 90', *Cinefantastique*, vol. 34, no. 3 / 4 (June 2002), p. 118.
- ⁹² Ibid.
- ⁹³ Ibid.
- ⁹⁴ Savini has taken cameo roles in a number of pictures including *Ted Bundy* and *Children of the Living Dead* along with a crowd-pleasing cameo of Romero's *Land of the Dead* and the key role of Sex Machine in *From Dusk Till Dawn*.
- ⁹⁵ See Chapter 1.
- ⁹⁶ Reportedly, Monash wanted to move the location, change the Iraq-set prologue, change Chris McNeil's career and the characterisation of Kinderman; the character to whom Blatty was most strongly attached, and drop Merrin completely. McCabe 1999:25.
- ⁹⁷ The role of Chris MacNeil had allegedly been based on Blatty's close friend and neighbour, Shirley McLaine, who had tentatively agreed to star in the picture.
- ⁹⁸ McCabe 1999: 36
- ⁹⁹ McCabe, 1999: 121.
- ¹⁰⁰ Friedkin recalls that "he didn't do the novel...I thought the script was frankly terrible and I told Bill that." McCabe 1999: 37.
- ¹⁰¹ Both Kermode and McCabe have documented how Friedkin first declined Herrmann's suggestions then rejected Schiffrin's composition outright before happening upon Mike Oldfield's *Tubular Bells*, a track now synonymous with the franchise. Although Schiffrin's work was deemed unsuitable by Friedkin, the score was later adopted by Rosenberg's adaptation of Anson's *The Amityville Horror* in 1979 and nominated for Best Original Score.
- ¹⁰² McCabe 1999: 126.

¹⁰³ Richard McCaffrey. 'William Peter Blatty: Novelist and Screenwriter of The Exorcist.' http://www.bbc.co.uk/films/2000/10/12/william_peter_blatty_interview.shtml (Downloaded: August 22nd 2002).

¹⁰⁴ Mark Kermode. 'Exorcist II: The Final Cut.' *Film Review*. November 2004. Issue 650, pp70-72. (p72).

¹⁰⁵ McCabe 1999: 79.

¹⁰⁶ It may have been 'for the good of the film' but surely this goes against Friedkin's assertion that he was making this first and foremost for Blatty. McCabe 1999: 126

¹⁰⁷ Friedkin's fondness for film adaptation was evident up until his disastrous return to Horror with *The Guardian* in 1990.

¹⁰⁸ Both Mancini and Lafia as writers and scriptwriters on *Child's Play* were equally frustrated by Tom Holland's take on the script.

¹⁰⁹ Marc Savolv. 'The Horror, The Horror: An Interview with Exorcist Screenwriter and Author William Peter Blatty.' http://www.austinchronicle.com/issues/dispatch/2000-03-24/screens_feature.html (Downloaded: June 16th 2001).

¹¹⁰ For King's own frank recollections and review of the film see *On Writing: A Memoir*, 2000.

¹¹¹ Philip Nutman. 'Bring On the Monsters: Part 1.' *Fangoria* 87. October 1989. pp 30-33 & 61. (p32).

¹¹² Howard Maxford. 'Psycho II.' *Shivers* 39. April 1997. pp 38-39 (p39).

¹¹³ Similarly both Stern and Henkel ignored the events of previous entries in self-penned sequels to *The Amityville Horror* and *The Texas Chainsaw Massacre*.

¹¹⁴ Despite an acknowledgement that there were "certain very mundane and commercial reasons for going out and making this film," Henkel optimistically argued in press interviews for the film that he "could do justice to the material where others had failed." John Wooley. *Saw Man*. *Fangoria* 147. October 1995. pp 48-51. (51).

¹¹⁵ 172J

¹¹⁶ Whilst Universal had the right to option Bloch's story, their disapproval ensured that their cinematic sequel would eschew Bloch's post-modern examination of the genre.

¹¹⁷ The concept of the Director's Cut, exploited as an additional marketing ploy nevertheless gained currency with audiences on account of Scott's revisiting *Blade Runner*.

¹¹⁸ Prior to this, Spielberg had sensationally shot additional footage and re-edited his film for a Special Edition of *Close Encounters of the Third Kind* released theatrically three years after the original in 1980. To a lesser extent, Carpenter shot additional sequences for the televised version of *Halloween* on the set of the sequel.

¹¹⁹ This approach has been integrated into the marketing strategies of big budget Hollywood blockbusters and the arrival of Ultimate, Platinum and Collector's Editions. Comic book franchises *X-Men* and *Spider-Man* have taken such an approach one step further with the 1.5 and 2.5 editions on DVD.

¹²⁰ For a full description of Mancini's outline and discussion regarding the project's stalled development at Universal see Arrow. 'Don Mancini Interview Part 2.' <http://www.joblo.com/arrow/interview32-2.htm> (Downloaded: March 30th 2003).

¹²¹ McCabe, 1999: 173.

¹²² This was due to the fact that "the motel, the house, the general surround...was as strong a part of the tone of the whole thing." Daniels, 1975: 14.

¹²³ As the iconic face of the franchise, Perkins was inextricably linked with both the character and concept to such an extent that he felt suffocated by it. McCarty, 1990: 69.

¹²⁴ Winecoff, 1996: 426.

¹²⁵ In constructing his slice of American Gothic, Perkins heightened the themes of conflict, tragedy and guilt to present a paradoxically ambiguous yet explicit tale of

redemption and salvation with a strong sense of satirical black humour. Edward Gross. 'Norman Bates: The Hamlet of Horror Roles.' *Fangoria's Bloody Best* 6. 1987. pp 54-57 & 65. (p56).

¹²⁶ McCabe, 1999: 173.

¹²⁷ Ibid.

¹²⁸ Hanke, 1991: 258.

¹²⁹ Scenes were shot with Dourif not only restaging Karras' final moments from *The Exorcist*, but also a sequence in which Karras' corpse (Dourif) is examined in a morgue by a pathologist with Kinderman in attendance.

¹³⁰ Mark Kermode. 'A Legion of Interference.' *Fangoria* 122. May 1993. pp 66-70 & 82. (p68).

¹³¹ Christopher Koetting. 'Speak of the Devil.' *Fangoria* 180. March 1999. pp 66-75. (p69).

¹³² Ivor Davis. 'Back to Fright.' *The Times*. November 20th 1986. p 16.

¹³³ Winecoff, 1996: 426.

¹³⁴ Ibid.

¹³⁵ McCabe, 1999: 174.

¹³⁶ Ibid.

¹³⁷ Steve Biodrowski. 'The Exorcist III: Legion.' *Cinefantastique*. Vol 21. No 2. September 1990. p 21.

¹³⁸ Ibid.

¹³⁹ Christopher Koetting. 'Speak of the Devil.' *Fangoria* 180. March 1999. pp 66-75. (p69).

¹⁴⁰ McCabe 1999: 175.

¹⁴¹ Ibid, p174.

¹⁴² Christopher Koetting. 'Speak of the Devil.' *Fangoria* 180. March 1999. pp 66-75. (p69).

¹⁴³ Landsburg was known as the producer of such schlock movies of the week as *The Savage Bees*. Jack Ruby. 'An Interview with Carl Gottlieb: Part 2.'

<http://www.13thstreet.com/site/common/view-content.jsp?section=Features&id=ababa-234ad-asdf3-234ad> (Downloaded: April 15th 2002).

¹⁴⁴ Nancy Mills. 'The Live-Action filming of Jaws 3-D.' *Cinefantastique*. Vol 13. No 6. September 1995. p62.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid.

¹⁴⁶ McCabe, 1999: 175.

¹⁴⁷ This quote from *Halloween III* antagonist Conal Cochrane is a reference to his plan to kill American's children through a combination of clever merchandising, marketing and advertising.

¹⁴⁸ Wildly different in approach and tone to the first two films and conceived of as the first of many generic anthology films, Wallace's sequel explored the festival's Celtic origins and American commercialism to answer the nursery rhyme that dared to ask what little boys were made of. By simultaneously commenting and capitalising upon the mass merchandising of cinematic tie-ins, the film's thematic ambivalence effectively complemented Wallace's *Toy Story* was an excursion into murder-mystery territory courtesy of an army of Terminator-esque toys. Halloweenmovies.com.

'Interview: Tommy Lee Wallace.'

http://www.halloweenmovies.com/site/interview_tlw.htm (Downloaded: February 10th 2003).

¹⁴⁹ Richard Holliss. 'Tommy Lee Wallace on Halloween III.' *Starburst*. Vol 4. No 11. July 1983. pp 14-17. (p16).

¹⁵⁰ Ibid.

¹⁵¹ McCabe, 1999: 175.

¹⁵² Whether the result of sheer coincidence or the product of shrewd commercial tactics and Studio strategies, many potential conflicts are resolved as stars leave, scripts change and many projects stall or fall apart.

¹⁵³ Barnes & Noble.com. 'William Friedkin: Exorcising cinematic demons with The Version You've Never Seen.'

<http://video.barnesandnoble.com/search/interview.asp?ctr=599175> (Downloaded: June 25th 2002).

¹⁵⁴ Co-writer Russo re-edited the film and shot additional footage for a heavily criticised 30th Anniversary edition.

¹⁵⁵ Mark Kermode. 'Exorcist III: The Final Cut.' *Film Review*. November 2004. Issue 650, pp70-72. (p72).

¹⁵⁶ Ibid.

¹⁵⁷ This included revolving heads, projectile vomit and bouncing beds. Ibid, p74.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid, p71.

¹⁵⁹ The Caretaker, 'Tom Savini Interview',

<http://www.houseofhorrors.com/tsinterview.html> (Downloaded: 19 June 2002).

¹⁶⁰ Indeed, more recent writer-directors Goyer and Mancini have seen *Blade: Trinity* and *Seed of Chucky* released on video unrated and rated, in keeping with the current marketing trend and demand for alternative versions and footage deleted from the theatrical version.

Chapter 4:

Joe Berlinger: Rage Against the Machine

“Often the writer and director are cogs in a much larger
and sometimes very cruel machine”¹

- Clive Barker

Promoting from within the franchise family ensured some degree of marketable fidelity and the rise of the special effects artist represented a form of logical progression. However, the reluctance and/or unsuitability of former directors or crewmembers to take over the sequel saw to it that replacements from outside the franchise had to be found. Consequently, this fourth Chapter will focus on franchise outsiders' relationships with the Hollywood Horror franchise with a focus on Joe Berlinger's *Blair Witch 2: Book of Shadows*. In doing so, this chapter will consider the extent to which outsiders are directed by executives, marketing departments and the preconceived notions of the audiences, critics and censors. Moreover, this chapter will address the lasting effects the franchise has had on directors' careers and how their films can be reconciled with their body of work. In order to examine these issues fully, I shall also be referring to David Fincher's *Alien 3*, John Boorman's *Exorcist 2* and Stephen Hopkins' *A Nightmare on Elm Street 5: The Dream Child* amongst other key examples.

Reportedly made for \$30,000 and acquired by Artisan for one million dollars at the Sundance Independent Film Festival, *The Blair Witch Project* grossed over \$250 million worldwide becoming the most profitable film of all time. As a fledgling company keen to make its mark, Artisan latched onto the film's potential and shepherded it through the final stages of post-production to create a film that would

raise their profile and profit margins. Funded through the generous assistance of John Pierson, host of the Independent Film Channel's *Split Screen* series, first time filmmakers Daniel Myrick and Eduardo Sanchez merely wanted something they could sell “to cable, (or) maybe get HBO or Showtime to pick it up.”²

Having drawn their inspiration and company name from Benjamin Christensen's witchcraft documentary *Haxan*, the pair combined the style and structure of *Cannibal Holocaust* and *Last House on the Left*³ to create an internet-reliant incarnation of the elaborate Horror hoax film. Although far from original in its endeavours, *The Blair Witch Project* effectively updated and fused the ‘snuff’ film format with the supernatural elements of American folklore. However, Artisan took this increasingly complex and compelling mythology and exploited its potential through one of the most successful and innovative marketing campaigns in recent film history.

After six months of pre-release publicity and post-purchase tinkering, Artisan released the film on July 30th 1999, fully embracing the range of merchandising opportunities available. Although the film's box office total soon surpassed the all-important \$100 million mark, audience reaction to the film was fiercely divided. Indeed, this profound difference of opinion set in motion a series of events that would see Berlinger's sequel consumed by an unprecedented backlash. With the film teetering on the edge of cultural phenomenon, Artisan were eager to exploit the title and ensure that the numerous imitations and parodies fast tracked through development did not diminish the power of any possible follow up. However, such a reactionary policy towards feature film production has an adverse effect on a sequel's potential success and increases the cumulative pressure placed upon the production.⁴ Motivated by a

combination of real and financial greed, Artisan followed in the footsteps of its competitors by rushing into pre-production on a legitimate sequel.

As proven in previous Chapters, the seeds of a franchise film's problems were often sown early in the production process and this is the case here with a tight twelve month release schedule to ensure it could be in theatres by Halloween. Coupled with an outsider's unfamiliarity with the material and a Studio's way of working, the need to acclimatise and focus on finishing the project left little room for experimentation or negotiation. Nevertheless, many directors were equipped with enough optimism, enthusiasm and determination to deliver a piece of filmmaking that was both creative and commercial.

The Outsiders

Just as Friedkin refused to return for *The Exorcist II*,⁵ Spielberg twice rejected⁶ Universal's advances when it came to creating a sequel to his Summer Blockbuster *Jaws*.⁷ Following his second refusal to indulge in what he publicly considered "corporate business,"⁸ and the DGA's decision to veto a waiver which would have given the job to *Jaws* editor Verna Fields as an esteemed member of the franchise family,⁹ Universal entrusted one of its most treasured commodities to a veritable outsider. Thirty-eight year old Frenchman Jeannot Szwarc, a TV veteran who had sufficiently impressed the Studio with his first feature *Bug*, was not 'afraid to go back in the water.'¹⁰ Despite only three weeks preparation time Szwarc believed he "would have been an idiot to turn it down;"¹¹ attracted by the opportunity of a high profile franchise film. Easily seduced by Studios keen to minimise budgetary expenditure and

ensure the longevity of the franchise, filmmakers often found the tone and content explicitly dictated as a result.

As the director of *Alien 3*, following the departure of Renny Harlin and Vincent Ward, David Fincher represents Hollywood's willingness to support the directorial debuts of advertising executives and MTV directors.¹² However, such appointments have been accompanied by expressions of concern and hypocritical accusations that these directors would favour style and special effects over script content and performance. Prior to these attacks, film school graduates Rick Rosenthal, Adam Grossman and more recently J.T. Petty have also been given the opportunity to direct sequels to *Halloween*, *Sometimes They Come Back Again* and *Mimic: Sentinel* on the basis of their thesis films *The Toyer*, *Trap Door* and *Soft For Digging*. In this respect the film school route has established itself as a valid gateway into the profession by way of the Hollywood Horror franchise.

Elsewhere, graduates from the small screen included *Child's Play 3's* Jack Bender and *Omen: The Final Conflict's* Graham Baker. However, *Omen* producer Bernhard had "a very strong idea of how the film should look"¹³ and intended to be "always on set to see what he is doing."¹⁴ Indeed, this decision to focus on novice directors who had demonstrated both passion and promise through their scripts, short films and show reels, saw Studios, production companies and producers tap into raw talent at an affordable and potentially lucrative rate and maintain a firm control over their properties.

An alternative approach was to recruit from a pool of directors who had already tasted success with their first genre film. These directors were eager to work on a project with a significantly higher profile as a means to an end through which they could ingratiate

themselves with the Hollywood studios. Therefore the franchise proved irresistible to those interested in furthering their careers¹⁵ and it was within the slasher sub-genre that such a trend often dominated director selection.¹⁶ Operating in a similar vein, Studios and production companies often expanded their search outside of the domestic arena and increasingly looked to the international film market. Hoping to exploit unfamiliar filmmakers as a means of rejuvenating their franchise titles, directors like Renny Harlin and Guillermo Del Toro who, after infiltrating Hollywood through Empire's *Prison* and Dimension's *Mimic*, were approached by New Line for *A Nightmare on Elm Street 4* and *Blade II*.

Prior to these sequels, Australian-based filmmakers Richard Franklin and Philippe Mora were also recruited in the early eighties.¹⁷ Trenchard-Smith was yet one more director who initially approached Hollywood with his own project, *The Paperboy*, only to be offered a franchise film. Similarly, directors such as Jean-Pierre Jeunet and Ronny Yu were approached by Fox and Universal to direct fourth entries in the *Alien* and *Child's Play* franchise on account of their stylistic success and international reputations.¹⁸ Seduced by the idea of accessing a wider international audience with a big budget high profile release established international filmmakers were persuaded to put aside self-penned projects in favour of assimilation and the opportunity to establish a credible reputation through the Hollywood Horror franchise.¹⁹

Based on this evidence, the franchise has focused on fresh talent and first-time filmmakers. Nevertheless, Studios also approached established and experienced independent filmmakers renowned for operating outside of the Studio system with some proven genre experience. Just as Schrader and Medak were recruited by Morgan Creek and Paramount for *Exorcist: the Beginning* and *Species II*, their first genre films in

almost twenty years, the late eighties saw John Hough and Joseph Sargent direct fourth entries in *The Howling* and *Jaws* franchises.²¹ Furthermore, *Alien* director Scott was approached by producer De Laurentiis to direct *Hannibal*²² and Van Sant used his Oscar “get of jail free card”²³ to get support for his controversial *Psycho* remake.

Having exhausted Hollywood’s indulgence on his philosophical fairy tale *Zardoz*, John Boorman, who had turned down *The Exorcist* on the grounds that “it would be rather repulsive,”²⁴ was an unlikely choice to helm the sequel.²⁵ Simultaneously spurred on by the frustration of developing two scripts without either reaching fruition and seduced by Warner’s offer of “an almost unlimited budget, a cool million dollar director’s fee, and, best of all, total artistic control,”²⁶ this combination of push and pull factors secured his involvement. In this respect the Hollywood Horror franchise has not only been approached by directors as a calculated yet challenging career move but also accepted as a chance to redress the past.

With Myrick and Sanchez unwilling to direct a *Blair Witch* sequel, Artisan was consoled by their intention to return for the third film; one they envisioned as a prequel. With a background in advertising, Berlinger was inspired by Wiseman’s controversial 1967 documentary *Titticut Follies* and worked with Bruce Sinofsky on the comic short *Outrageous Taxi Stories*. This led to the formation of Gray Matter Productions,²⁷ the company through which they released the award winning *Brother’s Keeper* in 1992. A showcase for concerns that would dominate the director’s career, *Brother’s Keeper* highlighted Berlinger’s interest in the U.S. criminal justice system and the media’s role in shaping small town America. After directing episodes of *Homicide*, Berlinger and Sinofsky returned to documentary filmmaking with the multi-award winning *Paradise Lost* in 1996. Venturing back into America’s heartland, the pair investigated the

murder of three eight-year-old boys and the subsequent manhunt that found three local teenagers responsible. In examining society's reaction, the pair exposed the flaws in the Prosecution's case and the way in which the accused were branded as 'satanic' by the local media. After years of research and reels of footage, Berlinger strongly believed the teens were innocent and followed up this investigation with a sequel, entitled *Paradise Lost 2: Revelations*, four years later.

Having lived with and through the trials of the West Memphis Three for over five years, Berlinger felt in need of a break from both the subject matter and frequent collaborator Sinofsky. Despite his status as an acclaimed documentarian,²⁸ Berlinger experienced frustration as he began pitching ideas to raise the financing for his first feature. However, after soliciting sufficient support from celebrated independent producer Christine Vachon and Killer Films, Berlinger brought his project about a bizarre 1930s murder case²⁹ to Artisan.

Under the impression that they were genuinely interested, Berlinger was shocked to be offered the *Blair Witch* sequel given its profile and reputation. According to Berlinger, Artisan was in search of a director who could lend "a certain level of credibility"³⁰ to the follow up and considered him a "calculated choice"³¹ in light of previous critical acclaim and an apparent affinity for the material's documentary style and backwoods 'true-crime' content. From this we can see how the participation of outsiders like Berlinger, Boorman and Cohen was often at the expense of self-penned personal projects turned down by these Studios and production companies.

However, Berlinger was cautious about accepting the assignment on account of his ambivalent attitude towards the first film. Although the director in him appreciated its

CONCEPT AND REGIONAL EXAMINATION OF OCCULTIST FOLKLORE, as a documentarian, he was “deeply disturbed and almost offended by”³² the clichéd way it was put together and then “marketed through misinformation.”³³ Like Boorman before him, Berlinger accepted the sequel out of sheer frustration, tired of “banging my head against the Hollywood wall.”³⁴ He seized this ironic opportunity to explore key thematic concerns and comment on the first film’s success. Much later Berlinger also cited an altruistic reason as partial motivation, in that it would help raise the profile of the Memphis Three and an alleged miscarriage of justice. Meanwhile Artisan sought to harness the director’s reputation as a means of maintaining the quality and content of the franchise.

Overwhelmingly in favour of this financial risk reduction strategy, Studios and production companies enticed experienced and fledgling directors alike into the franchise. Such offers forced a temporary adjustment in aspirations and outlook for directors to raise or resurrect their profile within a potentially safe and structured environment. Irrespective of their relative innocence, age or experience, outsiders recruited to take the franchise forward often discovered that such an arena was fraught with punishing schedules and oppressive budgetary constraints within which they had to satisfy the demands and expectations of producers and audiences alike. Furthermore, the work of inexperienced sequel writer/directors Ken Wiederhorn and Bruce Starr, of *Return of the Living Dead Part II* and *Silent Night, Deadly Night Part 2*, who had no specific filmmaking background to speak of, adversely affected the reputation of the Hollywood Horror franchise for all concerned.

As outsiders, many filmmakers inherited or courted key members of the first film’s cast or crew to elicit their co-operation and support. Although comparatively rare in the Horror genre, where big name actors and performers were not only unwilling to return

but also unavoidable, the participation of some key players was still considered pivotal, particularly in the first sequel. Boorman's *Exorcist II*, for example, not only featured the return of Blair's character but also required Max Von Sydow to return as Father Merrin. Similarly, Fox was unwilling to make *Alien 3* without Weaver and allowed the star to directly influence the tone and content of the picture.³⁵ Weaver's lucrative return in Jeunet's follow-up not only meant a rewrite of Whedon's script but also, as Kermode has rightly summarised, saw the actress "ascend to the throne of Alien Queen."³⁶

Indeed, franchise stars like Perkins, Englund and later Curtis were able to raise their fees and increase their level of creative control.³⁷ Present since the first film and perceived as an integral part of the previous films' success, returning franchise actors inevitably affected a director's ability to offer their own interpretation of a character and increased the potential for conflict.³⁸ With inherited cast and even crew-members tending to act as self-appointed guardians, the potential for outsiders to experiment within the confines of the franchise dwindled. Consequently, directors of literary sequels or later entries recast starring and supporting roles to accommodate either their own interpretation, a reduction in budget and/or an actor's reluctance to return.³⁹

Although such a stance contributed to the notion that all cast members were expendable or replaceable, stars' participation was certainly preferred by producers keen to forge marketable links and legitimise the project. Whereas some directors welcomed cast members with creative input and others had it imposed upon them,⁴⁰ overseas outsiders Jeunet and Yu shrewdly surrounded themselves with previous collaborators on *Alien Resurrection* and *Bride of Chucky* as a means of ensuring stylistic continuity, co-operation and support. With no surviving characters to consider, Berlinger's *Blair Witch* sequel side-stepped these issues by featuring a cast of unknowns in the style of

the first time. Alternatively, other outsiders killed off returning cast members as a means of shocking audiences, cutting costs and keeping the material fresh after using them to reconnect with the audience.⁴¹

With their outsiders selected, release dates set, and the cast and crew in place, a key area of contention was the script development. In some cases, Studios commissioned scripts from various writers as a means of exploring numerous options through subsequent drafts. Just as the final incarnation of Fincher's *Alien 3* script was rewritten throughout pre-production, Hopkins experienced a similar set of circumstances on *A Nightmare On Elm Street 5: The Dream Child* despite New Line's attempts to avoid the scriptwriting chaos that threatened to engulf part four.⁴² Whereas Hopkins and Fincher shepherded these unsatisfactory scripts, outsiders such as Steinmann, Freiser, Grossman and Othenin-Girard adopted a more hands-on approach to *Friday the 13th: A New Beginning*, *Warlock III*, *Sometimes They Come Back Again* and *Halloween 5* by redrafting their scripts to such an extent they were eligible for credit.⁴³

Dependent on Studio attitudes, others were subjected to varying levels of involvement in the scripting process. At the other end of the scale, intense producer involvement from Harvey Bernhard (*The Omen*), Robert Shaye (*A Nightmare on Elm Street*), Hilton Green (*Psycho*) and David Giler and Walter Hill (*Alien*) overrode a great deal of directorial control. Linked to the level of financial risk involved and status of previous entries, the majority of comparatively low budget sequels were subjected to far less Studio input at this stage. For their *Blair Witch* sequel, Artisan followed MGM's approach to *Species II* and commissioned scripts from three relatively unknown, and therefore inexpensive, writers.⁴⁴ However, Berlinger convinced Artisan to drop these cliché-ridden concepts, featuring Heather's relatives or news crews going in search of

the missing one, in favour of his own suggestion of a satirical and post-modern follow up. After submitting a two-page treatment to Artisan seven weeks prior to shooting, Berlinger wrote his script with experienced screenwriter Dick Beebe, whose previous credits included *House on Haunted Hill*.

Following outsiders Scott Spiegel, Greg Spence and Scott Derrickson on *From Dusk Till Dawn 2*, *Prophecy 2* and *Hellraiser: Inferno*, Berlinger's franchise experience began under an approved banner of relative free reign. Similarly, Freeman and Cohen, on *American Psycho 2* and *Return to Salem's Lot*, demonstrated how only the most tenuous of connections were required under the guise of creative carte blanche. At least during this stage of production then, the Hollywood Horror franchise offered some outsiders a remarkable amount of creative freedom, even if only within the confines of its central conceit.

Berlinger's Blair Witch

Outsiders often entered the Hollywood Horror franchise with fresh ideas keen to create a film that would paradoxically bare their own stamp and stand-alone as well as satisfy the rudimentary franchise requirements. By employing a range of strategies, these outsiders simultaneously sought to fulfil their contractual obligation to the Hollywood Horror franchise and create a film that would enhance their careers.

Berlinger, for example, adopted a reactionary and revisionist attitude in his refusal to continue the documentary style of the first film in the same vein that Boorman and Schrader approached their *Exorcist* sequels. Just as Schrader intended to "stay away

from all the things that people identify with the Friedkin film” in favour of a more “introspective”⁴⁶ approach, Boorman departed from Warner’s derivative ideology to atone for the alleged damage done by Friedkin’s film. Accordingly, the director described *The Heretic* as a “healing movie”⁴⁷ tracing Father Lamont’s metaphysical questions of faith with sumptuous sets and striking imagery.

As a documentarian who was equally critical of the first film and its subsequent reception, Berlinger was against making *Blair Witch 2* “derivative or dishonest to the documentary tradition”⁴⁸ or perpetuating “a hoax and wallow(ing) in the clichés of bad documentary.”⁴⁹ Moreover, Berlinger believed himself damned, irrespective of which avenue he pursued, and decided “to make a movie that was relevant to my work.”⁵⁰ Consequently, he described his film as an “anti-sequel”⁵¹ intending to “do everything possible and go against expectations.”⁵² This statement suitably echoed one critic’s description of Boorman’s film as “an anti-*Exorcist*”⁵³ with its prequel and sequel elements in the mould of Coppola’s *Godfather Part II*. Openly opposed to the tone and content of first films, directors like Berlinger, Boorman and Schrader were explicit and up front with the Studios to making a sequel that would not compromise their personal agendas.

Other outsiders also took steps to rebel against previous entries and returned to the darker tones of first films. Fincher and Hopkins, for example, actively sought to counteract the populist, action-orientated feel of *Aliens* and *Nightmare 4* with Fincher convincing Fox to “do something that was dark, mean and adult”⁵⁴ and Hopkins hoping to take Freddy “back into the shadows”⁵⁵ to be “less jokey and more brutal.”⁵⁶ Similarly, Derrickson’s *Hellraiser* sequel addressed an over-exposure of franchise icon,

instead, by focusing on the imaginative journey of a male protagonist and narrative more in keeping with Barker's first film.

In direct contrast to such an approach, yet in keeping with the reactionary mentality, *Alien Resurrection* outsider Jeunet was under strict Studio instructions to follow Cameron's successful formula by adopting the action-orientated feel of *Aliens*.⁵⁷ Aided and abetted by advances in technology, Van Sant, on the other hand, remade *Psycho* as part of an elaborate experiment that emphasised the theatrical essence of the franchise by redressing the representation of women and fulfilling Hitchcock's original intentions.⁵⁸ However, even though these outsiders endeavoured to appeal to fans with these comments and declarations, their redirection of the Hollywood Horror franchise often failed to find an appreciative audience or maintain much commercial viability.

As previously demonstrated, the remake often played and preyed upon the representation of gender roles as an assured method of updating the story. Whether assigned the role of "the final good guy"⁵⁹ in *Red Dragon* or merely allowed to kick out at a sister's killer in *Psycho*, the shackles and screams of the final girls of yesteryear have been shrugged off in favour of a new-found assertiveness and capacity for aggression denied to them in previous incarnations. Indeed, Nispel's *Texas Chainsaw Massacre* not only featured a more aggressive and resourceful Final Girl but also recast its infamous Chainsaw clan to incorporate female antagonists. Outsiders combined the monstrous-feminine⁶⁰ with the self-sufficiency of the 'modern woman,' to appeal to their core demographic with more challenging representations and role models.

With a target audience defined, Artisan "constantly reminded"⁶¹ Berlinger that he was supposed to be making a "teen psychological thriller,"⁶² Consequently, the director

populated his follow up with a cast of appealing twenty-something archetypes. Such attempts have been popular ever since Universal cynically geared *Jaws 2* towards this growing market by featuring a slew of teen protagonists.⁶³ And so, from Bender's *Child's Play 3* to Sherman's *Poltergeist III*, outsiders have focused on depicting the trials and tribulations of this target group to provide teen audiences with a specific point of reference within the Hollywood Horror franchise.

Since first film directors Myrick and Sanchez had laid claim to a *Blair Witch* prequel, Berlinger was forced to steer clear of any such elements. Furthermore, the director chose not to incorporate any flashbacks or first film footage in his follow up.⁶⁴ However, this approach has been liberally adopted by other outsiders who made concessions to an audience's perceived need for familiarity. Second sequels to *Poltergeist*, *Child's Play* and *Hellraiser* featured flashback therapy sessions and slideshow summaries to place the current film in context. The more innovative Scott however, attempted to appease the audience's need to see Starling and Lecter "on screen together as much as possible"⁶⁵ through a liberal use of audio tapes, pictures, letters and telephone calls. Alternatively, directors Franklin and Gibson boldly began sequels to *Psycho* and *Poltergeist* with a reminder of the first film's most memorable or climactic moments and then spent the rest of the running time trying to surpass them.

Back in the mid-1970s however, it was Warner Bros who initially adopted the most detrimental approach to franchise filmmaking in their early plans for an *Exorcist* sequel. Pointedly referred to as a "rather cynical approach,"⁶⁶ this follow up would heavily feature "unused footage, (and) unused angles from the first movie"⁶⁷ to create a "low budget rehash"⁶⁸ of the first film. Although Warner Bros ultimately dispensed with this idea it was a technique slavishly adopted by Harry's dismal *Silent Night, Deadly Night*

... which featured an astonishing twenty-five minutes of flashback footage.”⁶⁹

Such tactics illustrated the way in which some filmmakers and franchisors used flashbacks and first film footage as an easy way to save money and increase a sequel’s running time.

Although Berlinger decided against using first film footage, he deliberately referenced and incorporated recognisable clichés from several classic genre films.⁷⁰ As a means of emphasising the way in which certain characters are subject to the hypodermic model of media consumption, this iconography has been used to underline the sequel’s central conceit as to the dangerous nature of the media. Indeed, outside directors often felt the need to demonstrate their knowledge of the genre or graft scenes onto existing frameworks, with *Nightmare 5*⁷¹ and *Amityville II* borrowing liberally from *Rosemary’s Baby* and *The Exorcist*.

Just as Franklin’s *Psycho II* uncannily resembled Bloch’s *Straight Jacket*⁷² and Marcus’ *Jason Goes to Hell* mirrored elements of *The Hidden*, some directors also attempted to graft storylines from non-genre films onto their sequels. Cohen, for example, used Wilder’s play *Our Town* as “a model”⁷³ with vampires as “the ultimate Americans”⁷⁴ in *A Return to Salem’s Lot* and Del Toro similarly referred to *Blade II* as a vampiric “variation on the *Dirty Dozen*.”⁷⁵ The refore, directors’ ability to inject, update or transplant material from a range of sources demonstrates the cannibalistic nature of the medium, the genre and the Hollywood Horror franchise.

Rather than continue, replicate or compete with the first film’s narrative, Berlinger used the franchise as an opportunity to comment on the *Blair Witch* phenomenon. As an alternative he created a self-proclaimed “meditation on violence in the media”⁷⁶ within

the confines of a post-modern sequel.” Arguably inspired by Craven’s *New Nightmare*, Berlinger’s *Blair Witch* embraced a similarly subversive approach that eschewed any pretence at ‘mockumentary.’ Moreover, it also opened the door to the type of social commentary and content he was renowned for. A self-confessed fan of *Rosemary’s Baby* and *The Shining*, Berlinger sought to embrace a similar level of ambiguity and leave the film open to interpretation. However, without an established literary text or international reputation to back him up, Berlinger’s chances of being allowed to follow through on such aspirations were slim.

Reportedly pitched as an “edgy adult satire,”⁷⁸ most aptly demonstrated in the sequel’s opening montage, *Blair Witch 2* focused on the subject of evil “as something quite human, quite banal.”⁷⁹ This was in direct contrast to its predecessor which approached the subject matter in deadly earnest. Believing a particular concept or creature’s ability to scare audiences had diminished or disappeared, many outsiders took the relatively easy option of presenting parody and humour as a substitute. Such an approach was later adopted by Scott and Jenuet in *Hannibal* and *Alien Resurrection*⁸⁰ as many outsiders continued the narrative of previous instalments. However, their choices did not always fall in line with what audiences anticipated or necessarily wanted and Berlinger’s bold sense of experimentation critiqued the mythology, madness and hype that surrounded the franchise.

Rather than descend into parody at the expense of previous entries, other outsiders either ignored the tone and content of previous films or re-wrote franchise history. Although the director publicly claimed to have the freedom to do what he wanted,⁸¹ Berlinger’s “sequel to the phenomenon”⁸² was Studio-approved at the earliest stage. In forfeiting any chance of stand-alone status, the director shrewdly took Franklin’s

academic approach on *PSYCHO II* to the next level albeit without the reverence or twenty year hiatus.

Despite protestations to the contrary, few franchise directors have been able to dispense with a first film's tone, content and characters to such an extent that the only connection is the title. By acknowledging the first film's events as fact, the absolute opposite of Berlinger's approach, and offering only the most tenuous of links to a first film, *American Psycho II* director Freeman admitted that his contravention would be "a let down."⁸³ With the title its greatest commercial asset and creative liability, the director was nevertheless hopeful that people would warm to its jigsaw-like structure and campus setting before consigning it to the rejection pile.

Similarly, Dimension films repackaged existing scripts and strategically inserted the iconic Pinhead into the narratives for *Hellraiser* sequels *Deader* and *Hellworld*. However, with the notable exception of Ratner's *Red Dragon*, which attempted to erase Mann's first film from the franchise to create a more cohesive trilogy, this option to create a stand-alone film has been relegated to direct-to-DVD premieres – an avenue of distribution unavailable to Berlinger whose \$12 million sequel was scheduled to open across America on over 3,000 screens.

Some Kind of Monster

Whereas production was fraught with the pressure of deadlines, potential conflict with established cast members and the spectre of Studio executives, post-production posed insurmountable difficulties for outsiders. Having co-written the script and shot without

any franchise family members on board, Berlinger had been able to bring his own sense of perspective to the Hollywood Horror franchise prior to this point.

Indeed, many outsiders entered into a complex tripartite process of post-production scrutiny and consultation wherein feedback from test-screenings, Studios and censors could re-determine the film's content. The effects of this stage ranged from minor alterations to extreme cases of buyer's remorse. The term buyer's remorse was diplomatically employed by Schrader to describe the way in which Moran Creek took the unprecedented and expensive option of rejecting his *Dominion* prequel outright in favour of a fresh start with established sequel director Renny Harlin at the helm. The term is an appropriate way of describing the most extreme reactions on behalf of some Studios with regard to the very sequels they had not only developed but previously approved. Required to submit a rough cut, this stage of production saw many filmmakers forced to endure a series of creative compromises, irrespective of a film's budget, franchisor or financial backer, in favour of alleged mainstream sensibilities.

Just as Artisan rejected Berlinger's first cut in favour of what Berliner has called a traditional "teen slasher movie,"⁸⁴ *Alien 3* suffered the indignity of a surgical strike⁸⁵ by a Studio desperate to avoid the recent excess of *The Abyss* and *Die Hard 2*. With a \$50 million budget, Fincher's film warranted a great deal more scrutiny and interest from Fox in comparison to those sequels produced for considerably less. Indeed, the film's financial success was a high priority within the higher echelons of the Studio. After screening an assembled rough cut of 2hrs and 17 minutes, a "sobering experience"⁸⁶ for all as far as Fincher was concerned, Fox chairman Joe Roth issued his verdict. With the key comment that this follow up "needs to be more like a traditional Horror movie,"⁸⁷ the director has since commented how, "at a certain point (Fox) cut the balls off the

... . IN ROSENTHAL'S RELEASE, *ALIEN 3* ALL BUT DELETED CLASSIC SCARES IN FAVOR OF DRAMATIC TENSION WITH A BELEAGUERED RIPLEY FORCED TO ACKNOWLEDGE HER FATE AS A QUEEN EMBRYO LEECHED ITS WAY TOWARDS MATURITY. IN SUCH CASES, FINANCIERS HAVE BEEN GROSSLY INCONSISTENT WITH REGARD TO THEIR SUPPORT OF THESE DIRECTORS, THEIR PREVIOUSLY APPROVED SCRIPTS AND THE FUTURE OF THE HOLLYWOOD HORROR FRANCHISE.

Attempting to create a more satisfying and traditional Horror film for mainstream audiences, Artisan disliked the cerebral shocks and subtext of Berlinger's *Blair Witch* sequel in favour of what the director deemed "cheesy gore."⁸⁹ An after-thought from within Artisan's marketing department, these scenes and images were actually shot in the back of Berlinger's house five weeks prior to release. Indeed, it could be argued that these have been almost randomly inserted into the film despite the director's repeated protestations that such scenes affected the ambiguous tone he had strived for. Shot with Berlinger's co-operation but against his wishes, this inclusion of graphically violent scenes to an outsider's film during post-production accurately echoed Rosenthal's experiences on *Halloween II*.

As another first time director under the pressure of a Halloween release date, Rosenthal's rough-cut was supplanted with additional footage and violent scenes directed by co-writer/producer Carpenter, who felt audiences who were looking for a faster pace and more gore after *Friday the 13th*. Whilst Sholder and Little were similarly directed to include more blood and guts in *Nightmare 2* and *Halloween 4*, Demme's mainstream reluctance to "pander to...sado-voyeurs"⁹⁰ with *The Silence of the Lambs* was over-ruled by preview audiences whose feedback forced the director to "restore some of the discarded gore"⁹¹ he had fortuitously overshot.

to further satisfy audiences alleged need for standard Horror conventions and clichés, Berlinger was directed to shoot more additional footage within the truncated post-production period. This was intended to support Artisan's representation of Josh as an already imbalanced individual with a history of mental health issues, and therefore capable of the crimes that take place. Fond of these scenes in isolation, the director nevertheless felt that their inclusion in the film, as flashbacks at irregular intervals, was once again at the expense of any ambiguity he had created.

Rather than shoot additional footage, some directors were forced to delete sub-plots and specific scenes to appease Studio concerns. Peter Medak, for example, was directed to simplify events and focus on the effects. Understandably puzzled as to "why Studios don't decide to take something out at the appropriate time rather than after all the time, effort and money,"⁹² Medak followed instructions to alter the film at the expense of plot coherence with the addition of an unexplainable yet timely "blood and monster"⁹³ scene. Similarly, Fincher was forced to excise an entire subplot in *Alien 3* depicting Golic's intense yet deluded fascination with the Alien. Preferring to contradict themselves and undermine these outsiders than risk alienating audiences, Studios and production companies increasingly departed from approved scripts in favour simplistic and stream-lined approaches to the Hollywood Horror franchise.

After splicing Josh's asylum scenes and additional gore footage into Berlinger's film, Artisan also restructured it to "deliver the scares earlier."⁹⁴ This decision drastically altered Berlinger's original ending in which an eight minute interrogation sequence revealed the guilt of the film's core characters as opposed to anything supernatural. As far as the director was concerned, the inter-cutting of these confessionals throughout the film gave away the ending and ambiguity of the very film they had approved – one

designed to be a light-hearted romp in the woods” before taking “a deadly turn towards the end.”⁹⁶ Indeed, endings were a major source of contention for many outsiders committed to providing audiences with closure or a set-up for future instalments.

Fincher was equally unsuccessful at petitioning Fox to open *Alien 3* with Ripley’s suicide, a conclusion adopted at the insistence of star Weaver, and present the film in flashback. A major cause of concern for the Studio, particularly in light of similarities to *Terminator 2*, *Alien 3*’s final scenes became a key point of friction and in-fighting. This culminated in an enforced compromise shot two weeks before the film’s release that left neither party happy or particularly proud of the end result.⁹⁷ After entrusting the future of the Hollywood Horror franchise to talented outsiders, Studios and production companies, with the support of selected audiences, sought to safeguard the property by withdrawing their support during these final stages.

As franchise outsiders, directors often deferred to previous instalments for a fitting conclusion. *Jaws 2*, for example, followed the first film’s pattern whereas other sequels not only adopted an open-ended conclusion but also brought the franchise full circle to a new beginning.⁹⁸ Although a little more subtle than the staple shock epilogue, cliff-hangers at the final fade out denied directors and audiences alike an opportunity for closure. Part marketing ploy and part additional incentive for audiences to return with anticipation many outsiders eschewed shock epilogues in favour of some narrative closure. After *Damien: Omen II*’s relatively poor box office for example, Fox reworked its initial franchise strategy and planned a third, and reportedly final instalment in the *Omen* saga entitled *The Final Conflict*, with producer Bernhard proclaiming that “audiences really want to see the s.o.b die.”⁹⁹

Similarly, the death, and seemingly total destruction of the antagonist was also a key feature of *Child's Play 3* and *Stepfather 3*, both of which shredded their franchise stars in the final scenes. In search of an equally audience-pleasing finale, franchisors behind sequels to *Species*, *Candyman* and *Night of the Demons* provided directors Medak, Condon and Trenchard-Smith with additional funding to shoot extended special effects-laden finales. With the feedback from test screenings allowing for this additional financing, audiences were once again responsible for directing the Hollywood Horror franchise.

Having witnessed a series of changes and additions to *Blair Witch 2* during post-production, Berlinger was also required to add a title card at the film's opening which "went against one of the basic tenets"¹⁰⁰ of a sequel that acknowledged the first film as a fiction. Besides being allowed to keep the previously agreed and intentionally ironic *Book of Shadows* appellation¹⁰¹ as part of the film's title, few traces of Berlinger's satirical tone remain. This situation was further reflected in the removal of Frank Sinatra's 'Witchcraft' as the opening title track in favour of the Artisan-approved Marilyn Manson song 'Disposable Teens.'

A commercially cynical attempt to appeal to the target audience, this move was in keeping with their revised attitude towards the film. A similar event occurred on Zito's *Friday the 13th Part 4*, which had an extended introductory prologue imposed upon it by Paramount's Frank Mancuso Jr that focused on previous kill scenes and Jason's folkloric status. In this respect, outsiders were often guided by Studio appointed executives, temporary trustees or franchisors whose main concern was keeping the

commercial side of the Hollywood Horror franchise intact and ideally broadening its mainstream appeal.

Just as Berlinger intended to follow in the footsteps of the first film, by relying on suggestion and the audience's imagination, many outsiders sought to deliver more cerebral scares. With *Hannibal* a noteworthy exception,¹⁰² outsiders who attempted to return the franchise to its darker origins nevertheless continued to face opposition from the MPAA with *Species II* and *Alien 3* two such casualties.¹⁰³ Although it had never been Hopkins' "intention to throw all kinds of blood and guts up on the screen"¹⁰⁴ in *Nightmare 5*, the director nevertheless recalls the way in which New Line and the MPAA "cut the guts out of it completely"¹⁰⁵ to meet an August release date.

After attempting to play down his film's franchise origins and sequel status, the director also distanced his film from the Horror genre - equating it with the most clichéd aspects of the slasher film. Revealing an inherent prejudice and contradiction in his attitude and approach to the Hollywood Horror franchise, Berlinger's attitude and approach to *Blair Witch 2* was representative of the majority of outsiders.¹⁰⁶ Such efforts at reclassification and re-branding saw the more marketable term psychological thriller substituted for Horror. With such a biased and narrow-minded opinion arguably shared by mainstream audiences, this charade in which Horror films are reclassified and publicised, is perpetuated throughout marketing and publicity trails. Furthermore, it is evident in the numerous interviews conducted and press packs issued to promote these films.

Many outsider-directed sequels have forgone expensive advertising campaigns on account of their dwindling budgets. However, Berlinger's follow-up was afforded a

nationwide theatrical release and therefore subjected to additional interference - with the marketing department an on-going cause for concern. Indeed, both Berlinger and Fincher have since expressed serious concerns that “the marketing of the movie has driven creative decisions in a way that's typical of Hollywood”¹⁰⁷ to the extent that *Blair Witch 2* was (mis)represented and sold to audiences as another true story. This involved Artisan, who had fully exploited the potential of the Internet to create an unprecedented level of hype for the first film, saturating the market in a similar fashion on Berlinger’s sequel.¹⁰⁸

Over at Universal, Gus Van Sant was also dissatisfied with their marketing department who played “into the (audience’s) expectations of it being slicker and gorier”¹⁰⁹ than Hitchcock’s first film; misleading potential viewers as to the true nature and content of the film. Outsiders criticised franchisors for their miscommunication and audience dissatisfaction after the fact¹¹⁰ and New Line’s disgruntled *Freddy’s Dead* director Rachel Talalay¹¹¹ openly criticised the company for the part it played in the relative failure of Hopkins’ *Nightmare 5*. In this respect she cited their financial greed, market saturation and “horrible job of marketing”¹¹² the film to audiences as key causes.

Having expressed dissatisfaction with the way in which their films were governed and promoted, directors were also forced to take on board feedback from test-screenings. Unable to draw upon any previous association with the franchise, or an impressive enough back-catalogue to defend their cut, outsiders were often at the mercy of the results gleaned from scorecards and focus groups. Fincher in particular was frustrated at Fox’s decision to restructure and reedit his film based on the opinions of “16 yr old kids in Long Beach.”¹¹³ Although Berlinger and the majority of outsiders were unable to prevent their films from undergoing this additional scrutiny, Boorman was allowed to

release *Exorcist II* without such measures being imposed. However, after an unprecedented wide release¹¹⁴ and impressive weekend gross, Warner's flew Boorman back to try and salvage their collective reputations after reading highly critical reviews and receiving numerous reports of negative audience reactions. Withdrawing the film from theatres, Boorman attempted to restructure his poorly received sequel by making a series of extensive changes¹¹⁵ to "find a Horror film that was never there,"¹¹⁶ a task similarly assigned to Fincher and Berlinger.

Consequently, test screenings have been employed by Studios as just one of several preventative tools to improve a film's potential for success in an increasingly crowded marketplace. Far less costly and inconvenient than withdrawing a film and attempting to re-cut it, the process has also impacted on a film's allocated prints and advertising costs. As the first outsider, Boorman allowed the test-screening process to gain greater currency in the eyes of anxious Studio executives. In this respect it became a pivotal reference point for Studios and affected the way in which future outsiders, like Berlinger, were allowed to direct the Hollywood Horror franchise.

Judgement Day

Blair Witch 2 was released on October 27th 2000, fifteen months after the first film and in the wake of numerous parodies and spoofs from animation to soft-core porn.¹¹⁷ The film debuted with a \$13 million opening weekend before doubling this amount by the end of its theatrical run. Constituting an 80% drop in comparison to the success of the first film, and \$60 million less than industry insiders expected, the film's box office was far from impressive by industry standards despite its comparatively low budget.¹¹⁸

In terms of reception, New Line's first *Elm Street* sequel was similarly criticised for contradicting the first film's rules and internal logic. However, Sholder has since highlighted how his sequel out-performed its predecessor, set the tone for future instalments and contradicted the law of diminishing returns. Following Demme and Foster's departures due to the novel's content, critics were more forgiving of Scott's *Hannibal*, a film which became the highest grossing R rated film at that time, with the majority of critics tracing this film's problems back to the book's Grand Guignol excess and failure to conform to structure or expectations. With Lecter brought centre stage from film title to screen time, *Hannibal* fell in line with the established franchise tradition of cautiously rewarding audiences with a meatier role for its icons and antagonists. In his decision to question the very existence of the Blair Witch on the other hand, Berlinger made an unprecedented move which audiences and critics failed to anticipate or accept.

Left alone by Studios and producers, Van Sant and Boorman were not so easily acquitted by audiences and critics keen to point out discrepancies and the affects of recasting on meaning.¹¹⁹ In isolation of Studio and audience concerns, Van Sant rejected prevalent ideology in favour of his own vision - a move that confused audiences and outraged critics. Having adapted a franchise to suit his own theological and thematic concerns, Boorman portrayed himself as a victim of audience expectations on *Exorcist II*. In a series of confessional interviews, the director explained that his only sin as sequel director had been to deny the audience "what they wanted in terms of Horror"¹²⁰ – a sentiment later echoed by Berlinger and Fincher with respect to their franchise entries. Depicting the audience as "this wild beast out there,"¹²¹ the director

has since remarked that his failure creating an *Exorcist* sequel was not throwing “enough Christians to it.”¹²²

Fincher’s *Alien 3* similarly disappointed audiences expecting an action-orientated film in keeping with Cameron’s sequel and the franchises after-life in comic book form. With the primary love interest Hicks and adopted daughter Newt killed off within the first few minutes, it is easy to concur with Thompson that “audiences are not accustomed to being so vanquished, or undermined in a credit sequence.”¹²³ Echoing Boorman’s sentiments, Fincher later explained how if “we failed to do one thing in this film, and we failed to do many things, it was to take people out of their everyday lives. It’s not a scary scare movie but a queasy scare movie and I think people resent that.”¹²⁴ Indeed, by eschewing mainstream sensibilities and genre-specific clichés in favour of a more fitting narrative ‘conclusion’ more in keeping with Scott’s film, Fincher’s film failed to satisfy the masses.

Supported by friends and colleagues, Berlinger concluded that his sequel was grossly mistreated and fundamentally misunderstood by critics on account of its sequel status. The director even accused them of collectively poisoning audiences against the film with their cynicism and dismissive approach. However, Berlinger has claimed to be all the more shocked and disturbed by the personal criticism he sustained within their scathing reviews. A far cry from the praise bestowed upon him as documentarian, critics saw fit to question his apparent betrayal, lack of morality and, perhaps most damaging, the accuracy and authenticity of his previous works – a situation which left the director feeling unduly persecuted.

Having found what he later described as “a world-wide microscope waiting to rip the movie apart,”¹²⁵ Berlinger also had to contend with the disapproval of first film directors Myrick and Sanchez who disliked the sequel’s script and direction.¹²⁶ Although Chapter 2 has highlighted Craven’s candour with regard to the *Elm Street* franchise and Cameron considers *Alien Resurrection* to be the one “with the rubbish monster,”¹²⁷ Friedkin remains the most indiscrete and damning offender of subsequent entries in the *Exorcist* franchise. This ranges from his prophetic statement that Schrader’s prequel would become the cinematic equivalent of a “15 car pile-up”¹²⁸ with “bodies all over the place”¹²⁹ to his dismissal of Boorman’s film as “a stupid mess by a dumb guy.”¹³⁰ Having survived the Studios, audiences and critics to varying degrees of success, outsiders also faced unsolicited criticism from previous directors despite their potential understanding of its paradoxical nature.

Facing similar accusations of betrayal and dishonesty from audiences and critics, the directors of *Nightmare 2*, *Hellraiser 5* and *Friday the 13th Part V: A New Beginning* all came under attack from fans for being too radical in their reassessment of the franchise. On the other hand, the directors of *Jaws 2*, *Poltergeist II* and the remaining instalments of the Paramount’s *Friday the 13th* sequels were equally criticised for being clichéd and commercial with repetitively formulaic follow ups. Indeed, Berlinger’s metaphorical description of the project as a “poisoned chalice”¹³¹ supported such a paradox from the outset. Having taken the creatively ambitious option that ran the risk of alienating the first film’s fans, Berlinger clearly preferred Boorman’s flawed *Exorcist* follow up to Szwarc’s fundamentally safe *Jaws* sequel.

In his defence, Szwarc has been reluctant to take any directorial responsibility for a film he later referred to as a hugely collaborative “mop-up operation”¹³² he deserved credit

for completing. Furthermore, Berlinger's sequel dovetailed effectively into his previous and subsequent work as a filmmaker and documentarian. Forever cast as the first franchise outsiders, Boorman and Szwarc however, continue to epitomise opposing approaches to the franchise. As such, the appropriately titled *Exorcist II: The Heretic* and ritually simplistic *Jaws 2* could, and should, be held up as pre-existing templates for potential directors tempted to access Hollywood through the Horror franchise.

In their attempts to explain or justify what went wrong, outsiders have singled out specific departments within the Studio's corporate structure and implicated audiences and critics in a system that left many of them dissatisfied with the process and end result. On the cusp of walking off the film in protest, Berlinger was ultimately persuaded to remain and publicly support the Studio's final cut in the press after being warned that if "you walk off your first studio feature you'll never work again."¹³³

Similarly aware that walking out on *Alien 3* would be "more detrimental"¹³⁴ to his filmmaking career in the long term, Fincher also saw the project through to the very bitter end but withdrew from Fox's international marketing machine. As a first time director with no proven track record to fall back on, Fincher's attitude and experience accurately pre-empted Berlinger's, with the director describing the experience as "hellish"¹³⁵ and "the worst thing that ever happened to"¹³⁶ him. Indeed, the director has since responded to criticism by acknowledging that, although "a lot of people hated *Alien 3*...no one hated it more than I did,"¹³⁷ and to this day he feels physically "sick (at) all the concessions"¹³⁸ he had to make along the way. *Howling II* director also found his franchise film "murder from day one."¹³⁹ However, on account of his harrowing and heartbreaking experiences as a documentary filmmaker, Berlinger has broken this trend in describing *Blair Witch 2* as "a giant vacation in comparison."¹⁴⁰

Having blamed negative press for audiences' alleged failure to engage with what was left of the satirical subtext and social commentary he had attempted to instil in his sequel, Berlinger relished the opportunity to (re)present the film on DVD. Here, an accompanying booklet and feature length commentary track single-handedly seeks to redress the balance by answering the critics. He also explains the alternative interpretations and versions of a film which Artisan "just hacked...to death in the twelfth hour."¹⁴¹ Six months after the release of Harlin's *Exorcist: The Beginning*, Morgan Creek allowed Schrader to return to *The Exorcist* franchise to fine-tune his previously discarded prequel on a very limited budget. Following a series of select screenings at several international film festivals, Schrader's film has been released on DVD as a unique companion piece to Harlin's film and integral part of a unique franchise.

Likewise, the DVD release of the *Alien Quadrilogy* in 2003 saw Fox reinstate a great deal of deleted and alternative material from Fincher's preferred cut, thereby allowing audiences a chance to glimpse what Fincher had intended within the constraints of the fraught production and judge for themselves. Indeed, the growing importance and lucrative nature of DVD releases and re-releases, with their capacity for the inclusion deleted scenes, alternative endings and director commentaries has provided an invaluable opportunity for outsiders like Medak, Derrickson and Berlinger to respond to their critics and address fans and critics alike.

Although willing to return to the franchise for this purpose, Berlinger has dismissed any possibility of remaining part of the franchise family. Equally unlikely that Artisan would want this director to return, other Studios and production companies were keen to

retain their outsiders for *Psycho III*, *Halloween 5* and *Friday the 13th Part 5*. Indeed, some outsiders were persuaded to remain with or return to the franchise.¹⁴² *Howling II* director Mora, on the other hand, persuaded franchisor Stephen Lane to let him write and direct a third film after single-handedly setting up the financing and a distribution deal. Supposedly based on Brandner's third *Howling* novel, Mora's second attempt has been the most absurd departure to date in which Communism, oppression, immigration and genocide collided with Australia's Aboriginal ancestry as a means of exploring the genetic origins of werewolves. Eclectic and oddly enthralling, this sequel also featured a film-within-a-film subplot, entitled *Shape-shifters Part 8*, a misogynistic Hitchcock-clone, and an unholy trinity of lycanthropic nuns sent to Sydney to bring back a runaway bride. Subtitled *The Marsupials*, the film featured romance, inter-breeding, and the birth of a new generation and certainly proved that "there are more things in heaven and earth than you can shake a boomerang at."¹⁴³ This was a far cry from the commercial approach to *Halloween: Resurrection* which Rick Rosenthal returned to as "a second chance to make a similar but in some ways different movie"¹⁴⁴ after a seventeen year absence.

Whereas some outsiders optimistically carried on their association with the franchise and other low budget directors disappeared from the industry without a trace, a great many more returned to the relative security of previous positions within the film or television industry, sometimes permanently. In this respect, Berlinger entered into a period of profound inactivity, one described by the director as "two months on the floor of my office in the foetal position"¹⁴⁵ convinced his career was over. Full of regret regarding the choices and compromises he made, Berlinger's situation mirrored that of Fincher. The director found the industry unflinchingly unforgiving of *Alien 3*'s poor reception to such an extent that it "affected (his) reputation for a long time."¹⁴⁶

Although Medak and Van Sant returned to television and experimental independent filmmaking and Boorman retreated to Ireland, less established directors were able to secure the necessary support for their own first films within the genre. Just as Little and Derrickson graduated from *Halloween 4* and *Hellraiser 5* to *The Phantom of the Opera* and *The Exorcism of Emily Rose*, Bill Condon followed up his *Candyman 2* debut with the Academy Award-winning *Gods and Monsters* and *Kinsey*, scripting the successful adaptation of *Chicago* in between. Based on this evidence, and these directors' ability to sustain and develop their careers, it is clear that an outsider's decision to direct the Hollywood Horror franchise can translate into a higher profile and establish the necessary Studio support to move onto these and other commercially viable projects.

As others' career prospects languished in various stages of 'Development Hell', some outsiders turned their attention to more personal projects. These required less funding and resulted in more creative control as demonstrated by Jeunet's welcome return to French cinema with the critically-acclaimed *Amelie*. Channeling whatever effects of post franchise depression they felt into abating a growing pressure for critical and commercial success, directors such as Fincher, Boorman and Berlinger bounced back from their experiences as franchise outsiders with such acclaimed projects as *Se7en*, *Excalibur* and the award-winning documentary *Metallica: Some Kind of Monster*.

A project supportively resurrected by Berlinger's previous collaborator Bruce Sinofsky at the ailing director's suggestion, the *Metallica* documentary was the very antithesis of his franchise filmmaking experience. Freed from the constraints of an evolving script and punishing release schedule, this return to familiar territory was made with the full co-operation of the band and without any media backlash or insurmountable wall of

audience expectation to climb. With creative control and final cut signed over, Studio interference was completely removed once the band single-handedly bought back the rights to the footage to avoid becoming a syndicated heavy metal pastiche of *The Osbournes*. Since the successful release and reception of this documentary, Berlinger has not only completed *Gray Matter*¹⁴⁷ but also begun orchestrating his return to feature filmmaking with an adaptation of Edie Bunker's autobiography *Education of A Felon*.

Despite having no prior creative or financial connection with the franchise, established and aspiring directors alike were hired from a variety of different backgrounds. Once in the hands of these Studios and production companies who had previously owned, assimilated or purchased the rights to a particular title, franchises were often exploited without a realistic schedule or long-term franchise agenda. The role of director was often filled late in the production process and this further exasperated their potential for involvement or success. Indeed, few outsiders shared Scott's overwhelmingly positive experience on *Hannibal* prior to the test-screening process and the subsequent onslaught of audiences and critics well versed in sequel traditions. Insatiable and divisive, audiences have been more content to embrace mediocrity and regurgitation than innovation and an individual voice, despite repetitive complaints of dissatisfaction and a lack of originality with regard to each successive instalment.

Keen to exploit the frustration and ambition of fledgling and experienced filmmakers alike, the Hollywood Horror franchise has the potential to nurture or annihilate the creative talent involved. In spite of such stringent controls and restrictions however, directors have attempted to actively participate in and shape this process through a range of experimental and unexpected approaches ranging from faint facsimiles to the thoughtfully blasphemous. As a means of asserting themselves and inserting their own

ideas and thematic concerns into the material, directors have been reactionary, revisionist and returned to first principals. Subject to mixed messages, mis-marketing and the spectre of mainstream audiences, buyer's remorse has relegated many films' earning potential and popularity. However, by successfully courting controversy and raising their individual profiles, these outsiders have created a number of undoubtedly flawed, yet fascinating, pieces of contemporary cinema that collectively address the pitfalls of the production process and demonstrate the inherent potential of outsiders working within the Hollywood Horror franchise.

End Notes

¹ Michael Beeler. 'Clive Barker's Helraiser IV: Bloodline.' *Cinemafantastique*. Vol 27. No 2. November 1995. pp14—15 (p15).

² Marc Savlov. 'The Making of the Blair Witch Project: Into the Woods.'
<http://www.austinchronicle.com/issues/vol18/issue46/screens.blairwitch.html>
(Downloaded: 30 September 2002)

³ *Last House on the Left* Producer Cunningham has commented how "*Blair Witch* is like *Last House* revisited on a huge level." David Szulkin. 'Last House Mates.' *Fangoria* 200. March 2001. pp 56-60 & 98. (p60).

⁴ Also released within eighteen months of the previous entry were such under-developed sequels as *Amityville 3-D*, *Child's Play 3*, the ironic *Friday the 13th Part V: A New Beginning*, *A Nightmare on Elm Street 5: The Dream Child*, *Halloween 5*, *The Howling V* and Ratner's prequel/remake of *Red Dragon*.

⁵ See Chapter 4 for a detailed account of his refusal.

⁶ Once in the very beginning and again following the dismissal of ocean picture veteran John Hancock's after three weeks of shooting.

⁷ See Michael Dempsey. 'The Return of Jaws.' *American Film*. Vol 3. No 8. June 1978. pp 28-32. (p28). Similarly *Damien: Omen II*, *Pumpkinhead II*, and *The Rage: Carrie II* all saw a last minute switch in the director's chair with experienced TV or sequel-makers being brought in after Mike Hodges, Tony Randel, and Robert Mandel either quit the production or had failed to impress the powers that be.

⁸ McBride, 1997: 258.

⁹ Thereby adopting a similar approach to Paramount with Sam O'Steen's and the sequel to Polanski's *Rosemary's Baby* two years previous.

¹⁰ The infamous tag line 'Just when you thought it was safe to go back in the water,' was created for the trailer by Andrew J. Kuehn.

¹¹ Michael Dempsey. 'The Return of Jaws.' *American Film*. Vol 3. No 8. June 1978. pp 28-32. (p29).

-
- ¹² More recently Nispel and Snyder have directed well-received remakes of *The Texas Chainsaw Massacre* and *Dawn of the Dead* for New Line and Universal.
- ¹³ Adrian Hodges. 'First Chance on Conflict.' *Screen International*. No 241. May 17th 1980. pp 15 & 20. (p20).
- ¹⁴ Ibid.
- ¹⁵ Both Bill Condon and Gary Sherman were given the opportunity to direct first and second sequels to *Candyman* and *Poltergeist* on account of their previous genre specific success.
- ¹⁶ Such franchises as Paramount's *Friday the 13th* seemingly preferred this option in the case of part four and five with Joseph Zito and Danny Streinman respectively.
- ¹⁷ Richard Franklin and Philippe Mora had satisfied Universal and Hemdale's selection criteria with the Hitchcockian *Road Games* and *The Beast Within*.
- ¹⁸ Jeunet's previous credits included *Delicatessen* and *The City of Lost Children* whereas Yu came to Hollywood's attention with *The Bride with White Hair* and its sequel in 1993. Although Yu and Jeunet's first films for Hollywood were as franchise outsiders, international directors Sluzier and Shimzu were invited to direct the U.S. funded remakes of their films *The Vanishing* and *The Grudge* respectively. More recently, Hideo Nakata's Hollywood debut was the sequel to a remake of his *Ringu* franchise.
- ¹⁹ However, it was rare yet possible for directors to resist the franchise as a form of Hollywood short-hand with *Blair Witch* directors Myrick and Sanchez turning down *Exorcist 4* and *Bad Taste*'s Peter Jackson rejecting New Line's offer of directing *Leatherface: The Texas Chainsaw Massacre III* in favour of his independently financed and produced X rated puppet extravaganza *Meet the Feebles*.
- ²⁰ Medak had made *The Changeling* eighteen years earlier and Schrader had directed an ill-received remake of *Cat People* in 1982.
- ²¹ Although Hough's career had spanned over twenty five years, with credits including the notable *Legend of Hell House*, Sargent's thirty year career, primarily as a TV director, provided a clear indication of how high Universal regarded the future of the franchise four years after *Jaws 3-D*.
- ²² Arguably, this was Harris' authorial challenge to the traditional Hollywood filmmaking with a follow up which touched upon all manner of societal taboos from paedophilia to incest and humanised its eponymous character at the expense of the "free range rude" on display.
- ²³ Van Sant has described how the Hollywood Studios eagerly picked high profile nominated directors off the "Oscar tree" and capitalised on their current hype and popularity. Stephen Rebello. 'Return to the Bates Motel.' *Movieline*. Vol 10. No 4. Dec/Jan 1999. pp 69-72. (p70).
- ²⁴ McCabe, 1999: 158.
- ²⁵ Boorman considered the widespread reaction to Friedkin's film as a "loathsome" example of "child abuse by proxy" in which "audiences were only sickly responding with a kind of vicarious satisfaction at the abuses heaped upon a 12 year old girl." Hanke 1991: 254.
- ²⁶ Ibid.
- ²⁷ The company originally started off as Creative Thinking International (CTI) in 1989.
- ²⁸ By this point Berlinger had nominations and awards from Sundance, the New York Film Critics, the DGA and an Emmy,
- ²⁹ The case in question involved a man who secretly lived in his lover's attic for seventeen years. When the husband finally discovers the man, and the affair, he kills the husband and is brought to trial.

-
- ³⁰ Travis Crawford. Ready or Not It's Blair Witch 2: Book of Shadows. *Fangoria* 197. October 2000. pp 40-43 & 95. (p95).
- ³¹ Ibid.
- ³² Patrick Lee. 'Director Joe Berlinger Casts A New Spell in Blair Witch 2.' <http://www.scifi.com/sfw/issue183/interview.html> (Downloaded: January 10th 2005).
- ³³ James Mottram. 'Book of Shadows: Blair Witch 2.' http://www.bbc.co.uk/films/2000/10/24/joe_berlinger_bw2_interview.shtml (Downloaded: January 10th 2005).
- ³⁴ Gillian Flynn. Set Visit: Blair Witch 2.' *Entertainment Weekly*. May 7 2004. <http://jeffreydonovanfans.com/articles/ewblairwitch.html> (Downloaded: January 10th 2005).
- ³⁵ Having already said no to guns, Weaver's co-producer credit allowed her to monitor and control the way in which her character was written and, more importantly, dictate her fate in the final act.
- ³⁶ Mark Kermode's Narration. Alien Evolution Documentary.
- ³⁷ To secure their involvement, Studios often required directors to defer to or at least incorporate returning stars' ideas, protective of both their characters and reputations. Just as Weaver took a co-producer credit and Perkins ascended into the director's chair, *Elm Street's* Englund secured additional financial incentives in the form of profit participation deal and furthered his career with acting roles outside of the franchise and directing opportunities on the *Freddy's Nightmares* television series.
- ³⁸ One such example was the tense and turbulent relationship between director Dominique Othenin-Girard and actor Donald Pleasance on the set of *Halloween 5* in which the pair were unable to resolve issues over Loomis' characterisation and the film's violent content.
- ³⁹ When Scott was unable to secure Foster's return for *Hannibal*, on the basis that the actress objected to the way in which her character had been portrayed in Harris' novel, the role was sensationally recast with fellow Academy Award winner Julianne Moore taking her place and producer De Laurentiis put a positive spin on the proceedings.
- ⁴⁰ On *The Texas Chainsaw Massacre* remake, director Nispel worked with returning Director of Photography Daniel Pearl, whose presence constituted a unique selling point and marketable link to Hooper's first film. Consequently, Nispel played up Pearl's participation and input in interviews when describing the way in which he bowed down before "the grandmaster" and "just went along for the ride." Christine Allen. 'The Texas Chainsaw Massacre Cuts Again.' *Fangoria* 227. pp 16-21 & 90. (p21).
- ⁴¹ For example, just as *Psycho II's* Richard Franklin kills off Lila Loomis in a wickedly gratuitous homage to Hitchcock towards the end of the second act, first sequels to *The Omen*, *Friday the 13th* and *Candyman* used their returning characters in an extended prologue before killing them off and introducing a whole new set of characters.
- ⁴² New Line initially hired Leslie Bohem and Skipp and Spector to come up with competing drafts for the *Dream Child* script based on an approved outline which read: Alice is pregnant, Freddy wants the baby, and Dan is the first to die.
- ⁴³ The extent to which a director's input is incorporated into a film's script can be reflected in the WGA's arbitration process with Schrader and Spence receiving co-screenplay credit for *Exorcist IV* and *Children of the Corn IV*.
- ⁴⁴ The scriptwriters in question were Jon Bokenkamp, Neal Stevens, and Robert Parigi.
- ⁴⁵ Nick Hasted. 'Hell Hath No Fury Like A Studio Scorned.' *The Independent*. August 8 2003. <http://enjoyment.independent.co.uk/film/features/story.jsp?story=431680> (Downloaded August 24th 2003).
- ⁴⁶ Ibid.

-
- ⁴⁷ Omar Hendrix. 'What will 'Jaws' and 'Exorcist' do for an encore?' *New York Times*. June 27th 1976. p5.
- ⁴⁸ Patrick Lee. 'Director Joe Berlinger Casts A New Spell in Blair Witch 2.' <http://www.scifi.com/sfw/issue183/interview.html> (Downloaded: January 10th 2005).
- ⁴⁹ Dale Dobson. 'Slings and Arrows: An Interview with Joe Berlinger.' <http://www.digitallyobsessed.com/showinterview.php?ID=14> (Downloaded: January 10th 2005).
- ⁵⁰ Anthony Kaufman. 'Interview: Battling the Blair Witch, Joe Berlinger Takes on Sequels and Studio with Book of Shadows.' http://www.indiewire.com/people/int_Berlinger_Joe_001024.html (Downloaded: January 10th 2005).
- ⁵¹ Patrick Lee. 'Director Joe Berlinger Casts A New Spell in Blair Witch 2.' <http://www.scifi.com/sfw/issue183/interview.html> (Downloaded: January 10th 2005).
- ⁵² Anthony Kaufman. 'Interview: Battling the Blair Witch, Joe Berlinger Takes on Sequels and Studio with Book of Shadows.' http://www.indiewire.com/people/int_Berlinger_Joe_001024.html (Downloaded: January 10th 2005).
- ⁵³ Hanke, 1991: 254.
- ⁵⁴ Bill Norton. 'Zealots and Xenomorphs.' *Cinefex*. No 50. May 1992. pp 26-53. (p29).
- ⁵⁵ Marc Shapiro. 'The Nightmare Directors.' *A Nightmare on Elm Street: The Dream Child Magazine*. August 1989. pp 50-54. (p53).
- ⁵⁶ Marc Shapiro: 'Stephen Hopkins: An Englishman on Elm Street.' *Gorezone* 10. November 1989. pp 44-48. (p48).
- ⁵⁷ Endowed with such stand-out scenes as an underwater Alien ambush and Ripley's startling discovery, Jeunet's film also included such staples as an artificial person, the facehugger, a graphic chestbuster scene and the return of the Alien Queen.
- ⁵⁸ Van Sant specifically shot a continuous take in the opening sequence and an overhead shot of Marion's body at the end of the shower scene to fulfil this objective.
- ⁵⁹ Ted Tally. *Red Dragon*. DVD Commentary.
- ⁶⁰ This forms the main title of Barbara Creed's insightful text on the varying representations of women in contemporary Horror films.
- ⁶¹ Anthony Kaufman. 'Interview: Battling the Blair Witch, Joe Berlinger Takes on Sequels and Studio with Book of Shadows.' http://www.indiewire.com/people/int_Berlinger_Joe_001024.html (Downloaded: January 10th 2005).
- ⁶² Ibid.
- ⁶³ One critic accused Szwarc's sequel of looking just like a "Crown International youth picture" complete with its cast of "interchangeable teenagers." An earlier storyline involved the sons of Quint and Brody returning to Amity on the hunt for another killer shark, Szwarc reportedly felt trapped between two choices but, with Universal keen to capture the teen market, the director was encouraged to make "the second mistake" with his commercially viable sequel. David Bartholemew. 'Jaws 2.' *Cinefantastique*. Vol 8. No 1. Winter 1978. p18.
- ⁶⁴ An approach similarly followed by Boorman and Fincher in their franchise films.
- ⁶⁵ Ridley Scott. *Hannibal*. DVD Commentary.
- ⁶⁶ McCabe, 1999: 157.
- ⁶⁷ Ibid.
- ⁶⁸ Ibid.
- ⁶⁹ McCarty, 1989: 118.

⁷⁰ Berlinger references *Night of the Living Dead* in the owl eating shot, *The Omen* with the shot of the dogs on the bridge, *The Exorcist* with the backwards playing of the tapes and the tree-spinning girl in *Evil Dead 2*.

⁷¹ For a detailed analysis of Hopkins' film see Jenny Piston. 'Parturition and Horror in Stephen Hopkins' Nightmare on Elm Street 5: The Dream Child.'

<http://www.projectorbooth.com/topics/topic.asp?topic=60> (Downloaded: August 20th 2002).

⁷² In Bloch's script, which the author had written for William Castle for a picture starring Joan Crawford, an attempt is made to drive a former murderer insane. In Franklin's sequel Vera Miles' Lila Loomis is just one of the three mothers attempting to dominate and ultimately destroy Norman this second time around.

⁷³ Williams, 1997: 33.

⁷⁴ Kim Newman. 'Larry Cohen: Stuff n Nonsense.' *Shock Xpress*. Vol 1. No 5. August / September 1986. pp 6-9. (p8).

⁷⁵ Ian Spelling. 'Scripting a Fresh Cut.' *Fangoria* 211. April 2002. p33.

⁷⁶ Patrick Lee. 'Director Joe Berlinger Casts A New Spell in Blair Witch 2.'

<http://www.scifi.com/sfw/issue183/interview.html> (Downloaded: January 10th 2005).

⁷⁷ Anthony Kaufman. 'Interview: Battling the Blair Witch, Joe Berlinger Takes on Sequels and Studio with Book of Shadows.'

http://www.indiewire.com/people/int_Berlinger_Joe_001024.html (Downloaded: January 10th 2005).

⁷⁸ Paul Fischer. 'Interview: Brice Sinofsky and Joe Berlinger: Metallica; Some Kind of Monster.' <http://www.darkhorizons.com/news04/metallica.php> (Downloaded: January 10th 2005).

⁷⁹ Peg Aloï. 'Interview with Joe Berlinger: Director and Co-writer, Book of Shadows: Blair Witch 2.' http://www.witchvox.com/va/dt_va.html?a=usma&c=media&id=3052 (Downloaded: January 10th 2005).

⁸⁰ The financial success of Sholder's *Elm Street* sequel convinced *Sleepaway Camp 2 and 3* director Simpson, and *Bride of Chucky's* Ronny Yu, that "the teen horror genre was already in danger of becoming a parody of itself," and as such created their sequels to be "as much a parody of the Horror genre itself as a continuation of the" first film. Jeff Hayes. 'Twice Red: An Interview with Michael J. Simpson Part 1.'

http://www.angelfire.com/retro/scfilms/interview_simpson.html (Downloaded: November 11th 2002).

⁸¹ Dale Dobson. 'Slings and Arrows: An Interview with Joe Berlinger.'

<http://www.digitallyobsessed.com/showinterview.php3?ID=14> (Downloaded: January 10th 2005).

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ Ibid.

⁸⁴ Paul Fischer. 'Interview: Brice Sinofsky and Joe Berlinger: Metallica; Some Kind of Monster.' <http://www.darkhorizons.com/news04/metallica.php> (Downloaded: January 10th 2005).

⁸⁵ According to Fincher, the surgical strike followed the arrival of official 'hatchet-man' Jon Landau who was charged with monitoring progress on the London-based shoot. After a series of escalating rows, Landau, on the authority of Studio head Joe Roth, decided that it was "more cost-effective to cut the film and then see exactly what was needed" before recommencing the shoot, albeit this time in LA under even tighter supervision. John H. Richardson. 'Mother From Another Planet.' *Premier*. May 1992. pp 62-70. (p70).

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

-
- ⁸⁸ Adam Smith. 'Taming the Beast: The Making of the Alien Saga.' *Empire*. Issue 161. November 2002, pp 164-167 & 169. (p169).
- ⁸⁹ Paul Fischer. 'Interview: Brice Sinofsky and Joe Berlinger: Metallica; Some Kind of Monster.' <http://www.darkhorizons.com/news04/metallica.php> (Downloaded: January 10th 2005).
- ⁹⁰ O'Brien, 2001: 105.
- ⁹¹ Ibid. One such shot was a close-up of Raspail's head.
- ⁹² Peter Medak. *Species 2*. DVD Commentary.
- ⁹³ Ibid.
- ⁹⁴ Gillian Flynn. Set Visit: Blair Witch 2.' *Entertainment Weekly*. May 7 2004. <http://jeffreydonovanfans.com/articles/ewblairwitch.html> (Downloaded: January 10th 2005).
- ⁹⁵ Joe Berlinger. *Blair Witch 2: Book of Shadows*. DVD commentary.
- ⁹⁶ Ibid.
- ⁹⁷ Rather than have Ripley resigned in her final leap of faith, Fincher was forced to incorporate a climactic and crowd-pleasing chest-bursting shot of the Alien Queen as Ripley fell into the furnace. However, both Fincher and Weaver were nevertheless determined to make this violent and bloody explosion from the actress' chest a tender rather than brutal moment of self-sacrifice.
- ⁹⁸ Along with *Psycho II*, fourth entries in the *Halloween* and *Friday the 13th* saga's proved particularly effective.
- ⁹⁹ Christopher Koetting. 'Speak of the Devil.' *Fangoria* 180. March 1999. pp 66-75. (p72).
- ¹⁰⁰ Joe Berlinger. *Blair Witch 2: Book of Shadows*. DVD commentary.
- ¹⁰¹ The title was ironic in that it was intended to simultaneously challenge peoples' stereotypes of witches and refer to the dark side of the character's personalities and subconscious.
- ¹⁰² *Hannibal's* uncomplicated route to an R rating was attributed to its status as a big budget, high profile Studio release rather than Scott's handling of bowel slashing and brain surgery.
- ¹⁰³ Fincher, who had "always wanted (*Alien 3*) to be more graphically violent," subsequently regretted the way in which "a lot of stuff also got cut because of censors." Mark Burman. 'David Fincher's Alienation.' *Starburst*. Vol 15. No 8. April 1993. pp 9-16. (p15).
- ¹⁰⁴ Nevertheless, Hopkins' film featured one of the franchise's most graphic dream sequences, in which Freddy force feeds the eating disordered Greta her own innards. This footage, along with Dan's Cronenbergian fusion of man and machine, was highlighted by the MPAA as problematic. Marc Shapiro: 'Stephen Hopkins: An Englishman on Elm Street.' *Gorezone* 10. November 1989. pp 44-48. (p46).
- ¹⁰⁵ Marc Shapiro. 'Predator 2 Stalks the Urban Jungle.' *Fangoria* 99. December 1990. pp 36-40 & 64. (p40).
- ¹⁰⁶ From a background that included working for Hammer films, *Species II* director Medak was a noteworthy exception since the director embraced his film's status as Horror sequel and left any such attempts at re-branding in the hands of the Studio.
- ¹⁰⁷ Anthony Kaufman. 'Interview: Battling the Blair Witch, Joe Berlinger Takes on Sequels and Studio with Book of Shadows.' http://www.indiewire.com/people/int_Berlinger_Joe_001024.html (Downloaded: January 10th 2005).
- ¹⁰⁸ Artisan's campaign involved an onslaught of posters, trailers, books and other tie-ins coupled with a Sci-fi Channel mock investigative report focusing on Donovan's

character Jeff that was supported by a 64 hour 'webfest' to at least guarantee a strong opening weekend.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

¹¹⁰ Paramount's misleading yet canny titling and publicity of *Hedden's Friday the 13th Part VIII* is a solid example of this.

¹¹¹ Talalay had put herself forward to direct *Nightmare 5* but had been passed over.

¹¹² Steve Biodrowski. 'Freddy's Dead.' *Cinefantastique*. Vol 22. No 2. October 1991. pp 8-10 & 60. (p10).

¹¹³ However, the audience did support the director's logical demand to shoot a scene showing audiences where the Alien had come from, if nothing else. Mark Burman. 'David Fincher's Alienation.' *Starburst*. Vol 15. No 8. April 1993. pp 9-16. (p14).

¹¹⁴ Boorman's *Exorcist II* was afforded the widest release in Warner's cinematic history at that time.

¹¹⁵ Boorman's changes ranged from a reintroduced narration in the opening scenes through to altering the film's climactic scenes in terms of dialogue, story, structure and the film's running time, which the director reduced by over fifteen minutes.

¹¹⁶ Referred to as *Exorcist III* by Hollywood insiders, Boorman's first attempt at the franchise was finally released in 1988, twenty years after its first appearance. Hanke, 1991: 256.

¹¹⁷ More memorable examples include *The Scooby Doo Project*, *The Erotic Witch Project* and the comedy short *The Blair Bitch Project* starring Linda Blair.

¹¹⁸ According to box office analyst Tom Borys of ACNielsen EDI, "on average, sequels to \$100 million movies drop 40% and sequels (to) horror movies drop 45%...you'd expect this to do about \$85 million in total." Gillian Flynn. Set Visit: Blair Witch 2.' *Entertainment Weekly*. May 7 2004.

<http://jeffreydonovanfans.com/articles/ewblairwitch.html> (Downloaded: January 10th 2005).

¹¹⁹ For examples of such comparisons between the two and the reactions of both critics and audiences see: Steven Jay Schneider. 'A Tale of Two Psychos (Prelude to A Future Reassessment).' <http://www.sensesofcinema.com/contents/00/10/psychos.html>

(Downloaded June 20th 2002). and Constantine Santas. 'The Remake of Psycho (Gus Van Sant, 1998): Creativity or Cinematic Blasphemy?'

<http://www.sensesofcinema.com/contents/00/10/psycho.html> (Downloaded June 20th 2002).

¹²⁰ McCabe, 1999: 164.

¹²¹ Ibid.

¹²² Ibid.

¹²³ Fincher's film not only killed off all but one of *Aliens*' surviving characters in its title sequence, but also performed an exploratory autopsy on the deceased Newt later in the film. Thompson, 1998: 106.

¹²⁴ Marc Burman. 'A Real Horror Show.' *The Independent*. August 21st 1992. p14.

¹²⁵ For their 2001 Awards ceremony, the organisers behind the Razzies, the antithesis of Hollywood's Academy Award ceremony, introduced the category of 'Worst Sequel or Remake;' an accolade Berlinger's film walked away with despite competition from sequels to *Mission Impossible* and *The Flintstones* and remakes of *The Grinch* and *Get Carter*. Peg Aloï. 'Interview with Joe Berlinger: Director and Co-writer, Book of Shadows: Blair Witch 2.'

http://www.witchvox.com/va/dt_va.html?a=usma&c=media&id=3052 (Downloaded: January 10th 2005).

¹²⁶ However, as estranged executive producers with a vested interest in the success of the franchise and interest in making a third film, the two were reticent to openly criticise the picture prior to or during its release.

¹²⁷ Marc Dinning and Michael O'Neill. 'James Cameron Hall of Fame.' *Empire* 168. June 2003. pp 108-110 & 112 & 115. (p112).

¹²⁸ Interview William Freidkin. *Moviehole*.

<http://www.moviehole.net/news.php?newsid=649> (Downloaded: August 24th 2003).

¹²⁹ Ibid.

¹³⁰ McCabe, 1999: 165.

¹³¹ Patrick Lee. 'Director Joe Berlinger Casts A New Spell in Blair Witch 2.'

<http://www.scifi.com/sfw/issue183/interview.html> (Downloaded: January 10th 2005).

¹³² Michael Dempsey. 'The Return of Jaws.' *American Film*. Vol 3. No 8. June 1978. pp 28-32. (p31).

¹³³ Paul Fischer. 'Interview: Brice Sinofsky and Joe Berlinger: Metallica; Some Kind of Monster.' <http://www.darkhorizons.com/news04/metallica.php> (Downloaded: January 10th 2005).

¹³⁴ Mark Burman. 'David Fincher's Alienation.' *Starburst*. Vol 15. No 8. April 1993. pp 9-16. (p13).

¹³⁵ Ibid.

¹³⁶ Ibid.

¹³⁷ Xan Brooks. 'Directing ids Masochism.' *The Guardian* Wednesday April 24, 2002

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/arts/story/0,3604,689497,00.html> (Downloaded: September 12th 2003).

¹³⁸ Laurent Vachaud. 'An Interview With David Fincher: In the Circles of Hell.' *Positif*. No 420. February 1996. p83.

¹³⁹ Alan Jones. 'The Howling Continues...' *Starburst*. Vol 7. No 6. February 1985. pp 22-25. (p25).

¹⁴⁰ Peg Aloï. 'Interview with Joe Berlinger: Director and Co-writer, Book of Shadows: Blair Witch 2.'

http://www.witchvox.com/va/dt_va.html?a=usma&c=media&id=3052 (Downloaded: January 10th 2005).

¹⁴¹ Paul Fischer. 'Interview: Brice Sinofsky and Joe Berlinger: Metallica; Some Kind of Monster.' <http://www.darkhorizons.com/news04/metallica.php> (Downloaded: January 10th 2005).

¹⁴² Some outsiders were contractually obliged to make at least two sequels in quick succession, with Simpson's *Sleepaway Camp 2* and *3* and Christina Douguay's *Scanners* sequels being examples.

¹⁴³ This is just one of the exemplary lines of dialogue from Mora's *Howling III*.

¹⁴⁴ Marc Shapiro. 'Monster Invasion: Halloween 8.' *Fangoria* 206. September 2001. p8.

¹⁴⁵ D. Spence. Interview: Joe Berlinger & Bruce Sinofsky

We talk to the directors of the documentary *Metallica: Some Kind of Monster*.

<http://filmforce.ign.com/articles/529/529863p1.html> (Downloaded: January 10th 2005).

¹⁴⁶ Laurent Vachaud. 'An Interview With David Fincher: In the Circles of Hell.' *Positif*. No 420. February 1996. p83.

¹⁴⁷ *Gray Matter* is another of Berlinger's investigations into the nature and existence of evil. This time his subject matter begins with burial of the preserved brains of over seven hundred children murdered at a Nazi "euthanasia" clinic and continues as the director attempts to track down a man who allegedly participated in these murders.

Chapter 5

Jeff Burr: Divided We Fall

“Horror films have become so corporate and franchised...right now

I’m part of the problem, rather than the solution

but I hope to change that.”¹

Jeff Burr

As previously uncovered in Chapter 4, Studios and Production companies deferred to the franchise outsider in lieu of a first film director or suitable member of the franchise family with mixed results. The growth of the Hollywood Horror franchise has seen many filmmakers direct sequels in two or more different franchises, an unavoidable outcome given the genre’s development over the last twenty years. As previously established, the majority of trends and approaches to franchise filmmaking originated with classic Universal and Hammer Horror films.

Defined as any filmmaker who has directed at least two follow ups in two different franchises, the appearance of the sequel director is no exception since Horror’s first sequel maker was Erle C. Kenton with Universal’s *Ghost of Frankenstein*, *House of Frankenstein* and *House of Dracula*. Following the critical and commercial success of *The Island of Lost Souls*² in 1932, Kenton’s shift from slapstick comedy to Universal’s Horror franchises saw him take over from first film directors Browning and Whale just prior to Abbott and Costello’s introduction. Steeped in franchise folklore, Kenton’s films combined characters and cast members with increasingly preposterous yet entertaining narratives of redemption or revenge. Similarly, cinematographer Freddie Francis temporarily took over Hammer’s *Dracula* and *Frankenstein* franchises with *The*

Evil of Frankenstein and *Dracula Has Risen From The Grave* to create striking visuals that cemented his abilities behind the camera.³ Similarly Roy Ward Baker directed the third entry in the *Quatermass* franchise in 1967 and the sixth of Hammer's *Dracula* films in 1970.

With the concept of sequel director firmly established within the Hollywood Horror franchise, this final chapter will examine an alleged ghetto of franchise filmmaking and the experiences of the sequel directors apparently trapped within it. As the director of *Stepfather 2*, *Leatherface: The Texas Chainsaw Massacre III*, *Puppetmaster 4* and *5* and *Pumpkinhead 2: Blood Wings*, Jeff Burr became the definitive franchise filmmaker over the course of an intense five year period from 1989-1994 and this chapter will focus on his relationship with the franchise.

Although fledgling companies like Trimark and Blue Rider also relied upon tried and tested talent after acquiring the rights to first films,⁴ Dimension experimented with first time directors before financing their own ideas.⁵ This final chapter will also consider the extent to which sequel makers have delivered films in keeping with their attitudes and deemed satisfying by the established jury of Studios, stars, censors and audiences. In order to achieve this objective I will be contrasting Burr's experiences with those of sequel makers James Cameron, Mick Garris, Renny Harlin, Anthony Hickox, Tommy Lee Wallace, Steve Miner, Brian Yuzna and Ronny Yu; each of whom has earned the title of sequel maker. Finally, this chapter will evaluate the success of these sequel makers in relation to their subsequent and/or intervening careers outside of the Hollywood Horror franchise.

Corman's Children

With an on-going legacy of almost three hundred films as producer or director, genre-giant Roger Corman is one of Hollywood's most renowned living legends. His impact on the industry, and consequently the Hollywood Horror franchise, is both far reaching and profound. Starting off as a messenger for Fox, Corman became a story analyst before producing his first feature in 1954, the appropriately titled *Monster From the Ocean Floor*. As a key participant in what eventually became American International Pictures, Corman created genre pictures based on market research and catchy titles with pre-conceived ad campaigns. By responding to audience tastes, Corman flourished in the fifties by maximising budgets through a seemingly endless series of cost-effective tricks and techniques.⁶

In this respect, Corman secured his reputation by exploiting the ambition and inexperience of first generation film school graduates keen to break into Hollywood by any means necessary. With an uncanny eye for fresh talent, and virtual open door policy as employer, Corman has been instrumental in providing such figures and future sequel makers as Irvin Kershner and Francis Ford Coppola with their directorial debuts.⁷ Furthermore, Corman has been credited with launching the careers of directors Jonathan Demme, Ron Howard, Peter Bogdanovich and Martin Scorsese; therefore his impact on modern cinema has been inevitable and indisputable.

As an independent filmmaker in competition with television and big budget Hollywood films, Corman was nevertheless frustrated by Studio interference prior to distribution and the disproportionate allocation of profits thereafter. Consequently, he created New World Pictures in 1970. His second attempt at managing a production and distribution

company after Filmcorp in the 1960s, New World gave Corman complete control over all aspects of feature film production. After announcing his retirement from directing less than a year later, the full time producer simultaneously championed the New Wave of cine-literate directors and an endless series of European auteurs whose films he picked up for distribution.

Achieving success with audiences, critics and the Academy, Corman can also be credited as the inspiration behind Bob Shaye and the Weinsteins. Indeed, New World's in-house approach to directors and the pursuit of a successful formula has been successfully appropriated by New Line and Miramax's Dimension films, each playing a pivotal role in the selection of sequel directors for the Hollywood Horror franchise.⁸ As full-time producer and company director, Corman provided his future competitors with an effective foundation upon which to build their own empires.

After experimenting with Super 8 in his teenage years, the Ohio-born but Georgian-raised Jeff Burr enrolled at an L.A. film school. After dropping out during his undergraduate training, Burr nevertheless secured a position working in Corman's advertising department on the back of his student film *Divided We Fall*. Similarly inexperienced and ambitious, James Cameron was another aspiring filmmaker who convinced the company of his potential on the basis of a show reel he had apparently put together with dentists' money. Whereas Cameron began as a model builder⁹ on the *Star Wars*-inspired *Battle Beyond the Stars*, a certified Corman classic of clichés and incoherency, Burr remained in the advertising department working on potential campaigns and concepts.

Reportedly inspired by Romero and Raimi, Burr left Corman's company to work on his own independent Horror film. The project was produced by Darin Scott and Burr's brother, who also raised the necessary financing for the film, and designed as an EC-comics inspired anthology in the style of Romero's *Creepshow* and sequel director Baker's *Vault of the Horror*. Created as a showcase for Burr's talents the film starred Horror icon Vincent Price as the sinister interviewee responsible for these four tales.¹⁰ *The Offspring*, or *From A Whisper to A Scream*, follows the familiar pattern set down by sequel maker Sholder whose *Alone in the Dark* starred Donald Pleasence in 1982.

This style was later adopted by Hickox on *Waxwork* – a homage to the pantheon of classic monsters crammed with references and in-jokes. As director, co-writer and co-producer Burr had an opportunity to develop ideas surrounded by an established support network. By strip-mining Horror's rich heritage and filling their low budget debuts with an abundance of references and eye-catching cameos, directors such as Sholder, Burr and Hickox demonstrated their dedication and commitment to the genre in these first films which, although flawed, found a receptive audience on video.

For these future sequel makers, their first experience directing the Hollywood Horror franchise also varied, yet unfailingly informed their role in any future sequels or follow ups. Although Cameron and Wynorski adopted Corman as an unofficial mentor, others openly acknowledged the way in which previous professional and personal relationships were instrumental in securing them their first franchise film. Garris for example infiltrated the industry as a publicist and celebrity interviewer for Channel Z's Fantasy Film Festival before accepting a job as a publicist at Universal. Here he made a series of invaluable contacts including Cronenberg, who would later recommend him as a writer for *The Fly II*, and Spielberg, who hired Garris as a writer and then director on *Amazing*

Stories. Such progression saw New Line offer Garris *Critters 2* as a writing/directing package. Similarly, *Waxwork's* Hickox exploited his association with Vestron to raise the financing for his spoof Vampire Western, *Sundown: The Vampire in Retreat* before directing a *Waxwork* sequel.¹¹ Irrespective of their origins, and often in conjunction with such figures, companies and connections as Corman, Vestron and Spielberg, these and other future sequel makers were targeted and stereotyped by the industry from the outset.

Released in 1987, the same year as Burr's first film and eight months prior to its nearest contemporary companion piece *Fatal Attraction*, Ruben's *The Stepfather* was an effective thriller and cutting edge satire of Reaganism, traditional family values and one man's disillusionment with the American Dream. Written by mystery writer Donald Westlake, the film was loosely based on the case of John List, the New Jersey killer who murdered his own family. Despite accusations of mis-marketing and a lukewarm response at the US Box Office, the film was a sleeper hit, thereby prompting ITC to begin work on a sequel after convincing O'Quinn to resume the title role. Burr was approached by ITC on account of his debut feature and accepted the assignment with his brother, once again, on board. Predominantly a thematic and narrative retread of Ruben's first film, Burr's sequel nevertheless exploited the inherent black comedy of the scenario without detracting from the suspense. After a rushed, yet relatively straightforward, 25-day shoot Burr delivered an effective follow up that expanded on the first film without any form of desecration.

Scheduled to coincide with the release of Universal's *Jaws* sequel, Dante's *Piranha* was Corman's exploitative cash-in on the Hollywood Blockbuster, and one that came under Spielberg's protection when Universal considered legal action. Convinced he was

“making the worst movie in history,”¹² Dante intentionally doused the film with comedy, adhering to the producer’s guidelines regarding the timing of attacks and gratuitous nudity. Successful enough to warrant a sequel, Corman agreed to distribute a follow up after Dante’s departure¹³ and offered the project to Cameron as his first directing job, in light of his progress and special effects background.

According to the director, his first sequel experience lasted two and half weeks on a shoot characterised by a lack of finance, organisation and communication. Repeatedly under attack as an outsider from Ovidio G. Assonitis, the film’s executive producer and director of the 1977 *Jaws* imitation *Tentacle*, Cameron was fired and flew back to Los Angeles with the picture completed in his absence. Cast somewhere between Burr’s and Cameron’s first sequel experiences, Hickox’s *Hellraiser III* had a troubled pre-production history that impacted upon the film.¹⁴ Hickox’s belated arrival was the beginning of a demanding shoot in which an ambitious script, deprived of an appropriate budget, forced the filmmakers to rely on traditional cheats and limited choices when it came to individual set-ups.

Burr shot his *Stepfather* sequel in December and delivered it to ITC in time for a scheduled April release date. However, the company was impressed enough to consider giving the film a brief theatrical run. After selling theatrical rights to Miramax, the producers subjected the film to a series of test screenings before approaching Burr with their findings and suggestions for improvement. As Miramax’s first franchise acquisition, *Stepfather II* received the now standard pre-distribution procedure in which “Harvey Scissorhands”¹⁵ removed around eight minutes of character development in favour of additional gore sequences, replacing the TV broadcasts and re-shooting one of the film’s key sequences – the hanging of Caroline Williams’ character Matty. With

Burr already occupied on his second sequel, such changes were completed without the director's participation or approval. Miramax's attempts to make a roller-coaster ride out of Burr's slow building sequel were to the detriment of the film but in keeping with standard slasher conventions and clichés. Rendered "20% less effective"¹⁶ from Burr's perspective, *Stepfather II* nevertheless benefited from O'Quinn's riveting performance, a vital ingredient recognised by the director in his publicity for the film and cited as the only reason behind his decision to direct the Hollywood Horror franchise.

Having since stated that "if there's a theme to the movies we make, it's about the outsider who can come in and change things,"¹⁷ Harvey Weinstein's philosophy was also applied to Hickox's *Hellraiser III*, the company's second sequel purchase prior to the creation of Dimension films. Similarly acquired after completion, this second case of postproduction interference involved the initially reticent return of first film director Barker. The author had disapproved of Hickox's selection and was dissatisfied with aspects of the finished film. Described by screenwriter Atkins as both a sequel and prequel to *Hellbound* that completed the trilogy, the narrative dragged Pinhead's duality centre stage for a target audience of American teens in terms of look, location and soundtrack.

Keen to promote the film with a 'Clive Barker Presents' prefix however, Miramax agreed to Barker's terms of "total control...to remake the picture the way I wanted it."¹⁸ This arrangement saw a significant amount of restructuring, re-shoots and additional effects sequences as Barker temporarily reclaimed the franchise and proclaimed the film a "50/50 split between"¹⁹ his and Hickox's vision. Innovative in its early use of CGI, the film represented an uneasy compromise that suffered two further indignities at the hands of the M.P.A.A.²⁰ Nevertheless it highlighted Studios' preference for first film

directors and their endorsement as a means of promoting the Hollywood Horror franchise

Prior to Miramax's involvement with these first sequels, Cameron could not afford to abandon his first film and faced a far worse scenario on *Piranha II*.²¹ According to Cameron in subsequent interviews, his response to such overwhelming interference was to break into the editing room after dark and reconstruct the film the way he wanted it. The experience made the director "mistrustful of other people who have creative power on a film."²² Refusing to abandon his first film despite such opposition, Cameron's determination differed to that of many other outsiders who had begun work on other projects during such extended post-production periods.

With less creative, financial and emotional investment in either the project or the franchise's longevity, outsiders were easily distanced and dissuaded from any further involvement out of economic necessity and a lack of contractually negotiated creative control. However, in refraining from any public disputes with the producers and distributors to further their respective careers and protect their reputations within the industry, outsiders such as Hickox and Burr reinforced the negative stereotype of sequel directors as 'hacks' and confirmed it in subsequent films.

The Franchise Stepfather

Whether symptomatic of their outsider status or the franchisor's perception of their limited role in the filmmaking process, varying levels of dissatisfaction have been expressed by filmmakers. However, their association with it has often elicited interest

from other Studios keen to exploit ownership of specific titles and the experience of these franchise filmmakers. In other words, despite their previous outsider status on first sequels, directors with franchise associations are valued by marketing departments attempting to secure pre-sales. Spence and Trenchard Smith, for example, were offered sequels to *The Prophecy* and *Leprechaun* by the same companies for which they had recently made *Children of the Corn IV* and *Night of the Demons 2*.

Similarly, Trimark approached established sequel directors Hickox and Yuzna to resurrect their recently acquired titles *Warlock* and *Return of the Living Dead*. Indeed, New Line Cinema applied this stringent career stereotyping when approaching Jeff Burr as a potential candidate to direct *The Texas Chainsaw Massacre III* after screening a preview tape of *Stepfather 2*. In this respect, Burr bought into this process of mutual exploitation despite prior experiences.

However, not all sequel makers made two franchise films in such quick succession. Both Miner and Harlin made belated returns to the genre and the franchise with *Halloween H20* and *Exorcist: The Beginning* fifteen years after their first sequels.²³ Miner, who had worked with Curtis on *Forever Young* and directed several genre films since his *Friday the 13th* origins, was approached by the actress after her attempts to secure Carpenter's return were unsuccessful. Harlin, on the other hand, was one of several directors invited to comment on Schrader's prequel as a result of his prior associations with Warner Bros and prequel star Stellan Skarsgard.²⁴

Indeed, Studios and producers have characteristically deferred to sequel directors and previous collaborators to take over a franchise during the production process. *Omen* producer Harvey Bernhard for example, turned to close personal friend and *Escape from*

the Planet of the Apes director Don Taylor for Fox's first sequel after firing initial selection Mike Hodges three weeks into the shoot.²⁵ This was after proclaiming to *Variety* that Hodges "must have seen (*The Omen*) 15 or 20 times to make sure he'll keep the sequel in line with it."²⁶ Although Taylor was Bernhard's first choice replacement, Burr recalls how he was "probably the 50th choice"²⁷ for *Leatherface* based on the reports and reception he received from those outside and inside the industry.

Reports have indeed described how the project was offered to outsiders John McNaughton and Peter Jackson who had impressed New Line with their debut films *Henry* and *Bad Taste*. Moreover, New Line's selection of these two talented yet wildly different directors was indicative of their indecisive attitude towards the material. Having vetoed special effects artist Tom Savini, a strategy covered in Chapter 4 and later explored on *Freddy vs Jason* (until conflicts over the film's budget prompted Rob Bottin's departure), New Line eventually hired Jonathan Beutel for *Leatherface*. However, reported contractual obligations on the *Alien Nation* TV series saw the deal fall through and the project thrown into development hell. It was at this point that Burr cautiously stepped into the breach on the understanding that he could rework some elements of the script.

Since *Leatherface*, New Line has continued this strategy of appointing sequel makers from Isaac on *Jason X*, an appointment rooted in the director's long-standing relationship with Cunningham, to Ronny Yu's *Freddy vs Jason*. Whereas some sequel makers were approached by Studios, others actively pursued such projects on account of their profile and potential for career development with the most famous example being Cameron's supposed act of "career suicide"²⁸ on *Aliens*.

After *Piranha II*, Cameron salvaged his directorial career by writing an original script²⁹ suited to his special effects background and potential budgetary allowance. In so far as *Piranha II* played a part in this process, Cameron only used the credit, for want of a better word, to get this film off the ground. Afterwards it was all but dropped from his filmography in much the same way that the director has disassociated from his *Rambo: First Blood Part II* script.

With the unwavering support and loyalty of fledgling producer and fellow New World alumnus Gale Ann Hurd, *The Terminator* was tailored to his talents and interests as a filmmaker. After two years, the project found a home at Hemdale with a deal that saw Cameron sign away the sequel rights and Hurd resist Hollywood's attempts to buy the script without Cameron attached.³⁰ Having extensively prepped the film, the director nevertheless faced interference and a lack of support from distributor Orion during postproduction.³¹ *The Terminator's* success allowed Cameron to negotiate his way into *Aliens* director's chair - a decision with "absolutely no logic to it"³² other than the fact that the director "thought it would be cool."³³ Intimidated and seduced by the idea of directing a sequel to Scott's "vicious shocker,"³⁴ Cameron inadvertently became modern Horror's first sequel maker. Indeed, what has continued to distinguish this director from his contemporaries is his capacity to commit fully to a project and its potential, despite the risks involved.

The future and success of many franchise films has been determined by the production company behind it and reflected in the allocated budget and intended method of distribution. Prior to the current fondness for big budget remakes designed to resurrect a Hollywood Horror franchise from the seventies,³⁵ several sequels had been

commissioned on the understanding that they would be released direct to video/DVD whereas others, such as *Omen IV* and *The Birds II*, were to be screened on network or cable television channels.

This latter category also included Garris' *Psycho IV*, a sequel the director actively campaigned for on the back of John Landis' personal recommendation and promise of on-screen participation. The film was commissioned by Universal's Sid Sheinberg as the "ideal high profile low risk production"³⁶ to publicise the Studio's new Florida theme park. New Line hoped Burr's film would resurrect the franchise and take over from the recently ailing *Elm Street* films as the company's most profitable commodity. Under the influence of such high expectations internally, this project was subjected to intense round table scrutiny prior to Burr's arrival. In direct contrast to Burr's pressure-fuelled inauguration, Cameron was reportedly taken aback yet relieved that *Aliens* hardly seemed to register on Fox's radar - the Studio was preoccupied with its high profile summer release *Space Camp*. Whether cynical, shrewd or half-hearted, the origins of franchise films often exposed a lack of long-term insight or forethought on the behalf of franchisors whose motives and ambitions were infrequently backed up by adequate resources, understanding or experience.

Burr graduated from the comparatively low key *Stepfather* franchise and entered New Line's all-too literal *Texas Chainsaw Massacre* as an outsider late in the pre-production process. Cameron however had the benefit of recently acquired clout afforded to him by the success of *The Terminator*. Consequently, when the creative team of Cameron and Hurd experienced an unfortunate reversal of fortune during negotiations, in that Fox were not happy with Hurd on board as producer, Cameron was able to fight her corner

and persuade the Studio to back down. Hurd the producer was not one of Hollywood's many "frustrated directors"³⁷ and did not interfere on set or in the editing room.

In contrast to Hurd's collaborative approach, producer Bernhard continued to hire and fire directors of *The Omen* franchise. *Halloween 5*'s Dominique Othenin-Girard became a further casualty after two weeks of shooting; discovering too late that the "*Omen* road shows...were a one man operation"³⁸ with Bernhard "used to full control."³⁹ Similarly, New Line's increasingly corporate structure relegated Burr as a franchise outsider from the start. Far from being in a strong position to assert his authority during an endless series of rewrites, the director was isolated and unable to direct the Hollywood Horror franchise in keeping with his ideas.

Often allocated lower budgets than their predecessors, sequel directors have either been unable to secure the participation of previous franchise actors or forced to cast relative unknowns. Consequently, producers have also shrewdly employed actors with recognisable genre credentials, on account of their appearance or musical background to attract audiences.⁴⁰ Accordingly, New Line exploited Ken Foree's *Dawn of the Dead* and *From Beyond* connection and arranged a brief cameo by *Chainsaw 2*'s final girl as an intrepid reporter in search of the cannibal clan in the opening scenes.⁴¹ However, Burr was unable to secure Gunnar Hansen for the title role on account of New Line's reluctance to pay above scale given the limited budget. In conjunction with this approach to casting, directors retained their own cast and crew members as a means of ensuring some continuity and quality control. Hickox, for example, recast *Hellraiser III*'s Paula Marshall for *Warlock: Armageddon* and Burr contacted R.A. Mihailoff to take on *Leatherface* after working with the actor on his student film. Much like the sequel director, the Hollywood Horror franchise has also heralded the rise of the sequel

actor. Affordable and marketable to target audiences, stars such as Foree and Lance Henriksen have been equally stereotyped by the industry and recast by directors and franchisors throughout their careers.

The narrative departure of Burr's film pre-empted many casting issues or need for negotiations. Cameron on the other hand, who completed his *Aliens* screenplay based on Fox's assurance that Weaver was already attached, later discovered the actress was unaware of the project. In response, an increasingly Studio-savvy Cameron orchestrated a series of events guaranteed to ensure Fox's support and readiness to meet the actress' asking price. The return of increasingly expensive franchise stars Perkins, Curtis and Englund has been integral to the plots and potential success of *Psycho IV*, *Halloween H20* and *Freddy Vs Jason*. Their co-operation and creative input was appeased and ascertained by financial incentives at the expense of the sequel director.

However, on Miner's *Halloween: H20* the franchise family was fiercely divided. With franchisor Akkad on one side as the self-proclaimed "protector of the franchise"⁴² and star Curtis proudly on the other as both "an unbilled executive producer"⁴³ and "Laurie Strode's guardian angel,"⁴⁴ Miramax was caught in the middle. In siding with Curtis, Miner found a mutually supportive ally just as Garris agreed with returning screenwriter Stefano in wanting Perkins to tone down his performance for *Psycho IV*.⁴⁵ Indeed, with various parties to please in terms of profit participation and production personnel, sequel scripts for high profile films were revised innumerable times in accordance with a franchise family's conflicting viewpoints.

The Franchise Family Massacre

Although Cameron had to court Brandywine's approval during preproduction his script was, according to Sammon, based on the remnants of the gutted *Rambo* screenplay and "a pre-existing story...Cameron had created years earlier...originally titled *E.T.*"⁴⁶ and then *Mother*. As previously established, grafting elements of an existing treatment, script or film into or onto a franchise has been increasingly adopted by companies like Dimension⁴⁷ and seen in rejected proposals for *Psycho IV* and *Jason X* with regard to *Spellbound* and *The Shining*.

Whereas Cameron was *Aliens* scriptwriter from the outset and Wallace gained a screenwriter's credit on *Fright Night Part II*, Burr was an unwelcome outsider whose late arrival and revisionist intentions were largely unwanted and seldom incorporated. For example, Burr's interest in developing a "sick juxtaposition"⁴⁸ between the Final Girl's dysfunctional family and the warped interactions of the Leatherface clan was rejected. Similarly, his suggestion shoot on 16mm in Texas, to increase the film's authenticity, was swiftly discarded. Harlin however, in his role of Studio-appointed saviour, had to ensure his prequel adhered to a mutually agreed checklist of *Exorcist* franchise ingredients seemingly drawn up in accordance with perceived audience expectations.

Eschewing such authenticity, Burr's follow up was filmed on the outskirts of Hollywood next door to the Magic Mountain theme park. Although this location was an improvement over Garris' on *Psycho IV*, where the shoot also served as a tourist attraction, the production was in close proximity to New Line's offices and subjected to unwelcome set visits from Studio executives. Shooting at London's Pinewood Studios,

Cameron and Hurd were free from impromptu Studio visits and Fox executives throughout *Aliens*' principal photography. However, Cameron has since revealed that in the absence of a strong Studio presence he was faced with a "scornful British crew that was convinced it was working on a crappy sequel to a great (British-directed) thriller."⁴⁹ This led to his firing the cinematographer and Hurd extending that threat to others when the potential for mutiny surfaced.

For Cameron, it was Weaver's politics that proved most problematic with her anti-gun stance seeming somewhat absurd in light of his action-packed screenplay. Moreover, the director has since characterised their relationship in describing himself as the throttle and Weaver as the breaks.⁵⁰ Since the majority of low budget projects are now being shot in Vancouver or Eastern Europe to reduce costs, Burr's Hollywood shoot is increasingly an exception. Although this has reduced the opportunity for set visits, it has unfortunately increased the potential for Studio dissatisfaction and interference during post-production.

Although Weaver strongly disapproved of the film's apparent glorification of gun violence, Cameron's authority as director was never called into question. Burr, on the other hand, was reportedly fired after five weeks of filming by New Line's appointed second in command who, according to the director, "hated the movie, hated the script, (and) hated the idea of making it."⁵¹ As the replacement sequel director, Burr was isolated from his familial support group for the first time. Moreover, he had to come to terms with Hollywood's corporate structure and "a gauntlet of people you had to run through to make a decision"⁵² over the course of an ambitious thirty day shoot. For the director, this sequel's downfall can be traced back to its elevated status, mainstream

aspirations as New Line's latest potential cash cow and its roots as an independent Horror film.

In direct contrast to Burr's isolationist experience on *Leatherface*, Isaac, an established special effects artist and surviving sequel director, was attached to *Jason X* from the start. With a pitch to producer Cunningham and distributor New Line that involved trading on previous working relationships and twenty years of experience in the industry, Isaac promised to "put together a team of talented people...who wouldn't normally work on Jason part 10."⁵³ Furthermore, he helped develop the script with screenwriter Farmer, brought in his own crew and personally hired everyone on the project for the Toronto-based shoot.

Despite continuing the franchise's fondness for unscrupulous authority figures, promiscuous teens and creative deaths, Isaac's *Jason X* avoided Camp Crystal Lake in all but one scene.⁵⁴ Instead, the film substituted scares for science-fiction⁵⁵ with such staple plot devices as an exploding ship and malfunctioning airlock. Prior to this combination of science-fiction and splatter, Cameron distanced his sequel with a generic shift and action-orientated "Vietnam analogy."⁵⁶ Just as Cameron's *Piranha II* featured genetically modified piranhas with wings as *Flying Killers*, *Aliens* ditched Scott's claustrophobic scare tactics, and allegedly "stupid concept"⁵⁷ of having humans transform into eggs, in favour of a termite-esque approach and grandiose egg-laying Queen. Although Cameron's sequels epitomised this approach of slipping into other established formats and sub-genres, directors Yuzna and Trenchard-Smith have also demonstrated that science-fiction, comedy and romance can resuscitate a franchise with *Leprechaun 3* and *Return of the Living Dead Part 3*. However, this was only possible

so long as the frequency and potency of the special effects sequences remained intact and the central conceits of the script and franchise were adhered to.⁵⁸

Scripted by David J. Schow, *Leatherface* was an intense and visceral bloodbath that was developed by New Line and Burr as a return to the suspense of the first film. After criticising the script for being “a gore-a-thon,”⁵⁹ the director ironically focused on the skewed family interactions and the importance of a tag line appropriated from the previous film.⁶⁰ Hooper’s sequel boldly departed from the first film’s ‘through the looking glass’ approach to drag audiences down the rabbit hole to meet the circus-like horrors and rotting sideshows of an “American Dream gone sour.”⁶¹ With its underground labyrinth resembling an intestinal tract littered with partially digested degenerates, Hooper’s second Sawyer clan no longer operated outside society. Interpreted by Hanke as “a blistering indictment of Reganism and the ‘Me’ generation,”⁶² the film controversially made implicit sexual connotations explicit and combined them with an EC comics approach. Targeted at those audiences that had not “appreciated or understood”⁶³ the first film, Hooper wanted to solicit “guilty laughter”⁶⁴ at the outrageous effects and revelled in such disparate sub-genres as the rape revenge film and culture clash comedy through biting satire. Burr “absolutely despised”⁶⁵ this film and his follow up was a **radical** departure from it and comparable to Hickox’s approach on *Hellraiser III*. Both projects were awkward marriages of commercialism and cinematic sadism culminating in a final girl’s extended fight for survival.

Whereas Wallace’s *Fright Night* retread substituted Jerry Dandrige for an avenging sister and her acolytes, both Cameron and Miner took this approach one step further in *Aliens* and *Halloween H20* with tales of redemption and revenge. They revolved around returning characters Ripley and Laurie Strode whose transformations from final

girls to fiercely protective mothers struck a crowd-pleasing chord with audiences. By denying the final girl any emotional depth or backstory, Burr's film was further hindered by a lack of audience investment in the character. This absence detracts from our ability to root for her revenge and survival. Under strict Studio directives to break from Hooper's narrative and not contact the director, Burr was brought on board to create a film that would focus on the titular character at the expense of over-exposure. Consequently, Burr's film featured an adoptive family, in keeping with the first film, at the expense of continuity, innovation and emotional investment. This selective approach towards previous instalments was often dictated by a perceived audience response and also fed into New Line's stipulation that *Jason X* should disregard the redundant resolutions of previous entries yet accommodate *Freddy Vs Jason*.

In a reversal of the events affecting Burr's sequel, Yu drew on his marketing experience to dispute New Line's demands for sufficient protagonist back stories. Appealing to basic expectations, Yu included the stereotypical characters and clichés associated with each franchise. From post-coital slaughters and shower scenes to surrealistic deaths,⁶⁶ the director was shepherded through the process by aficionado Shaye to ensure he pleased and appeased fans of both franchises.⁶⁷ With a deep respect for Carpenter's film and blatant disregard for all that came after, Miner also directed *Halloween: H20* "like I'm the audience."⁶⁸ In doing so he married such clichés as introductory voice-overs, the early dispensing of returning characters and an uncommonly judicious use of nightmarish flashbacks with enough references, reversals and in-jokes to appeal to the post-*Scream* audience in an economical yet suspenseful account of a Final Girl's revenge. In taking the narrative forward and pushing for a character-based resolution, Miner's sequel reaped the benefits of narrative continuity, returning characters and a

contemporary High School setting to create a contemporary classic of the Hollywood Horror franchise.

However, the direction of a franchise and the level of respect, fidelity and continuity afforded to previous instalments has been subject to Studio agendas. United in their much-publicised decision to direct the franchise with respect for the first film, sequel directors empathised with fans throughout the publicity trail as a means of endearing their projects to them. With the potential for genuine scares somewhat restricted by an unfamiliar African landscape and post World War II setting, Harlin's *Exorcist* prequel was further constrained by its characters and thematic content. By echoing shots, sounds and images from the first film, Harlin slavishly combined the iconography of Pazuzu and Captain Howdy with a standard case of cinematic misdirection. Furthermore, the final act evoked all the stereotypes associated with Freidkin's film.⁶⁹

However, both Harlin and Garris, could not compete with the first film in terms of impact. Indeed, with over thirty years of parodies, clichés and spoofs to soften the suspense or shock impact, some sequel directors could only aspire to acceptability in so far as audiences were concerned. Nevertheless, Garris felt protected by the existence of previous entries, Stefano's script⁷⁰ and Perkins' presence; all of which gave the film an air of authenticity. In this respect, later sequel directors have been less intimidated on account of their previous experience and the reception of previous entries.

Post-production exposed the inconsistencies of a Studio's approach and highlighted their lack of focus and direction at sequel directors' expense. Conclusions and shock epilogues were often the first elements to be altered after test-screenings first film comparisons. Although Cameron created one of the greatest confrontations in franchise

if not cinematic history, the director nevertheless succumbed to Scott's resolution in which the Alien is jettisoned into space. A closing shot of not one but two sleeping beauties brought the narrative full circle as the faint sound of a rogue facehugger slithered over the final credits. Similarly, *Jason X*, *Halloween H20*, and many others cannibalised this template and concluded with an iconic shot and/or sequel friendly set up, be it Jason returning to a teen-infested camp ground or Laurie Strode maniacally standing over her brother's decapitated corpse. Furthermore, prequels *Red Dragon* and *Exorcist: The Beginning* simultaneously achieved narrative closure and a definite link to the first film through choice dialogue and location.

Whereas Garris shot multiple endings for *Psycho IV* as part of a bid to preserve the mystery and more importantly generate publicity, New Line subjected Burr and Yu to endless re-shoots and alternative endings on *Leatherface* and *Freddy vs Jason*. With shock epilogues and sequel set-ups shot then discarded on a regular basis, directors were charged with ending their sequel narrative on a satisfying note. Reportedly left alone during the initial editing period, Burr's post-production problems escalated after the first test screening. Attended by New Line's foreign and domestic department heads, their response led to the removal of many objectionable sequences from the original negative. Furthermore, an on-going dispute over the film's conclusion necessitated re-shoots, both with and without Burr's involvement that rendered the film increasingly incoherent as characters were resurrected and sequences rewritten to accommodate an audience/franchise friendly finale. Trapped between making a mainstream movie and independent Horror film, Burr faced a difficult situation that fostered conflict and mutual dissatisfaction.⁷¹ Nevertheless, *Leatherface* fell under New Line's jurisdiction and therefore the film had to fall in line with its corporate sensibilities prior to feedback from the MPAA.

Producers of the Hollywood Horror franchise may have reaped the benefits of high profile productions and exploited genre history through publicity and marketing. Many directors however, have argued that first film reputations and current release strategies have adversely affected their film's treatment by the ratings board. Viewed by *Return of the Living Dead Part 3's* Yuzna as a business decision, so "long as there are some unrated festival prints and an unrated video around,"⁷² the MPAA has repeatedly been criticised by filmmakers on account of its alleged double standards and enduring memory.

Consequently, Burr and New Line executive De Luca cited Cannon's Unrated release of the first sequel as the reason behind the board's negative attitude. They also have bemoaned the inadequacy of the current system, the commercial suicide of the X rating, and accused the board of being "harder on independents like New Line than on major companies."⁷³ A war of attrition that totalled a record breaking eleven resubmissions⁷⁴ cost the company their December release date but raised the publicity and profile of the film in the press. Since *Leatherface*, New Line's franchises have benefited from a corporate structure more adept at anticipating ratings problems.⁷⁵ As gritty as it was grounded, Burr's film made few concessions to the video-gaming generation yet was penalised for its realistic portrayal of violence in contrast to the comic book fantasy approach of other films.

Together New Line and the censor rendered Burr's film "incoherent...a hideous compromise,"⁷⁶ and one De Luca has accepted some responsibility for.⁷⁷ Moreover, the director has since conceded that his fatal mistake was in trying to make the film his own when it "can never be yours...(and) never could be."⁷⁸ This admission that a fatal flaw

was rooted in his own approach saw the director attempt to have his name “taken off the movie.”⁷⁹ Although Burr was unsuccessful, sequel director Rosenthal took a stand and formally disowned his second sequel by successfully petitioning the DGA to have his name taken off *The Birds II: Lands End*. Rosenthal represents the most extreme case of rejection that often characterised the sequel director’s reflections and audience responses. Just as Isaac appealed to audiences to enter “theatres with an open mind,”⁸⁰ Burr has since described *Leatherface* as a “missed opportunity”⁸¹ that “everyone was really primed to not like”⁸² on account of its sequel status and Hooper’s absence. From first mistakes to final regrets, Burr’s involvement with New Line and the *Texas Chainsaw Massacre* franchise came at an important turning point in their respective histories with the director retrospectively noting the irony that “the film I’m probably least proud of...is the film that most people will see.”⁸³

Although Yu’s *Freddy vs Jason* shied away from Castle’s *Mr Sardonicus* scenario,⁸⁴ the Hollywood Horror franchise has increasingly courted the affirmation of audiences following the advent of cable, video and DVD. DVD in particular has provided many first films and follow ups with a profitable after-life. From Cameron’s *Aliens: Special Edition* to the release of Schrader’s *Dominion: Prequel to the Exorcist*, this additional source of revenue has allowed increasingly media-savvy audiences to pass judgement on alternative and extended cuts. In this way, Studios and production companies have encouraged fans to ‘buy into’ the postproduction nightmares of these films in retrospect. Just as Harlin passionately defended *Exorcist: The Beginning*,⁸⁵ Burr’s *Leatherface* has undergone a similar reinvestigation and re-release with New Line’s financial support. Given the opportunity to critique his own work, the director has provided a subjective insight into the circumstances which surrounded the film’s production after fourteen years and several other experiences with the Hollywood Horror franchise.

Straight Into Darkness

Cameron capitalised on *Aliens*' success by maintaining his relationship and funding arrangement with Fox on his next project - an ambitious underwater fantasy. *The Abyss* continued his fondness for science-fiction and kick-started an obsession with underwater technologies. Burr, on the other hand, made a **radical** retreat from Studio and genre-based filmmaking with *Eddie Presley*; a character-driven comedy-drama based on writer/star Duane Whitaker's play. The film was a definite return to his humble beginnings following a brief but ironically appropriate association with the TV series *Land of the Lost*. Characteristically featuring genre stalwarts in supporting and cameo roles, *Eddie Presley* was about, for and by independent industry outsiders. Directors Burr and Yu both found work as independent filmmakers temporarily escaping industry stereotyping and the trappings of franchise association. However, many sequel makers were either unable to find projects or were restricted to a combination of TV series and occasional features before similar offers materialised.

Whereas Miner and Isaac exploited their generic associations and moved from slasher films to monster movies,⁸⁶ others embarked upon a more surreptitious return to the Hollywood Horror franchise. *Return of the Living Dead Part 3's* Yuzna, for example, started his own serial killer franchise with *The Dentist* in 1996 after trading on his *Re-Animator* connection as a contributor to the Lovecraft anthology *Necronomicon*. Similarly, Wallace shot a relatively successful yet tepid and under-funded adaptation of King's *IT* after his successful *Fright Night* retreat before returning to franchise filmmaking with *Vampires: Los Muertos* in 2002. However, it was Garris who most effectively side-stepped the franchise. Following a brief return to *Amazing Stories* before developing *Hocus Pocus* for Disney, Garris established a long running

association with King on *Sleepwalkers* that continued through TV-bound adaptations of *The Stand*, *The Shining*, and *Desperation*.⁸⁷ However, this attachment to King belies a more stereotyped and widespread sensibility at work as directors often traded on reputations and relationships by attaching themselves to another established brand name, literary or otherwise. Evident in the careers of Gordon and more recently Coscarelli, the industry has allowed sequel directors to work in a similar vein as a means of exploiting their association with the Hollywood Horror franchise.

Similarly, Burr's follow up to *Eddie Presley* grew out of his shared history with low budget mogul Charles Band which began with meetings over *Ghost Town* – a Horror Western hybrid Empire pictures had been developing in the late eighties.⁸⁸ Whereas Garris deliberately avoided any further direct association with the Hollywood Horror franchise, Band persuaded Burr to direct *Puppetmaster 4* and *5* back to back; a cost-effective approach previously adopted on the company's *Subspecies* and *Trancers* franchises. Although these films were originally conceived by Band as Full Moon's first theatrical venture that he would direct, the script was split in two and rewritten as a pair of direct to video sequels.

Despite his negative experiences on *Leatherface* and to a lesser extent *Stepfather 2*, Burr not only returned to the Hollywood Horror franchise, but also accepted this assignment as a replacement director with only two weeks' preparation time. Whether born of desperation, dedication or career-based masochism, Burr's apparent willingness to reprise a familiar role under similar circumstances once again came with a mainstream mandate. Having explored time travel in its third entry, *Toulon's Revenge*, these sequel scripts set up a new story arc to attract a wider audience and carried over iconic puppets and moments from previous entries. By lessening the horrific elements

in favour of a more light-hearted approach, these back-to-back projects saw a switch in the puppets' allegiance and the introduction of new villains and puppets alike. Following Full Moon's directives to the best of his ability, Burr fulfilled his clearly defined role without the problems that plagued his previous attempts. Without the pressure of a high profile or weighty audience expectations, Burr thrived in this arena of financially restrictive autonomy.

Arguably the director was attracted to the fantastic elements of the franchise and opportunity to become a part of the Full Moon family. Burr's decision to return to the Hollywood Horror franchise with its financial security was not an isolated one since *Leprechaun 3's* Brian Trenchard-Smith signed on for a science-fiction-esque *Leprechaun in Space*. Despite having his name removed from *The Birds II*, Rosenthal directed *Halloween 8* almost twenty years after his first sequel. However, he soon found an alternate and extended, yet no less involved, franchise family in place. Contradicted and forced to solicit approval, Rosenthal clashed with Curtis and Akkad throughout the production process highlighting how little had changed in the intervening years since *Part II*. Although Wallace was a third returning director with *Vampires: Los Muertos*, his involvement was more on account of his long-standing friendship with Carpenter whose Storm King productions co-produced the direct-to-video sequel. Nevertheless, each of these cases reflects the way in which franchise history, production companies and directors mutually exploited one another in the search for success.

As such, the Motion Picture Corporation of America approached sequel directors Hickox and Randel for the follow up to Winston's *Pumpkinhead*.⁸⁹ However, when Randel left the project, Burr stepped back into the breach with only three weeks of pre-

production remaining. This time, however, the director ensured previous collaborator Will Huston was on board to help flesh out the script. After loyally placing a positive spin on the film's low budget and status as a 50s "B movie in the best sense"⁹⁰ during interviews, the director attacked Winston's first film for being slow and "little more than a slasher movie."⁹¹ Having criticised the pacing and content, Burr's *Pumpkinhead II: Blood Wings* fell back on uncomfortable clichés and failed to capture the atmosphere for which its predecessor had been praised. With the inclusion of a black and white prologue, which insufficiently expanded the *Pumpkinhead* mythos, the film was amateurish and ineffective. Arguably more interested in developing the franchise away from feature films and into an accompanying video game, the Motion Picture Corporation of America employed Burr on the basis of his sequel directing reputation. Without the necessary budget, backing or guidance from Band, Burr's fifth franchise film was a half-hearted and ill-thought out enterprise that failed to make an impact.

Despite this setback, Burr was finally given the opportunity to become a key member of a franchise family with Republic Picture's *Night of the Scarecrow*. His first genre film without a number since 1987's *The Offspring*, the film was an effective companion piece to *Pumpkinhead II*. Both featured a Midwest setting and examined the origins and vengeful spirits of American folklore but this second slice of dark Americana was atmospheric and engaging with actual scares and solid acting. Rather than wallowing in the actual constraints and clichés of the genre, the director exploited the concept and limited production values to his advantage. Shepherded and supported by veteran Horror /franchise producer Barry Bernardi⁹² on this occasion, Burr wove a more compelling narrative, complete with creative deaths, before concluding with a relatively satisfying finale. However, despite Burr's intentions and the concept's potential, the film has yet to warrant a follow up. Consequently, the director returned to the Full

Moon fold, and the aforementioned remit of making more palatable pictures for the family market, with *Johnny Mysto: Boy Wizard* and *The Werewolf Reborn*.

Following these family-orientated features, Burr once again adopted a reactionary approach by making a second break from Full Moon to direct *Spoiler*. A futuristic prison-set action film, the script's focus was an innocent (every)man's struggle to re-establish a connection with his family against all odds. With a narrative liberally borrowed from such films as *Demolition Man*, *Total Recall* and Gordon's *Fortress*, the actual production was, according to Burr, appropriately shot for around half a million dollars in eighteen days "using cannibalised sets from two other movies."⁹³ Downbeat in execution and littered with Burr's fondness for cameo players, the film showed some promise, particularly in relation to key sequences, yet faltered in its overall effect. In his defence, the director has since revealed that he was removed from the film right after shooting. Furthermore, he alleges he was prevented from putting together a first cut of the film by a producer who wanted to direct the movie in postproduction. Disenfranchised once more the director adopted the pseudonym Cameron Van Daacke and distanced himself from the film. In this respect, Burr's career echoes Cameron's early experiences on *Piranha II* as producers and directors clash over creative control and final cut.

After experiencing early success and a sustained involvement with the Hollywood Horror franchise, Burr's career descended into a dependable yet creatively dissatisfying on/off relationship with Full Moon entertainment. This began with back to back sequels and culminated in family-orientated fairy tales targeted at the *Harry Potter/Goosebumps* audience. With the financial security of Full Moon replacing the Hollywood Horror franchise, Burr returned to Band's company after *Spoiler* to make

The Boy With the X-Ray Eyes and *Phantom Town* – a light-hearted version of Band's *Ghost Town* featuring an array of impressive sequences and references. In many ways superior to *Ghost Town*, and innovative in its use of Romanian locations, Burr's Horror/Western hybrid is one of the few Full Moon entries to feature likable protagonists, some pitch-perfect scares and appeal to the *Pulse Pounders* pre-teen audience. However, during this period, Burr drew together the right creative team to make a successful break from his franchise/Full Moon past to produce an independent film for a different audience demographic.

Shot in Romania, Burr's 2004 film *Straight into Darkness* was the direct result of his association with director of photography Viorel Gergevicij, who offered to co-finance the project through his recently established Silver Bullet production company. To secure his share of the funding, the director relied on previous supporters and collaborators and put together a dedicated creative team that included his brother Mark Hannah from *The Offspring* and Chuck Williams and Will Huston from *Eddie Presley*. Written by Burr around Romanian actors and actual locations in close proximity to Band's multi-purpose set, the director referenced a number of documentary and cinematic sources to create an ambitious yet achievable epic set during World War II.

A stark yet sumptuous story of two U.S. soldiers forced to navigate their way through the Nazi heartland, *Straight into Darkness* effectively showcased Burr's talents. Furthermore, he exploited his previous genre experience to maximum effect, particularly in a number of disturbing sequences and encounters with cannibal priests and feral children playing at being freedom fighters. Indeed, Burr received an unprecedented amount of critical acclaim with a film that was tonally in keeping with his features outside of the Full Moon/franchise arena. Clearly afforded artistic license

and creative control on account of his supportive financiers and dual role of writer and director, Burr benefited from being an integrated part of the production process from the outset. As such, this film presents a more accurate representation of his cumulative talents. In doing so, the restrictive nature of the Hollywood Horror franchise, and the industry it has come to represent, has been highlighted.

Following *Straight into Darkness*, Burr used the positive press attention to firmly reposition himself alongside his fellow independent filmmakers. In replicating Berlinger's return to documentary success, the director has also attempted to re-establish his credibility by drawing a very clear distinction between those films deserving of a Jeff Burr Picture credit, and those that do not.⁹⁴ In a similar vein to Spielberg, Burr has begun to exploit an area of compromise wherein he may soon be able to alternate between personal pet projects and those commercially viable compromises for which he has become renowned.

The director's association with the Hollywood Horror franchise has been resurrected with his fleeting association to a pair of *Monster Man* sequels for Lion's Gate and the star-studded *The Demons 5* – characteristically featuring a plethora of veteran Horror actors. Prior to these commercial enterprises, Burr has homaged Coscarelli and Tarantino/Rodriguez with *Mil Mascaras vs. The Aztec Mummy* and *The Devil's Den* - a film whose synopsis cannibalises *From Dusk Till Dawn* and *Underworld*. Having worked for both Corman and Band during the course of his twenty year career, Burr has used imitation and the franchise to forge ahead in an increasingly difficult market. With numerous sequels, setbacks and self-penned projects, he has consistently proven his resilience and ensured his career longevity with juxtaposing ventures.

In an industry notorious for stereotyping its stars and product, the sequel makers have fought with, for and against the Hollywood Horror franchise. From chronologically correct continuations to comedies and spoofs, these directors have collectively addressed and challenged its complex needs in these projects. As a late and sometimes unwelcome addition to the franchise family, these seasoned outsiders were often relegated to the role of a vessel through which a studio, star or producer's version of the Hollywood Horror franchise had to be filtered and preserved.

Indeed, this final chapter has clearly demonstrated the way in which sequel directors, like their franchise films, were frequently disrespected throughout the production process. Seduced by a myriad of push and pull factors, these directors fought against a diminishing role and the difficult responsibility of reconciling contractual obligations with their own ambitions and concerns. As a result the Hollywood Horror franchise has frequently seen these filmmakers, with the unique exception of Cameron, enjoy and endure an ambivalently addictive relationship that shows no sign of ending.

End Notes

¹ Chuck Crisafulli. 'Pumpkinhead II.' *Cinefantastique*. Vol 25. No 3. June 1994. pp 52-53. (p53).

² An adaptation of H.G. Wells' *The Island of Dr Moreau*.

³ Indeed, Francis later became a multi-award winning cinematographer on such diverse pictures as *Glory*, *The Straight Story* and Scorsese's *Cape Fear* remake.

⁴ Trimark built their business around sequels to *Warlock* and *Return of the Living Dead* and Blue Rider bought the sequel rights to *Leprechaun* and *Night of the Demons* before working on the *Children of the Corn* franchise for Dimension.

⁵ Miramax production executive Greg Spence co-wrote and directed *Children of the Corn IV* and *The Prophecy II*.

⁶ For a full analysis of Corman's inspirational career, readers should consult his 1990 autobiography, *How I Made A Hundred Movies in Hollywood and Never Lost a Dime*.

⁷ Kerschner shot *Stakeout on Dope Street* in 1958 whereas Coppola directed *Dementia 13* five years later in 1963.

⁸ Indeed, they both began as independent distributors and attempted to infiltrate the market through the Horror genre. Miramax released its *Halloween / Friday the 13th* clone *The Burning* in 1981, with Bob scripting and Harvey producing and Shaye wrote the story for Jack Sholder's *Alone in the Dark*.

⁹ Cameron's role required him to create the first "spaceship with tits." Kenneth Turan. 'Interview: James Cameron.' *L.A. Times*. August 1991.

http://www.terminatorfiles.com/reload.htm?extras/articles/cameron_005.htm

(Downloaded: October 12th 2003).

¹⁰ Price relates each of following four stories to an interviewer. The first segment touches on necrophilia and the second revolves around the secret to eternal life. Burr's third segment combines Browning's *Freaks* with a classic tale of jealousy and revenge before concluding with an alternative take on King's *Children of the Corn* in a Civil War setting which evoked his student film.

¹¹ *Waxwork II: Lost in Time* featured the same segmented stylistic approach as the first film and incorporated classic and contemporary Horror images and icons.

¹² McDonagh, 1995: 132

¹³ Having paid Dante \$8,000 for *Piranha*, Corman offered the director the similarly-themed *Humanoids of the Deep* which was rejected in favour of an offer from De Laurentiis to direct a planned *Orca II* for \$50,000. Despite the film falling through, Hollywood still had Dante stereotyped and Universal offered him *Jaws 3*, which at that time was to be a parody of the first two films entitled *Jaws 3 People 0*.

¹⁴ After New World collapsed, the rights to the franchise remained with producer Larry Kuppin despite Barkers attempts to buy them back. With the remnants of this company forming Trans Atlantic Pictures the project, along with plans for a *Children of the Corn II*, remained in development. However, Randel's reluctance to "become a total hack" in the wake of script changes led to his sacking one month before shooting and Hickox was recommended to the producers as an emergency replacement by special effects artist Bob Keen. Alan Jones. 'Hellraiser III: The Politics of Hell.' *Cinefantastique*. Vol23. No 2/3. October 1992. p21.

¹⁵ Having edited, restructured and re-shot many films prior to US distribution, Harvey Weinstein earned this cinematic nickname within the industry.

¹⁶ Dan Scapperotti. 'Stepfather II: Director Jeff Burr behind the scenes.' *Cinefantastique*. Vol 20. No 5. May 1990. pp52-3. (p53).

¹⁷ Biskind, 2004: p59.

¹⁸ Barker felt excluded by the film's producers throughout the creative process but was approached by Kuppin to offer feedback and endorse Hickox's film in exchange for money. Reluctant to do so having witnessed "the same old Hickox stew," Barker declined the offer until Miramax, who had purchased the film for distribution, approached him with a better deal. Alan Jones. 'Hellraiser III And Me.' *Shivers* 3. pp 24-26. (p26).

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ After removing almost three minutes of gore footage from the film, Miramax were informed that the character's image was too controversial for the marketing campaign and Pinhead was effectively banned from the film's poster despite Miramax's attempts to have the decision overturned. More recently the MPAA banned Lions Gate's poster for *Saw II*.

²¹ After being fired during production and replaced by Assonitis, Cameron's name was to remain on the picture for contractual reasons compelling the first time filmmaker to fly to Rome and confront the executive producer.

²² John H. Richardson. 'Iron Jim.' *Premier*. August 1994.

http://www.terminatorfiles.com/reload.htm?extras/articles/cameron_005.htm

(Downloaded: November 26th 2004).

²³ Similarly, Artisan approached *Nightmare 2*'s Jack Sholder for their direct to video sequel to *Wishmaster*.

²⁴ Harlin had previously worked with the actor on Warner's *Deep Blue Sea*, affectionately known in the industry as *Jurassic Shark* - a film whose ending was rewritten digitally to kill of Saffron Burrows' character after unfavourable test screening responses.

²⁵ Bernhard was reportedly underwhelmed by the footage he was seeing and frustrated by the way in which his feedback was disregarded.

²⁶ Christopher Koetting. 'Speak of the Devil.' *Fangoria*. Issue 180. pp 66-75. (p69).

²⁷ Jeff Burr. 'The Shocking Truth' Documentary. *Texas Chainsaw Massacre* Special Edition DVD.

²⁸ According to the director, he had "some pretty well respected people in Hollywood say: 'This is career suicide, don't do it. If your film is good, they'll attribute it to the first film, and if your film is bad, it'll always be negatively compared to the first film.'" Adrian Wootton. 'Interview: James Cameron.'" *The Guardian*. Sunday April 13, 2003.

<http://film.guardian.co.uk/interview/interviewpages/0,6737,942591,00.html>

(Downloaded: November 26th 2004).

²⁹ Cameron was threatened with legal action by Harlan Ellison who alleged that Cameron's script was based on several of the episodes he had written for *The Outer Limits*. Without the Studio's backing Cameron conceded in an out of court settlement which saw the writer acknowledged in the film's credits.

³⁰ Cameron has since explained in interviews how he sold Hurd the rights for \$1 on the condition that she did not make the film without him.

³¹ Hemdale Chairman John Daly believed the final reel should be removed and the film should end on an explosion. Cameron vehemently felt otherwise. In this case, at least, Cameron triumphed and the film was released as intended. This conflict was followed by Orion disappointing the director with their lack of support for the film in its advertising and, according to Cameron, in the way that they "treated me like dogshit."

John H. Richardson. 'Iron Jim.' *Premier*. August 1994.

http://www.terminatorfiles.com/reload.htm?extras/articles/cameron_005.htm

(Downloaded: November 26th 2004).

³² Adrian Wootton. 'Interview: James Cameron.'" *The Guardian*. Sunday April 13, 2003. <http://film.guardian.co.uk/interview/interviewpages/0,6737,942591,00.html>

(Downloaded: November 26th 2004).

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Sammon, 2000: p12.

³⁵ More notable examples include *The Texas Chainsaw Massacre*, *The Amityville Horror* and *The Hills Have Eyes*.

³⁶ Steve Biodrowski. 'Psycho IV.' *Cinefantastique*. Vol 21. No 3. December 1990. pp46-47 & 61. (p46).

³⁷ Adrian Wootton. 'Interview: James Cameron.'" *The Guardian*. Sunday April 13, 2003. <http://film.guardian.co.uk/interview/interviewpages/0,6737,942591,00.html>

(Downloaded: November 26th 2004).

³⁸ Alan Jones. 'Harvey Bernhard's Omens.' *Starburst* Vol 14. No 3. November 1991. pp 28-31. (p30).

³⁹ Apparently this is "a right he's always felt compelled to exercise ever since he invented and developed the whole Vegas lounge act institution in the fifties." Ibid.

⁴⁰ Although good-looking teens are a mandatory selling point for many sequels, *Freddy Vs Jason* and *Halloween: H20* also featured performances from established music stars Kelly Rowland and L.L. Cool J respectively.

⁴¹ In many respects, such a concept could be considered a missed opportunity in terms of an alternative approach to the franchise.

⁴² Halloweenmovies.com. 'Interview: Moustapha Akkad.'

http://www.halloweenmovies.com/site/interview_ma.htm (Downloaded: December 12th 2002).

⁴³ Halloweenmovies.com. 'Interview: Jamie Lee Curtis.'

http://www.halloweenmovies.com/site/interview_jlc.htm (Downloaded: December 12th 2002).

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ As the screenwriter of Hitchcock's *Psycho*, Stefano publicly derided previous sequels and only consented to returning so long as he could expand the prequel elements in keeping with his own interpretation.

⁴⁶ Sammon, 2001: 12.

⁴⁷ In addition to its approach to the *Hellraiser* franchise, Bob Weinstein directed *The Stepfather III's* Magar to use *The Shining* as a template for *Children of the Corn: Revelation*.

⁴⁸ Jeff Burr. *Leatherface: The Texas Chainsaw Massacre III*. DVD commentary.

⁴⁹ A sentiment in the same vein as this, which highlighted the apparent cinematic snobbery of some crew members within the British Film Industry, was also expressed by George Lucas as a result of his negative experiences directing *Star Wars* at Pinewood almost ten years previous to Cameron's conflicts. John H. Richardson. 'Iron Jim.' *Premier*. August 1994.

http://www.terminatorfiles.com/reload.htm?extras/articles/cameron_005.htm (Downloaded: November 26th 2004).

⁵⁰ Paraphrased from an interview with Cameron on the documentary *Alien Evolution*.

⁵¹ Burr recalls being fired on a Friday and then rehired late on the Sunday night, presumably after New Line were either unable to find a replacement, or the producers felt that they had taught the director a valuable lesson. Jeff Burr. 'The Saw is Family: A Documentary' *Leatherface: The Texas Chainsaw Massacre III* DVD.

⁵² Jeff Burr. *Leatherface: The Texas Chainsaw Massacre III*. DVD commentary.

⁵³ Michael Rowe. 'Jason X: Kills in Space.' *Fangoria* 210. March 2002. pp 44-48. (p46).

⁵⁴ Although there are no flashbacks, the inclusion of a *Star Trek*-esque 'holodeck' allowed the film to pay "homage"⁵⁴ to Buechler's *New Blood*. James Isaac. *Jason X* DVD Commentary.

⁵⁵ Jason's resurrection aptly coincides with a couple of copulating teens - highlighting the unspoken connection that has existed between the two.

⁵⁶ Sammon, 2001: 18.

⁵⁷ Ibid. p14.

⁵⁸ Charged with making a clean break from the first film in order to "build a new franchise from the ground up," Hickox directed a teen-orientated follow up to Miner's *Warlock*. Steve Biodrowski. 'Warlock: The Armageddon.' *Cinefantastique*. Vol 24. No 3 / 4. October 1993. pp 120-121. (p120).

⁵⁹ Ibid. Burr and New Line came under attack from the *Leatherface* screenwriter David J. Schow in the pages of *Fangoria* 88 and 89.

⁶⁰ The line of dialogue in which Cook exclaims that the 'Saw is Family' appeared in Schow's script as an inscription on the infamous Chainsaw.

⁶¹ McCarty, 1990: 151.

⁶² Hanke, 1991: 268.

⁶³ Marc Savlov. 'The Texas Chainsaw Massacre.' *The Austin Chronicle*. November 2nd 1998. <http://www.filmvault.com/filmvault/austin/t/texaschainsawmass4.html> (Downloaded: January 6th 2003).

⁶⁴ Nick Hasted. 'What A Carve Up.' *The Guardian*. 28th September 2001. <http://film.guardian.co.uk/features/featurepages/0,4120,559120,00.html> (Downloaded: January 27th 2003).

⁶⁵ Bill Warren. 'Into the Death Tank With Leatherface.' *Gorezone* 11. January 1990. pp 18-23. (p19).

⁶⁶ Playing on the popular notion of a Prozac Nation, *Freddy vs Jason* re-emphasised Freddy's history as a lynch-mobbed pederast and child killer and depicts the dream demon indulging in scenes of rape, incest and necrophilia. Shrouded in a *Candyman*-esque conceit, whereby he must be feared and believed in to exist, Kruger continues his penchant for surreal transformations and disguises. A similarly vengeful Jason is depicted as the emotionally damaged and disfigured mother's boy who is bullied by his peers and tragically drowned as a direct result of neglect.

⁶⁷ Designed solely to place the film, and Freddy's motivation, within the context of the *Elm Street* franchise, Yu's introductory prologue also encapsulated the essence of the *Friday the 13th* franchise by allowing a machete-wielding Jason to stalk and slash an attractive bare-breasted girl through the woods at Camp Crystal Lake.

⁶⁸ Halloweenmovies.com. 'Interview: Steve Miner.' <http://www.halloweenmovies.com/site/lobby.html> (Downloaded: 12th September 2003).

⁶⁹ The final exorcism featured elaborate versions of the spider-walk sequence, special make-up effects, Mercedes MacCambridge's vocal effects and sexual dialogue.

⁷⁰ By focusing on Norman's internal struggle and the potential for redemption, Garris wove the past and present together in a pair of parallel narratives exploring the nature vs. nurture debate. By bringing back Dr Richmond and lacing the script with dialogue and imagery that marked the first film, Stefano's script was a nostalgic flick through the *Psycho* family album.

⁷¹ Yu, on the other hand, was vindicated by the test screening process, in that audiences rejected the level of human backstory with the film pared down accordingly.

⁷² Anthnoy C. Ferrante. 'Director of the Dead.' *Fangoria* 128. November 1993. pp52-56 & 74. (p53).

⁷³ As in previous cases, MPAA head Heffner referred to such charges as "bullshit...foolishness" and merely a variation on "the same old garbage I've heard before." Dann Gire. 'Texas Chainsaw Massacre III.' *Cinefantastique*. Vol 20. No 4. March 1990. p 14.

⁷⁴ Since *Leatherface's* battle with the ratings board, rules have been changed to prevent multiple resubmissions within a set time frame.

⁷⁵ Isaac's *Jason X* switched from backwoods slasher film to action-orientated sci-fi and Yu's *Freddy vs Jason* became a comic book fantasy for the video-gaming generation.

⁷⁶ Jeff Burr. *Leatherface: The Texas Chainsaw Massacre III*. DVD commentary.

⁷⁷ In a somewhat unprecedented move for a Studio executive, De Luca has since declared that it was he, and New Line, who "fucked it up." Patricia Goldstein. 'The Rise of Mike De Luca.' *Premier*. December 1994. pp 112-119. (p119).

⁷⁸ Jeff Burr. 'The Saw is Family Documentary.' *Texas Chainsaw Massacre III* DVD.

⁷⁹ Jeff Burr. The Shocking Truth Documentary. *Texas Chainsaw Massacre* Special Edition DVD.

⁸⁰ Diabolical Dominion. 'Interview: Jim Isaac.'

<http://www.diabolical-dominion.com/Interviews/Isaac/> (Downloaded January 20th 2003).

⁸¹ Jeff Burr. *Leatherface: The Texas Chainsaw Massacre III*. DVD commentary.

⁸² Jeff Burr. 'The Saw is Family Documentary.' *Texas Chainsaw Massacre III* DVD.

⁸³ Ibid.

⁸⁴ The film was marketed as giving audiences the chance to decide the character's fate. Despite publicising such a gimmick, Castle had confidently shot only one ending to his film, one in which the character died.

⁸⁵ This was done with regard to charges of exploitation and dishonesty. Harlin also expressed regret over the film's over-reliance on standard genre clichés, elaborate make-up effects sequences and appallingly inadequate C.G.I.

⁸⁶ The unexpected success of *Halloween H20* allowed Miner to explore *Tremors*' territory and expand his sub-genre resume with *Lake Placid*; an affectionate monster of a B movie with a recognisable cast, whereas *Jason X*'s Isaac has recently complete work on Lions Gate's *Skinwalkers*.

⁸⁷ Having carved out a productive if not prolific niche for himself on account of this, Garris has emerged as one of the key figures in Horror – particularly as the driving force behind the *Masters of Horror* format and key contributor to *Nightmares and Dreamscapes*.

⁸⁸ The film was eventually directed by Richard Governor.

⁸⁹ In the wake of bankruptcy proceedings involving DEG and Atlantic, a sequel was being developed by associate producer Jed Weintrob.

⁹⁰ In this respect Burr described it as being "tightly constructed, lean, mean and with no frills" Simon Bacal. 'Pumpkinhead II.' *Shivers*. No 12. May 1994. pp8-10. (p10)

⁹¹ Ibid.

⁹² Barnardi began his career as a co-producer on Carpenter's eighties films and the *Halloween* sequels before moving on to the *Amityville* and *Poltergeist* franchises over the past fifteen years. Since his work with Burr on *The Night of The Scarecrow*, Barnardi has infiltrated the mainstream as producer of Disney's *Haunted Mansion*.

⁹³ According to Burr, *Spoiler* was the third of three movies shot back to back; the others being *Convict 762* and *Absolution*. Keith Bailey. 'Spoiler: Review.' <http://www.badmovieplanet.com/unknownmovies/reviews/rev107.html> (Downloaded: September 18th 2003).

⁹⁴ "I want the credit A JEFF BURR FILM to mean something. My personal theory is that credit is deserved if you have total creative control on the movie...from script development to final cut. I have had that on three movies, and they are the ones with that credit for me. Another thought is that...would the movie exist without you? These are my guidelines, and I made (it) clear in my contracts that they CAN'T say it's a JEFF BURR MOVIE unless I have those stipulations." Scott Weinberg.

'SXSW Pre-Production: Straight into Darkness Director Jeff Burr.'

<http://www.efilmcritic.com/feature.php?feature=1048> (Downloaded: January 2nd 2005.)

Conclusions

"The film medium has always been parasitic and vampiric... the movies are always interested in adapting."¹

- David Cronenberg.

"I'm going to keep making this over until I get it right."²

- Sean S. Cunningham.

"Films aren't made, they're remade."³

- Irving Thalberg.

As part of the Hollywood Horror franchise, filmmakers are immersed within a microcosm that encapsulates the cyclical nature of Hollywood film genres. They are also assimilated into the reigning Studio system. Much like the classic genre system, the franchise expands upon the foundations of a tripartite system of production, distribution and consumption in order to seamlessly match concept and consumer as a means of ensuring financial success. As a cultural and economic cash cow, its popularity is the result of notoriety, prejudice and predictability and these are signposts for audiences, critics and censors alike. Supported by brand identities and fuelled by an effective combination of audience anticipation and corporate greed it is a process of adaptation and mutual exploitation. Directors, Studios and independents have consistently manipulated and mined the profitability of the Hollywood Horror franchise through synergy, merchandising and any other method imaginable.

Bound by Studios and audiences to replicate a film's success, irrespective of their relationship to it, filmmakers have consistently courted success and encountered pressure to adjust their own expectations. Throughout a process of collaboration and compromise, they have attempted to reconcile the paradoxical need for conformity with a sense of innovation. For Fincher in particular, "the lesson to be learned is that you can't take on an enterprise of this size and scope if you don't have a *Terminator* or *Jaws* behind you;"⁴ especially as a first-time feature filmmaker working for Fox on *Alien 3*. In other words, the vast majority of directors, discounting the phenomenal success and autonomy afforded to Cameron and Spielberg, have been required to all but abandon an auteur-based fantasy in favour of a more realistic approach through their affiliation with the Hollywood Horror franchise.

The Franchise Director

Directors' assimilation mirrored that of many independent production companies and distributors in that they were either bought up by the industry conglomerates or simply unable to compete with them. For the Hollywood Horror franchise, this shift to Studio financing and control often impacted upon the way in which returning directors were allowed to redress the perceived inadequacies of a first instalment and the extent to which they could depart from its proven formulae. Although many first films are representative of directors' attitudes towards filmmaking at that time, their involvement in sequels was sometimes devoid of personal attachment. Indeed, they bore all the hallmarks of a standard business decision designed to ingratiate them with the Studios and ensure their professional development. Rather than work against or outside Hollywood, directors such as Raimi even sought acceptance and absolution from the

very controversy they had initially courted. As a consequence directors produced more palatable follow ups to ensure an R rating. Nevertheless, there were others who pioneered new ideas and reflected prior concerns and even continued to challenge audience expectations and MPAA rulings.

Initially cautious to answer the collective cry of ‘what happened next,’ few directors have been able to resist those push and pull factors designed to ensure loyalty and career longevity. Some directors cited contractual or moral obligations whereas others did so out of industry coercion, frustration or simply the opportunity to direct another feature film. However, after a dissatisfying Studio experience, filmmakers found the additional funding, increased autonomy and higher profile of a franchise film a shrewd decision. Indeed, Spielberg, Lucas and Coppola are all indebted to the franchise followed by the likes of Donner and Zemeckis in the mainstream.⁵ Seduced by its relative security, directors were drawn to the franchise by bigger names, budgets and backers.

For genre directors such as Romero, Raimi and Craven, the opportunity to explore new themes and expand the mythos of the first film also paved the way for academic analysis and a swifter elevation to auteur status and increased academic attention. This approach also extends to such directors as Cohen and Henenlotter whose *It's Alive* and *Basket Case* trilogies have not only allowed them to develop characters, concepts and themes over a sustained period but also opened up the financing for other projects.

In this respect, only Cronenberg has notably avoided the franchise in favour of literary adaptations; side-stepping such industry trappings despite an overwhelming number of offers.⁶ Rather than a titular association, Cronenberg's body of work is often canonised under the thematic term and almost burgeoning sub-genre of ‘Body Horror.’

Fundamentally concerned with the process of bodily evolution, transformation and disintegration, his focus ranges from the individual to society as a whole. Thematically consistent and challenging in his choice of material in which medicine, science and the media are fused with sexuality and self destruction, this director's filmography, under the auspicious banner of Body Horror, has nevertheless benefited from this association following the early success of *Shivers* and *Rabid*.

Whereas audiences identify Cronenberg with 'Body Horror' and controversial adaptations of Burroughs and Ballard, Argento's association with the Giallo⁷ and self-proclaimed *Three Mothers* trilogy has seen the Italian auteur develop an identifiable brand name with which to penetrate the American / International markets and potentially raise the necessary financing for future films. Indeed, the commonality shared by those directors who eschewed the Hollywood Horror franchise is the support of established producers. Moreover, there has been a perceived marketable strength in the source material, literary or otherwise, based on previous successes with which they have become identified.

Although numerous installments of variable quality in a particular franchise could potentially tarnish all those associated with the franchise, in many cases, the appearance of numerous sequels has only served to elevate the alleged originality and effectiveness of first films. What is more, their directors and literary inspirations are often held in higher esteem in contrast to their contemporary competitors despite sequel directors' best efforts to work within the constraints of the medium and an unforgiving media.

United in their decision to begin careers within the controversial commerciality of the Horror genre, Gordon, Coscarelli and Craven have each made a significant impact upon

audiences with varying degrees of success. With Hollywood in search of fresh ideas, these and other such directors were readily assimilated into a system of supply and demand in which the Hollywood Horror franchise emerged as a preferred route. However, such generic stereotyping also played an important role by way of industrial relegation with directors unable to secure financing for personal projects. For example, both Gordon and Coscarelli have primarily been relegated to the low budget independent arena on account of their preferred material, industry stereotyping and limited professional relationships.

Craven on the other hand has repeatedly broken out of the exploitation market in search of a mainstream audience and worked with the majority of Hollywood's Studios and Corporations to varying degrees of personal satisfaction and commercial success. However, such opportunities were only made available on account of his commitment to the Hollywood Horror franchise and a level of commercial success that exceeded the \$100 million mark. Furthermore, his significantly higher profile has led to tabloid controversy, increased media scrutiny and pressure.

Despite differing relationships with the Hollywood Horror franchise directors' first film experiences have shaped their subsequent careers. Indeed, those professional relationships formed during a first film were resurrected and revisited through similarly themed projects and conceptual spin-offs. Many shrewdly exploited their success to solicit Studio interest or raise the requisite amount of financing for future films. Similarly, publicity departments reminded audiences of such accomplishments throughout various teasers, trailers and materials at the crux of their marketing campaigns. Whether adopted as leverage or dismissed as history in accordance with their current industry standing, directors' attitudes towards these films clearly varied.

However, their names and reputations are irrevocably entwined with the title's successes and failures in much the same way that authors are attached to adaptations of their work. Indeed, the franchise is equal with other forms of adaptation, literary or otherwise. In other words, they remain connected to their landmark first films and therefore the franchise in the collective minds of Studios, audiences and to a lesser extent censors.

This investigation into the franchise has shown that an established directorial hierarchy is at work within the Hollywood system, one that places the adaptation and more recently even the remake above the Horror film. For directors such as Coscarelli, the role of sequel director is a significant step down in terms of career progression despite the opportunities and exposure it can potentially provide. In this respect, Hollywood's hierarchical attitude and approach to genre-based filmmaking, and franchise filmmaking in particular, is clearly exposed.

Moreover, the inherent hypocrisy of the industry is illustrated by the Studios' attitude towards the genre in spite of the commercial success it affords them.⁸ Unfortunately, such feeling has also infiltrated the collective consciousness of directors, who are equally deserving of such an indictment in light of their exploitation of the genre and the Hollywood Horror franchise. Consequently, even though literary adaptations have legitimacy and respectability, the traditional view of the Hollywood Horror franchise is one which sees it residing somewhere below the line of professional respectability, especially if the first film director is no longer attached.

When such incentives proved unsuccessful, directors nominated close friends, acquaintances and first film colleagues to take over sequel chores. This mentoring system began with Cunningham and Carpenter in the early eighties. Preferring to shoulder producing responsibilities and/or receive passive payments, this relationship with the franchise was later adopted by Romero and Barker who fulfilled their obligation to Studio demands and supported key members of a production team. More recently, Craven's editor, Patrick Lussier was promoted into the director's chair for Dimension's *Dracula 2000*, a film heavily promoted and released under an all-too familiar 'Wes Craven Presents' banner.⁹

However, several filmmakers remained involved or were seduced back to the franchise on account of their status as franchisors and professional mentors to new talent. In this respect, a further level of exploitation was afforded to these filmmakers allowing directors such as Steve Miner and Tommy Lee Wallace a chance to kick-start their careers. Therefore the Hollywood Horror franchise has placed first film directors in an enviable position, previously epitomised by Corman and Band, of being able to offer ambitious yet relatively inexperienced individuals the opportunity to prove themselves as directors in their own right. Provided with a structured platform from which to experiment and develop the Hollywood Horror franchise has proven to be a fertile training ground from the beginning.

Deliberately echoing this farming out of the franchise based on a director's recommendations, Studios and Production companies also promoted key figures from within a first film's cast and crew into the director's chair. Not only employed as a means of ensuring continuity, fidelity and commitment, Studios also exploited such associations in marketing campaigns. Rather than forgo their involvement and see the

franchise taken in a direction they felt was inappropriate, writers, production assistants, stars and special effects artists also claimed the sequel as an invaluable training ground. Rewarded for their franchise loyalty, screenwriters in particular have exploited their literary connections and used their knowledge of its generic codes and conventions to manoeuvre the franchise back to their original concerns. The most recent examples of this growing trend have been with Mancini and Goyer on *Seed of Chucky* and *Blade: Trinity*. Consequently, filmmakers such as Blatty have challenged audiences' notions of fidelity in seeking to put their own personal stamp on the material as members of the franchise family and, in some respects, reclaim it in line with their own original intentions.

Franchise families are headed by a franchisor who depends upon the longevity and continued success of the Hollywood Horror franchise. Inspired by commercially successful follow ups, the franchisor or licensee has exploited established titles and acquired the rights to others. As self-appointed guardians with a vested interest, these companies and individuals exerted creative control from initial concept to final cut. *House* and *Friday the 13th* producer Sean S. Cunningham has described how, “an active producer...(is) responsible for everything from the time the idea is hatched to the time the film reaches theatres....He produces the film (even though) the industry however doesn't perceive producers as filmmakers.”¹⁰ Such a stance detracts from the role, responsibilities and definition of a director and certainly has implications for auteurist approaches.

Indeed, with producers Shaye, Akkad and Bernhard scrutinising and shepherding sequels to *A Nightmare on Elm Street*, *Halloween* and *The Omen*, critics and audiences have understandably, yet mistakenly, attributed the success or blame to the film

director. As *Hellraiser*'s Barker has since pointed out, "when the reviews come out, nobody ever criticises the producer...it's always the director or the writer, or both who get it in the neck."¹¹ Nevertheless, at its most positive and productive, the role of the franchisor is not a self-serving guardian but an intermediary between outsider and audience. The main issue being that this restricted view leads them to 'direct' the tone and content from a position of relative safety. This, in turn, means an economically motivated temptation to abandon experimentation and edginess in favour of formula and cliché.

For outsiders, franchise families were often obstacles to achieving professional satisfaction. Recruited on account of their prior genre experience in TV or film or independent credentials, such directors were preferable for production companies keen to promote an ongoing franchise. Many of these second or third time filmmakers hoping to follow in Romero and Hooper's footsteps regarded the Hollywood Horror franchise as an isolated yet fairly established route into bigger budget Studio-based filmmaking. Impressionable yet enthusiastic with comparatively less experience, directors in this third category were a great deal more affordable than their absent predecessors. However, such a recruitment strategy, whether adopted through necessity or choice, opened up many franchises to criticisms that centred on the relative obscurity of their directors.¹² Nevertheless, the notion of contributing to what many industry insiders have deemed to be a destructive force has seen Studios recruit from outside Hollywood. By importing up-and-coming talent from across the globe, the Hollywood Horror franchise has been a showcase for new talent¹³ with Aja's *Haute Tension* most recently precipitating his selection and approval as the director of the disturbing *The Hills Have Eyes* remake.

A popular point of entry for filmmakers with little Studio experience, the Hollywood Horror franchise has also served as an intermediate training ground for directors caught between television and a first film of their own. As demonstrated in Chapter 5, the sequel makers' prior knowledge, experience and to some extent acclaim in relation to the Hollywood Horror franchise, saw them subjected to industry stereotyping. Whether willing victims or seasoned survivors their involvement with various sequels further ghettoised the genre director into a sub category.

Attitudes and Approaches

The demands placed upon franchise directors are inherently paradoxical. Their attitude and approach must be conservative yet innovative and geared towards pre-empting industry and audience expectations. Herein lies the challenge for the franchise filmmaker – to walk the tightrope between these two arenas. With the support and co-operation of the franchisor, the director's objective is to meet or exceed expectations in keeping with his or her creative concerns.

Whereas returning directors traded autonomy for advancement, outsiders were frequently stifled by a Studio's lack of financial support. Directors such as Spiegel on *From Dusk Till Dawn 2* were charged with the duplicitous task of transforming the property into a marketable commodity on a fraction of the first film's budget. As such they struggled to maintain quality and continuity with their ability to secure key cast members and adequate special effects firmly capped. Commissioning sequels purely for the direct-to-video/DVD or cable markets after the theatrical release of previous entries demonstrates the reluctance of companies like Dimension, Trimark and Lion's

Gate to reinvest in a franchise and uphold the quality behind it. This denies sequel directors the opportunity to continue or compete with the first film's content.¹⁴ Consequently, this corporate choice to take advantage of the new developments in distribution damages a director's ability to do any follow up justice and diminishes the reputation of the title and every franchise. Furthermore, it duly exposes the dismissive attitude and approach of companies towards the Hollywood Horror franchise.

Whether timed to capitalise on the recent impact of previous entries or commemorate a first film's anniversary, the relationship of a sequel to its ancestors fluctuated according to a director's mandate. In following a linear and logical approach to narrative, several erred on the side of caution by adhering to a first film's conceit. As writers and co-writers of a first film, others sought to expand it in line with their own creative vision. Indeed, with franchise film criticism dominated by notions of fidelity, sequels are subjected to an extensive process of comparison at the expense of any objective assessment. However, by promoting films with a numerical or titular association Studios have invited this instinctive form of appraisal. With the process reframed as an additional form of adaptation, some directors have taken into account the way in which a pre-existing text has shaped and sharpened audience expectations. However, audiences and critics equally have to overcome the aforementioned hierarchy and hypocrisy surrounding the Hollywood Horror franchise.

Cannibalism within and between genres is a cinematic constant and it has spread throughout the microcosmic confines of the Hollywood Horror franchise. Faced with the fusion of disparate elements and demands, many directors succumbed to pressure and took the easier option of shamelessly recreating a first film, with slight alterations, as in Szwarc's *Jaws 2*. In other words, this pressure led to increasingly imitative and

desperate approaches with first film narratives adopted but not updated. Whether designed as a shot for shot remake or slight variation on a theme, reproduction has remained central to many directors' approach.

Indeed, the temptation to succumb to imitation as a form of cinematic flattery by producing a facsimile of a first film without any real thought, has become a generic staple. Whereas first sequel directors were challenged and intimidated by the idea of a follow up, subsequent directors benefited from some necessary distance. To this end, later directors exploited the participation of franchise family members to not only legitimise their entry, but also to justify the dramatic license they had taken with it. Indeed, the greatest success has been experienced by those directors who embraced a form of playful reverence that, for the most part, eschewed any elements of parody.

Trapped between audience's expectations and preserving enigmatic antagonists, directors seldom shied away from dragging them centre stage by a third film. This need for further instalments to theorise, rationalise and research their origins has been a legitimate cause for concern. This satisfying of our collective curiosity as to how and why such people or events occur in society is a key function of the Hollywood Horror franchise. It perpetuates a need to explore what Robin Wood has referred to as the "return of the repressed"¹⁵ with sequels detracting from the intensity of the genre and its potentially cathartic nature. With the exception of Craven's *Scream* franchise, directors have placed their faith in 'The Other' and diminished the extent to which they must rely upon returning cast members.¹⁶ In these and other cases, the Hollywood Horror franchise has exerted its supremacy over Hollywood's star system with actors written out, written off or simply replaced in future instalments.

Horror's interdependent relationship with Comedy has provided many sequel directors with a seemingly easy option. Many opted to dilute the intensity by shifting into parody as means of securing success. However any modicum of achievement in this respect has been overshadowed by atrocious second instalments in the *C.H.U.D.* and *Return of the Living Dead* franchises produced by ineffective companies with little understanding of the material. Moreover, the collapse of these and other such production companies and distributors, coupled with a first film director's desire to break into Hollywood, saw the rights to many third entries revert to Studios and individuals only willing to finance a successful formula. One such company was Trimark who wisely entrusted the resurrection of the *Return of the Living Dead* franchise to Brian Yuzna five years later.

Whether recovering from a poorly received first sequel or strengthened by a second film's success, directors of third films often found themselves compelled to introduce gimmicks as an incentive to potential audiences. In other words, the success or failure of a second film dictated the extent to which directors were allowed to experiment. Nevertheless, a healthy resistance to convention has been demonstrated by many filmmakers eager to embark upon a variety of generic shifts into the various other genres. In this respect, the Hollywood Horror franchise has not been as conservative a cash cow as first suspected and has, on occasion, demonstrated its potential to successfully subvert previous entries.

In light of the stigma associated with directing the Hollywood Horror franchise, filmmakers often followed a deliberate process of distancing their film from both its predecessors and the genre as a whole. These public denials and misleading marketing campaigns are damaging to the film and the franchise. It also mirrors the industry's denial of a film's belonging to the Horror genre with Craven being a repeat offender on

this charge with regard to the initial publicity for *A Nightmare on Elm Street* and *Scream*.¹⁷ Rather than broaden the working definition and audience's understanding of the Horror film, this unsavoury hallmark of the Hollywood Horror franchise further detracts from any respectability it may aspire to.

Indeed, the industry has actively encouraged directors and publicists to transcend the genre. By creating an artistic hierarchy films have attempted to buy their way out of the genre with big budgets, Studio backing or a stellar cast. From *Arachnophobia*'s marketing as a 'thrillomedy' to *Fangoria* magazine's Studio-savvy 'It's Not A Horror Film' feature coverage in the early nineties, ambitious directors and demographic-conscious Studios sought to broaden their mainstream appeal at the genre's expense. Consequently, the genre has been afforded an increasingly narrow definition which wallowed in the worst aspects of exploitation cinema.

Despite such complications and first sequel directors' adherence to successful formulas, subsequent directors saw fit to question the essence of the first film and explore alternatives. Besides excursions into unfamiliar genres and frequent hybrids, directors adopted a series of revisionist and post-modern approaches to the franchise, particularly in relation to issues of gender, stereotypes and genre clichés, as seen in Savini's *Night of the Living Dead* remake. Rather than aggressively challenge or abandon a franchise in all but its brand name value, others faithfully recreated a series of memorable moments with delicate shifts in location and logic.

However, as the Hollywood Horror franchise has evolved, several directors have deliberately subverted the established conventions and audience expectations by blending familiarity with innovation in the scripting process. Savini and Cameron for

example have highlighted the importance of a filmmaker's interest, affection and inside knowledge of the genre and a particular franchise. In this respect, the Hollywood Horror franchise has been able to develop in line with a judicious approach to cultural development and the introduction of new technologies.

As demonstrated by Cameron and Boorman in particular, generic experimentation and stylistic shifts have not been uncommon. They have also ranged from the slight to the severe in terms of content and success. By adopting an antagonistic stance towards their audiences and predecessors, some directors challenged the very concepts and characters upon which a first film was based. Choosing instead to work against the Studio system, they embraced all manner of anarchic approaches and issued a challenge to the Hollywood establishment.

As Berlinger found on *Blair Witch 2*, drastic departures and contradictory concepts have often been regarded as a form of betrayal by fans and inconsistent by critics. Including only the most negligible of references to previous instalments, some sequels required audiences and critics to discard their formulaic expectations and attachments to a stand-alone film. In light of such unwelcome departures, directors of the Hollywood Horror franchise have often utilised the promotional aspect of their role to appeal to audiences and request that they approach their film with an open mind as a means of pre-empting potential criticism and any such adverse reactions.

Filming the Franchise

The Hollywood Horror franchise has produced a disproportionate number of troubled shoots stemming from pre-production problems and miscommunication. Although

returning directors and franchise family members were far from spared with regard to such conflicts and limitations, outsiders and sequel makers were subjected to inordinate levels of interference from the outset on account of their status and lack of previous involvement. The majority of uninitiated sequel directors were replacements for first film or franchise family directors who had declined to participate.

Therefore their pre-production relationship with a project was often last minute, chaotic and focused on solving a myriad of problems under increasing levels of pressure with Burr being a classic example. Shooting scripts came under additional scrutiny from directors wanting to make their mark on the film, sometimes at the expense of the original writer, first film director or both. Whether seduced by the salary, a significantly high profile release or the opportunity to work with specific cast and crew members, directors addressed the challenging nature of the franchise, and an apparent love and respect for the first film, throughout their publicity trails and press junkets. With little evidence of such sentiments discernible in the finished film, directors were often ill-prepared for the potentially negative impact and consequences the Hollywood Horror franchise could have on their careers.

Directors accepted a sequel assignment on the understanding that there would be alterations to the script in line with their own attitude and approach. Indeed, a sequel's pre-production period often heralded changes in direction and director with several replaced and creative differences cited as the over-riding factor. Consequently, many expectations were left unfulfilled and unforeseen circumstances affected schedules, budgets and the temperamental nature of Studio-backing. Furthermore, directors had to contend with the contributions of executives, producers and returning stars – each of whom had their own take on the material.

However, some directors found themselves at the opposite end of the creative spectrum with free reign to explore alternative approaches as writers and directors. In this respect, the Hollywood Horror franchise has facilitated directors' creative freedom. Even so, completed scripts and treatments were subject to approval, revisions and rewrites throughout the production process; one seldom free from budgetary restrictions and punishing schedules to meet a previously arranged release date in the wake of test-screenings and MPAA approval.

As facilitators of the franchise, sequel directors were charged with delivering a successful addition and providing the necessary link and narrative sustenance for future films. Consequently, a plethora of climaxes, cliff-hangers and shock epilogues were often invoked at the franchisor's insistence to provide an adequate source of closure and linger on the omnipresent threat of future films. However, such standardised conclusions were contentious and a prime source of disagreement. With many filmmakers entering the franchise without the benefit of a big budget Blockbuster or firmly established track record, their powers of persuasion were significantly lacking and unable to solicit creative support. Despite second, third and fourth units shooting simultaneously, many directors entered post-production phase under intense scrutiny from Studios and production companies eager to see a return on their investment.

Without the right to final or sometimes even first cut, some directors underwent the ironic process of being disenfranchised at this stage. As has been demonstrated throughout, the multiple forms of interference inflicted upon directors included alternative endings, additional effects sequences and structural overhaul. Wary of taxing the attention span of the lowest common denominator, sub-plots, expositional

sequences and character-enhancing back-stories were also cast aside by distributors and production companies in consideration of a more profitable and audience-friendly running time.

Although low budget independent franchises could not afford to embark upon a costly test-screening process, directors of higher profile, box office bound sequels like *The Exorcist III* and *Alien 3* were routinely subjected to this stringent yet far from scientific process. Just as negative reactions have comforted directors during post production, positive comments and test scores have seen Studios release additional funding and shifting release dates to maximise earning potential. However, this process has also demanded that directors adhere closer to the rules of the previous films and adequately satisfy audiences' demands for additional violence and those clichés for which the Hollywood Horror franchise has been criticised.

By demanding the inclusion of various clichés and stereotypes, audiences have reinforced Studios' narrow approach to the genre. Indeed, the pivotal role of audiences in the production and proliferation of the Hollywood Horror franchise cannot be negated or ignored. This is evidenced by Coscarelli's mindful online dialogue and interest in fan-sites prior to scripting the next instalment in his *Phantasm* franchise and seen in Barker and Cunningham's alternate views of where the *Hellraiser* and *Friday the 13th* franchises should continue in a narrative sense.¹⁸ In this respect, directors' original intentions have frequently been superseded by those of the franchise fan-base.

Once released, the franchise belongs to an audience that has the option to accept or reject future instalments. Therefore, audiences' masochistic mainstream sensibilities and unwillingness to embrace innovation within the franchise have directed franchise

content. In other words, far from being passive or innocent victims in this process, audiences have, through a unique combination of Internet forums and fan sites, influenced the direction and directors of the Hollywood Horror franchise.

As is often the case with Horror films, success and scandal are intrinsically linked. Rising box office figures have often led to an unfortunate yet anticipated backlash and controversy from newspapers, pressure groups, critics and sections of the community. Accusations of copycat killers have seen condemnation fuel the cultural impact of these first features and the topic of censorship become a political cause celebre - an approach propagated by the media and groups dedicated to denigrating the genre. Although this further complicates Hollywood's exploitation of it, the franchise filmmaker is inevitably caught up in the minefield with the MPAA caught in the middle.

Interpreted as proactive or reactive, depending upon your point of view, the Classifications and Ratings Administration (CARA) has been subjected to criticism from both sides. Craven for example, has described how "the trick with scary material is to break through the audience's complacency"¹⁹ by challenging their adjusted sensibilities and crossing a hypothetical line in terms of tone and intensity. That said, the director, like so many others working within the genre, has found that "the first line you cross is the ratings line."²⁰ In carrying out its self-regulatory role for the Hollywood film industry, the board has been demonised by directors. Moreover, accusations of favouritism and unfair play have further diminished the genre's relationship with the MPAA in favour of publicity and promotion.

The MPAA has been portrayed as biased, corrupt and vindictive with regard to specific franchises and directors. Their films have either courted controversy or previously

abstained from the ratings process in favour of the less profitable alternative and consequently paid the price of such rebellion or abstention. Both hypocritical and mysterious in its methods, advice and judgements, the board's inner workings are for most confusing if not thoroughly inconsistent.²¹ In response to such accusations, the board has repeatedly stressed its impartiality towards all films and filmmakers irrespective of their background, backing or budget.

Although the ratings board is not a legal requirement and the introduction of an NC-17 rating has, at least on the surface, provided filmmakers with an additional option with regard to releasing their films with an approved rating, Studios have continued to insist that directors contractually deliver an R rated film. Indeed, the alternative continues to be perceived as the equivalent of commercial suicide. By imposing the more profitable R rating, Studios and production companies have inadvertently prevented directors from either competing with their predecessors on a visceral level or simply maintaining the standard set down in previous films. In this respect, a sense of audience disappointment has characterised directors' and audiences' experiences of the Hollywood Horror franchise.

To fulfil their contractual obligations directors had to work within this system for the purposes of a theatrical release. In this respect, Studios and key members of the production team are an integral part of the self-regulatory process. As self-appointed supervisors, producers such as Paramount's Frank Mancuso Jnr on the *Friday the 13th* franchise have explicitly advised directors to shoot alternate takes of specific scenes, ranging from the bloodless to the bloody. Expected to push the boundaries and provide a visually satisfying follow up and provide distributors with an R rated feature, directors

have adapted and adopted a range of well-publicised techniques to ensure that certain shots remain in the film.

From Hitchcock's use of misdirection and deliberate inclusion of outrageous footage as a bargaining tool in *Psycho* through to Romero's most recent and judicious use of green screen zombies and CGI gore to dilute the impact of particular single-take scenes in *Land of the Dead*, directors have engaged in pre-emptive strikes. Moreover, their publicity and promotion for a franchise film has led to the exploitation of such experiences as a means of demonstrating their affection for the genre and affinity with the audience against the MPAA. As an external scapegoat for sequel directors, the board has given credibility back to the Hollywood Horror franchise and enhanced its marketable reputation as controversial and capable of returning to its independent roots.

Directors have similarly criticised the misleading marketing strategies adopted by distributors to either cover up or over-emphasise a sequel's numerical history and generic association. Furthermore, an over-reliance on and pandering to the profitable youth market has contributed to their concerns in this respect. Wallace and Blatty for example would have preferred their films to have been publicised without the use of *Halloween* or *The Exorcist* in the title.

The reality of the situation, from a Studio standpoint at least, is that such pictures would never have been commissioned at all without such marketable associations. Keen to distance themselves from the stigma of Horror sequels, directors have also had their generic denials plastered across the pages of industry magazines using alternative terms to either disguise or impose franchise history. Nevertheless, an accepted hierarchy, in which the slasher film, epitomised by the *Friday the 13th* franchise in the minds of

many, is regarded as a vastly inferior and unsavoury label in comparison to the psychological thriller, further complicates the current standing of the Hollywood Horror franchise.

With marketing campaigns subject to Studio endorsement and direction, filmmakers were often trapped between internal pressures and external expectations. A staple of the genre since its Universal and independent origins, Horror films have been marketed as cinematic endurance tests. With spectacular warnings and promises scrawled across posters and other such publicity they have been specifically designed to goad audiences into attending. Indeed, the genre has traditionally functioned as a parentally forbidden rite of passage and quintessential 'date movie.'

To intensify the experience and similar such associations, marketing departments behind *The Exorcist*, *The Omen* and *The Blair Witch Project* for example, have also exploited a story's origins, supernatural connotations and propagated fictional curses. Following the creation of a cult classic or cultural phenomenon, sequel directors have been trapped under the burden of media hype and experienced an audience backlash.²² In response to such circumstances, directors have incorporated William Castle-esque gimmicks and exploited new technologies to solicit critical and commercial success with the increasingly successful *Saw* franchise sponsoring an annual Blood Drive²³ as part of its pre-release publicity campaign.

This reliance on hoaxes, hyperbole and media hype has seen subsequent entries accused of being ineffective and lacking innovation by critics for whom the genre holds little fascination or merit. Although positive comments from critics played a pivotal role in raising the profile of a first film like *The Evil Dead*, virulent reviews have equally

enabled directors to reach their target audiences more efficiently than could ever have been hoped for. Whereas Hitchcock solicited critical support with *Psycho*, directors such as Romero with *Night of the Living Dead* duly exploited the controversy and supposedly negative comments and bore them as an unexpected seal of approval to fuel the marketing fire. Sequel directors however had to face critics, who sometimes adopted a nostalgic or revisionist stance to the first film in their condemnation, and comments from openly disappointed first film directors. Friedkin in particular has been a strong critic of *Exorcist* sequel directors. As cinematic underdogs derided and dismissed by the critics and their predecessors, directors of the Hollywood Horror franchise have nevertheless endured and enjoyed a sustained existence due to the devotion of fans and dogged determination of franchisors to exploit their interest.

Directing the Hollywood Horror Franchise

From conception to reception the Hollywood Horror Franchise could be characterised as a cinema of creative dissatisfaction for all concerned with its directors often displaced. Nevertheless, it is an invaluable point of entry for those seeking career progression and planning to infiltrate the industry through a widely recognised product. Relatively inexperienced directors, drafted into the sequel and promoted from outside a first film with only a few features or episodic TV experience, found it to be a challenging training ground. The experience has been complicated by franchise families; a situation successfully avoided by Demme on *The Silence of the Lambs*, the most successful sequel thus far. By importing their own production teams and trusted personnel, and sometimes even recasting certain characters, directors cut down on the potential for miscommunication. For those operating on a significantly lower budget, the freedom to

experiment within the framework of the franchise proved vital in securing directors' first assignments and, more often than not, their most financially successful film to date.

Hollywood's hypocrisy, hierarchies and greed are the three key barriers limiting the potential of the Horror franchise. Production companies and franchisors have begun to take advantage of new technologies but without sufficiently investing in research and development during pre-production. Unprecedented access to audience responses and tastes through online forums and fan-sites has the potential to be overwhelming and contradictory in so far as impacting on the direction taken. Franchisors have been unclear of established parameters and in their expectations of what could and should realistically be expected from filmmakers working within an allocated schedule and budget. Without minimising the potential for miscommunication, Studios and production companies have hampered directors' attempts to adapt and adopt these concepts.

With regard to the test-screening process, Studios have yet to adopt a realistic and genre-sensitive approach in keeping with the target audience. That said, feedback from National and International film festivals in addition to those comments made on fan sites and such forums are increasingly having an impact on production.²⁴ As with the marketing campaign, directors should neither mislead an audience nor set the finished film up to fail. Test audiences, however, have been stoic in their expectations and support and as such must take responsibility for a lack of product that dares to challenge the established codes and conventions.

Undeniably a creative and commercial asset for these directors to exploit, the Hollywood Horror franchise has the potential to be as empowering as it is castrating.

with the end result a trade off between autonomy and advancement. Based on their experiences, directors have shown a limited awareness of the benefits and pitfalls associated with it and the vast potential for conflict, confusion and compromise. Describable in retrospect as a Faustian pact in which ambitious directors are seduced by the Studios, directors have nevertheless adopted a number of roles with respect to their sequel involvement. Whether presented as victims, survivors or co-conspirators, it must be understood that each has been a willing participant and paid employee with creative objectives and an ambitious career-driven agenda.

In terms of career progression, directors such as Berlinger and Burr have made a less profitable yet personally more rewarding return to their roots. For example, *Some Kind of Monster* and *Straight into Darkness* have since showcased their skills and potential post-franchise. Similarly, both Gordon and Craven have made effective bids for the mainstream with *Edmond* and *Red Eye* which, although far more prestigious in terms of the recognisable talent in front of and behind the camera, continue to bare a close relation to the tone and content of their franchise films. Both filmmakers have also continued to highlight the links between the franchise, theatre and adaptation by participating in upcoming anthology series' and the development of similarly themed projects for the stage.

Further proof that the franchise is conducive, if not essential to a long career, can be found in Coscarelli's plans to adapt and direct a prequel to *Bubba Ho-Tep*, entitled *Bubba Nosferatu*, and plans to exploit his connection to the *Phantasm* franchise which is back in development at New Line. By addressing familiar themes and issues throughout their careers, irrespective of their franchise involvement, the core content of directors' films has supported Renoir's claim that "all directors make the same film over

and over again;”²⁵ one that challenges the status of ‘official’ follow ups. United by their established support networks and fruitful professional relationships, these filmmakers are all industry survivors for whom numerous sequels have elevated their status and potential for success.

On a par with the theatrical and literary adaptation, and with its origins firmly rooted in both realms, the Hollywood Horror franchise is a frustrating and fascinating form of cinema. From formulaic to innovative, the paradoxical nature of the franchise is further constrained by audiences’ clichéd expectations. Furthermore, Hollywood’s hierarchy infects its reputation and informs its frequent mishandling and misappropriation of it. With the agenda for change set down, directors can begin to challenge attitudes towards the genre and the franchise from the inside through their own production companies and ability to set up distribution deals.

In adopting the mentoring system on an industry-wide basis, directors such as Barker and Raimi with Midnight Pictures and Ghost House Pictures, have adopted Carpenter, Craven and Cunningham’s approaches. Similarly, Garris’ *Masters of Horror* anthology series for Showtime has been an overdue generic breakthrough in format, freedom and execution.²⁶ In light of this, directors may no longer have to use the franchise as a negotiable asset or be tempted to return purely for commercial reasons. Instead, they may willingly explore the concepts and themes of a first film on their own creative terms as just one of the options available rather than the only route remaining open to them.

However, much like the genre itself, the Hollywood Horror franchise is currently perceived by many filmmakers as a first step or foundation. Many would prefer to

embark upon an unrelated project or first film but the industry is geared towards the risk reduction strategy of franchise filmmaking. From Spielberg and Schumacher to Craven and Coscarelli, the franchise is a guaranteed form of career advancement and has been exploited by these and all subsequent directors through a judicious approach to their careers and the projects they support. Del Toro's *Blade II* success, for example, guaranteed the necessary support to direct *Hellboy* with his chosen cast and lessened the level of interference faced throughout production.

Indeed, directors of the Hollywood Horror franchise have always been indebted to receptive audiences, regardless of intent, content or fidelity, and subject to their discerning approval or rejection. Directors have therefore cannibalised their predecessors and contemporaries to create a medium that has become increasingly self-referential and intertextual. With Newman previously describing how "few arenas of cinema depend so on the loyalty and inside knowledge of their audiences,"²⁷ the Hollywood Horror franchise has expanded the genre's cinematic scope and cyclical nature.

In providing an examination of the Hollywood Horror franchise from their perspective, this thesis has demonstrated the diversity of directors' experiences. Moreover, it allows for an extensive investigation into these films, both as individual features and as distinct groups. Whether approached from an historical perspective or thematic analysis, a contextual foundation for the Hollywood Horror franchise has been established and these films are overdue reassessment. The implications for further research also allow for a non-genre specific comparative analysis from alternate perspectives, including the writer, producer and star. In focusing primarily on the production process, there still

remains the potential for an investigation into the franchise with regard to reception since several of the films addressed here have divided audiences and critics.

As for the future, the rise of the video game film has arguably displaced the Hollywood Horror franchise as the worst form of adaptation within the current climate. Director Uwe Boll, for example, has excelled in this arena to an even greater extent than the sequel maker with an output set to rival that of Corman and Ed Wood combined.²⁸ Moreover, such figures as King, Barker, Romero and Carpenter are further exploiting this form of adaptation in various forms. Elsewhere, the popular trend of softening mainstream Studio Horrors, as epitomised by their profitable and proud PG-13 ratings, in the form of domestic and international remakes, has intensified and been fuelled by the stars of the WB network. Cementing the genre's status as the ideal 'date movie' and specifically targeted at young women through their protagonists, Studios and production companies have adopted a Lewton-esque approach to their frequently supernatural tales and evoked the harmless feel of the traditional campfire ghost story.²⁹

Fortunately, a **radical** renaissance of the realistic Horrors first celebrated in the seventies. Testing the boundaries, breaking taboos and far more powerful in both their intentions and sheer intensity, several filmmakers have begun to redress the balance of genre-related product on the market following the impressive advancements made in international markets. From Roth's *Hostel* franchise through to the McLean's *Wolf Creek* and Marshal's *The Descent* from the U.K and Australia respectively, this revival has made a significant impact at the box office and such projects have been actively supported by Lions Gate³⁰ and other Studios keen to exploit this trend.

With the advent of the Laser Disc and DVD, directors have finally been given a forum to begin addressing, redressing and discussing the reception of a finished film in contrast to their original intentions. Increasingly exploited by Studios, franchisors and production companies through a seemingly endless process of re-releases and retrospectives, this revolutionary new format offers audiences and critics an additional insight into the production process from publicity materials to multiple commentaries. The inclusion of deleted scenes and alternative endings also allows audiences to make their own judgements following a more holistic, but by no means complete, account of film production. Taking full advantage of this newfound freedom to communicate both technically and thematically with their intended audiences on an unprecedented level, directors have justified their decisions and pinpointed those that were made for them.

Although a film's fidelity or illegitimacy has traditionally been exposed upon its release, and extensively commented upon by audiences and critics, directors' intentions and experiences have often been buried as a consequence. However, through a comparative understanding of their contributions and considered reflections and the mechanics of filmmaking, audiences are far better equipped to reconcile and reassess alternative interpretations as the Hollywood Horror franchise continues to develop in spite of its critical reputation.

End Notes

¹ Cronenberg is keen to point out that such an attitude and approach is far from negative but characteristic of the industry in that "you can make a good movie from anything." Indeed, *A History of Violence* was a critical success and was nominated for the Academy's Best Adapted Screenplay award. Michale Rowe. 'A History of Violence Lesson.' *Fangoria*. 247. October 2005. pp75-79 & 98.

² Simon Bacal. 'The House of Sean S. Cunningham.' *Starburst*. Vol 14. No 3. November 1991. pp 16-18 (p18).

³ McCabe, 1999:164

⁴ Marc Burman. 'A Real Horror Show.' *The Independent*. August 21st 1992. p14.

⁵ From *Jurassic Park*, *Indiana Jones*, *Star Wars* and *The Godfather* through to the *Back to the Future* and *Lethal Weapon* series, mainstream directors have equally exploited successful first films.

⁶ Cronenberg has however remade *The Fly* and in many ways provided subsequent directors with a superior example in his attitude, approach and final outcome.

⁷ Italian for yellow, these early works of detective fiction with Gothic overtones clearly evoked the work of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle and Edgar Allen Poe. First appearing in literary form in 1929, its cinematic counterpart arguably did not appear until 1963 with Mario Bava's *The Girl Who Knew Too Much*. For a brief introduction to the Giallo see Gary Needham. *Playing with Genre: An Introduction to the Italian Giallo*. <http://www.kinoeye.org/02/11/needham11.php> (Downloaded: 15/03/05).

⁸ Most recently, Universal saw fit to release Don Mancini's *Seed of Chucky* under their newly created Rogue Pictures banner rather than bring the Universal logo into disrepute or single-handedly face any negative critical backlash to the film.

⁹ Lussier then went on to direct a pair of back-to-back sequels for the Studio in 2003.

¹⁰ McDonagh, 1995: 89.

¹¹ Michael Beeler. 'Clive Barker's Hellraiser IV: Bloodline.' *Cinefantastique*. Vol 27. No. 2, November 1995. pp 14-15. (p15).

¹² For the opinion of such industry commentators on such a trend see Stuart Jeffries. 'Desperation Part 3.' *The Guardian: Section 2*. June 23rd 1994. p11.

¹³ However, those franchises with a significantly higher budget, profile and potential mainstream appeal were able to afford and attract more established filmmakers from inside and outside the genre with similar promises and incentives as those previously offered to first film directors.

¹⁴ In response to such budgetary decreases and differing methods of film distribution, Studios and production companies have often cited the unwritten, and recently unsubstantiated law of diminishing returns with regard to any sequel's economic success as the reasoning behind their reluctance to risk increased funds for what was expected to be a reduced return.

¹⁵ See Wood. 'The American Nightmare: Horror in the 70s.' in Jancovich, 2002: pp 25-32.

¹⁶ The most recent incarnation of such an approach is evident in Anderson's *Alien Vs Predator* which did not resurrect Schwarznegger's *Commando* or Weaver's *Ripley*.

¹⁷ According to Craven's publicity pitch, "it's more of a fantasy, an impressionistic thriller." Robb, 1998: 69.

¹⁸ Barker and Cunningham in particular envisioning an alternative narrative thread which did not feature the iconic rise of either Pinhead or Jason with respect to the *Hellraiser* and *Friday the 13th* series.

¹⁹ Steve Biodrowski. 'Wes Craven: Alive and Shocking.' *Cinefantastique*. Vol 22. No 2. October 1991. p11.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Kirby Dick's most recent documentary *This Film is Not Yet Rated* is a belated yet vital beginning of an investigation into the inner workings and alleged double-standards of the MPAA. Indeed, it is a worthy cinematic successor to Jonathan Rosenbaum's 2002 text *Movie Wars: How Hollywood and the Media Limit What Movies We Can See*.

²² Just as the *Jaws*, *Friday the 13th* and *Amityville* franchises resurrected the 3-D format and promised finality, others employed such fictional ratings as a V for violence.

²³ According to the franchise's website, last year's Blood Drive encouraging audiences to donate blood, and this year 'give 'till it hurts,' collected over 10,000 litres and potentially saved over 30,000 lives. www.saw2.com (Downloaded 12/04/06).

²⁴ Most recently, New Line actively responded to fan sites by increasing the sex, violence and bad language quotient of *Snakes on a Plane*; a B movie with an A list actor destined for a cult following.

²⁵ Tom Shone. 'Sharp Act to Follow.' *The Sunday Times*. June 28th 1992. p10.

²⁶ The format offers director's creative freedom on a relatively low budget/tight schedule and its success has spread into a second season as well as competition from the Stephen King-based *Nightmares and Dreamscapes* anthology series.

²⁷ Kim Newman. 'The Pleasures of Horror.' *Sight and Sound / The Guardian*. London Film Festival Supplement. pp 16-18 (p16).

²⁸ Boll's despair-inducing filmography includes such adaptations as *House of the Dead*, *Alone in the Dark*, *Bloodrayne* and *In the Name of the King: A Dungeon Siege Tale*.

²⁹ Recent examples of this approach include *The Skeleton Key* and *The Return* starring Kate Hudson and Sarah Michelle Gellar respectively.

³⁰ Lions Gate's role in this 70's revival, and the Hollywood Horror franchise, is epitomised by such sequels as *The Devil's Rejects* and *Saw II*.

Appendix I: Filmography

<u>TITLE</u>	<u>YEAR / DIRECTOR</u>
<i>Abyss, The.</i>	1989. James Cameron.
<i>Alice.</i>	2007. Marcus Nispel.
<i>Alien.</i>	1979. Ridley Scott.
<i>Aliens.</i>	1986. James Cameron.
<i>Alien 3.</i>	1993. David Fincher.
<i>Alien Resurrection.</i>	1998. Jean-Pierre Jeunet.
<i>Alien vs Predator.</i>	2004. Paul W S Anderson.
<i>Alone in the Dark.</i>	1984. Jack Sholder.
<i>Alone in the Dark.</i>	2005. Uwe Boll.
<i>Amelie.</i>	2001. Jean-Pierre Jeunet.
<i>American Werewolf in London, An.</i>	1981. John Landis.
<i>American Psycho.</i>	2000. Mary Harron.
<i>American Psycho 2: All American Girl.</i>	2002. Morgan J. Freeman.
<i>Amityville Horror, The.</i>	1979. Stuart Rosenberg.
<i>Amityville Horror, The.</i>	2005. Andrew Douglas.
<i>Amityville II: The Possession.</i>	1982. Damiano Damiani.
<i>Amityville 3-D.</i>	1983. Richard Fleischer.
<i>Amityville 4: The Evil Escapes.</i>	1988. Sandor Stern.
<i>April Fool's Day.</i>	1986. Fred Walton.
<i>Arachnophobia.</i>	1990. Frank Marshall.
<i>Army of Darkness (Evil Dead III).</i>	1993. Sam Raimi.

<i>Bad Dreams.</i>	1988. Andrew Fleming.
<i>Bad Taste.</i>	1987. Peter Jackson.
<i>Back to the Future Part II.</i>	1989. Robert Zemeckis.
<i>Back to the Future Part III.</i>	1989. Robert Zemeckis.
<i>Basic Instinct 2: Risk Addiction.</i>	2006. Michael Caton-Jones.
<i>Basket Case.</i>	1982. Frank Henenlotter.
<i>Basket Case 2.</i>	1990. Frank Henenlotter.
<i>Basket Case 3: The Progeny.</i>	1992. Frank Henenlotter.
<i>Batman.</i>	1988. Tim Burton.
<i>Batman Forever.</i>	1995. Joel Schumacher.
<i>Batman Returns.</i>	1992. Tim Burton.
<i>Battle Beyond the Stars.</i>	1980. Jimmy Murakami.
<i>Beast From 20,000 Fathoms, The.</i>	1953. Eugene Lourie.
<i>Beastmaster, The.</i>	1982. Don Coscarelli.
<i>Beast Within, The.</i>	1982. Phillippe Mora.
<i>Beetlejuice.</i>	1988. Tim Burton.
<i>Beyond Re-Animator.</i>	2003. Brian Yuzna.
<i>Birds, The.</i>	1963. Alfred Hitchcock.
<i>Birds II, The: Land's End.</i>	1994. Rick Rosenthal.*
<i>Black Christmas.</i>	1974. Bob Clark.
<i>Blacula.</i>	1972. William Crain.
<i>Blade.</i>	1998. Stephen Norrington.
<i>Blade II.</i>	2002. Guillermo Del Toro.
<i>Blade: Trinity.</i>	2004. David S. Goyer.
<i>Blade Runner.</i>	1982. Ridley Scott.
<i>Blair Bitch Project, The.</i>	1999. Scott LaRose.

<i>Blair Witch Project, The.</i>	1999. D. Myrick /E. Sanchez.
<i>Blair Witch 2: Book of Shadows.</i>	2000. Joe Berlinger.
<i>Blob, The.</i>	1958. Irwin S. Yeaworth Jr.
<i>Blood Feast.</i>	1963. H.G. Lewis.
<i>Blood Feast 2: All You Can Eat.</i>	2002. H.G. Lewis.
<i>BloodRayne.</i>	2005. Uwe Boll.
<i>Blue Iguana, The.</i>	1988 John Lafia.
<i>Body Bags.</i>	1993. John Carpenter.
<i>Boogeyman.</i>	2005. Stephen T. Kay.
<i>Boogeyman II, The.</i>	1983. Bruce Starr.
<i>Boy With the X-Ray Eyes, The.</i>	1999. Jeff Burr.
<i>Breed, The.</i>	2006. Nicholas Mastandr ea.
<i>Bride of Chucky.</i>	1998. Ronny Yu.
<i>Bride of Frankenstein.</i>	1935. James Whale.
<i>Bride of Re-Animator.</i>	1990. Brian Yuzna.
<i>Bride With White Hair, The.</i>	1993. Ronny Yu.
<i>Bride With White Hair II, The.</i>	1993. Ronny Yu.
<i>Brother's Keeper.</i>	1992. Jeff Burr.
<i>Bubba Ho-Tep.</i>	2003. Don Coscarelli.
<i>Bug.</i>	1975. Jeannot Szwarc
<i>Burning, The.</i>	1981. Tony Maylam.
<i>Candyman.</i>	1992. Bernard Rose.
<i>Candyman 2: Farewell to the Flesh.</i>	1995. Bill Condon.
<i>Cannibal Holocaust.</i>	1976. Ruggero Deodato.

<i>Cape Fear.</i>	1990. Martin Scorsese
<i>Carnival of Souls.</i>	1998. Adam Grossman
<i>Carnosaur.</i>	1993. Adam Simon.
<i>Carrie.</i>	1976. Brian De Palma.
<i>Casablanca.</i>	1942. Michael Curitz.
<i>Cat People.</i>	1982. Paul Schrader.
<i>Cellar Dweller.</i>	1988. John Carl Buechler.
<i>Changeling, The.</i>	1980. Peter Medak.
<i>Cherry Falls.</i>	2000. Geoffrey Wright.
<i>Chicago.</i>	2002. Rob Marshall.
<i>Children of the Corn.</i>	1984. Fritz Kiersch.
<i>Children of the Corn II: The Final Sacrifice.</i>	1993. David Price.
<i>Children of the Corn IV: The Gathering.</i>	1996. Greg Spence.
<i>Children of the Corn: Revelation.</i>	2001. Guy Magar.
<i>Children of the Living Dead.</i>	2001. Tor Ramsey.
<i>Children Shouldn't Play With Dead Things.</i>	1972. Alan Ormsby.
<i>Child's Play.</i>	1988. Tom Holland.
<i>Child's Play 2.</i>	1990. John Lafia.
<i>Child's Play 3.</i>	1991. Jack Bender.
<i>Christine.</i>	1983. John Carpenter.
<i>C.H.U.D. II: Bud the CHUD.</i>	1989. David Irving.
<i>Citizen Kane.</i>	1941. Orson Welles.
<i>City of Lost Children, The.</i>	1995. Jean-Pierre Jeunet.
<i>Clash of the Titans.</i>	1981. Desmond Davis.
<i>Close Encounters of the Third Kind.</i>	1977. Steven Spielberg.
<i>Conan the Barbarian.</i>	1981. John Milius.

<i>Conan the Destroyer.</i>	1984. Richard Fleischer.
<i>Convict 762.</i>	1997. Luca Bercovici.
<i>Crazies, The.</i>	1973. George A. Romero.
<i>Creature From the Black Lagoon.</i>	1954. Jack Arnold.
<i>Creature Walks Among Us, The.</i>	1956. John Sherwood.
<i>Creepshow.</i>	1982. George A. Romero.
<i>Creepshow 2.</i>	1987. Michael Gornick.
<i>Crimes of Passion.</i>	1984. Ken Russell.
<i>Crimewave.</i>	1985. Sam Raimi.
<i>Critters 2: The Main Course.</i>	1988. Mick Garris.
<i>Curse of Frankenstein, The.</i>	1957. Terence Fisher.
<i>Cursed.</i>	2004. Wes Craven.
<i>Dangerous Game, A.</i>	1987. Stephen Hopkins.
<i>Damien: Omen II.</i>	1978. Don Taylor.
<i>Dark Half, The.</i>	1993. George A. Romero
<i>Darkness.</i>	2002. Juamae Balaguro
<i>Dawn of the Dead.</i>	1978. George A. Romero.
<i>Dawn of the Dead.</i>	2004. Zack Snyder.
<i>Day of the Dead.</i>	1985. George A. Romero.
<i>Day of the Dead.</i>	2007. Steve Miner.
<i>Deadly Blessing, A.</i>	1981. Wes Craven.
<i>Deadly Friend.</i>	1986. Wes Craven.
<i>Dead of Night (aka Deathdream).</i>	1974. Bob Clark.
<i>Deep Blue Sea.</i>	1999. Renn y Harlin.

<i>Delicatessen.</i>	1991. Jean-Pierre Jeunet.
<i>Deliverance.</i>	1972. John Boorman.
<i>Dementia 13.</i>	1963. Francis Ford Coppola.
<i>Demolition Man.</i>	1993. Marco Brambilla.
<i>Dentist, The.</i>	1996. Brian Yuzna.
<i>Deranged.</i>	1974. Alan Ormsby.
<i>Descent, The.</i>	2006. Neil Marshall.
<i>Desperation.</i>	2006. Mick Garris.
<i>Devil's Rejects, The.</i>	2005. Rob Zombie.
<i>Diaboliques, Les.</i>	1955. Henri-Georges Clouzot.
<i>Die Hard 2.</i>	1990. Renny Harlin.
<i>Dirty Dozen, The.</i>	1967. Robert Aldrich.
<i>Divided We Fall.</i>	1982. Jeff Burr and Kevin Meyer.
<i>Dog Soldiers.</i>	2002. Neil Marshall.
<i>Dominion: Prequel to The Exorcist.</i>	2005. Paul Schrader.
<i>Don't Look Down.</i>	1998. Larry Shaw.
<i>Dorm that Dripped Blood, The.</i>	1982. J Obrow and S Carpenter
<i>Dr. Giggles.</i>	1992. Manny Coto.
<i>Dracula.</i>	1931. Tod Browning.
<i>Dracula Has Risen From the Grave.</i>	1968. Freddie Francis.
<i>Dracula: Prince of Darkness.</i>	1966. Terence Fisher.
<i>Dracula 2000.</i>	2000. Patrick Lussier.
<i>Dream Demon.</i>	1988. Harley Cokeliss.
<i>Dreamscape.</i>	1984. Joseph Ruben.

<i>Duel.</i>	1972. Steven Spielberg.
<i>Dungeonmaster.</i>	1985. John Buechler and Dave Allen.
<i>Eaten Alive.</i>	1977. Tobe Hooper.
<i>Eddie Presley.</i>	1992. Jeff Burr.
<i>Edmond.</i>	2005. Stuart Gordon.
<i>E.T.</i>	1982. Steven Spielberg.
<i>Erotic Witch Project, The.</i>	1999. John Bacchus.
<i>Escape from New York.</i>	1981. John Carpenter.
<i>Escape from the Planet of the Apes.</i>	1971. Don Taylor.
<i>Evil Dead, The.</i>	1983. Sam Raimi.
<i>Evil Dead II: Dead By Dawn.</i>	1987. Sam Raimi.
<i>Evil of Frankenstein, The.</i>	1964. Freddie Francis.
<i>Excalibur.</i>	1981. John Boorman.
<i>Exorcism of Emily Rose, The.</i>	2005. Scott Derrickson.
<i>Exorcist, The.</i>	1973. William Friedkin.
<i>Exorcist IV: The Beginning.</i>	2004. Paul Schrader.
<i>Exorcist II: The Heretic.</i>	1977. John Boorman.
<i>Exorcist, The III: Legion.</i>	1990. William Peter Blatty.
<i>Fatal Attraction.</i>	1987. Adrian Lyne.
<i>Feast.</i>	2005. John Gulager.
<i>Final Conflict, The: Omen III</i>	1981. Graham Baker.

<i>Flightplan.</i>	2005. Robert Schwentke
<i>Flintstones: Viva Rock Vegas, The.</i>	2000. Brian Levant.
<i>Flowers in the Attic.</i>	1987. Jeffrey Bloom.
<i>Fly, The.</i>	1958. Kurt Neumann.
<i>Fly, The.</i>	1986. David Cronenberg.
<i>Fly II, The.</i>	1988. Chris Walas.
<i>Fog, The.</i>	1980. John Carpenter.
<i>Fog, The.</i>	2005. Rupert Wainwright.
<i>Forever Young.</i>	1992. Steve Miner.
<i>Fortress.</i>	1993. Stuart Gordon.
<i>Frankenhooker.</i>	1990. Frank Henenlotter.
<i>Frankenstein.</i>	1910. Thomas Edison.
<i>Frankenstein.</i>	1931. James Whale.
<i>Frankenstein Meets the WolfMan.</i>	1943. Roy William Neill.
<i>Freaks.</i>	1932. Tod Browning.
<i>Freddy's Dead: The Final Nightmare.</i>	1990. Rachel Talalay.
<i>Freddy vs. Jason.</i>	2003. Ronny Yu.
<i>French Connection, The.</i>	1971. William Friedkin.
<i>French Connection Part II, The.</i>	1975. John Frankenheimer
<i>Friday the 13th.</i>	1980. Sean S. Cunningham.
<i>Friday the 13th.</i>	2007. Jonathan Liebesman.
<i>Friday the 13th Part II.</i>	1981. Steve Miner.
<i>Friday the 13th Part 3-D.</i>	1982. Steve Miner.
<i>Friday the 13th: The Final Chapter.</i>	1984. Joseph Zito.
<i>Friday the 13th Part V: A New Beginning.</i>	1985. Danny Steinmann.
<i>Friday the 13th Part VII: The New Blood.</i>	1987. John Buechler.

<i>Friday the 13th Part VIII.</i>	1988. Rob Hedden.
<i>Fright.</i>	1971. Peter Collinson.
<i>Fright Night Part II.</i>	1988. Tommy Lee Wallace.
<i>From Beyond.</i>	1986. Stuart Gordon.
<i>From Dusk Till Dawn.</i>	1996. Robert Rodriguez.
<i>From Dusk Till Dawn 2: Texas Blood Money.</i>	1999. Scott Spiegel.
<i>From Dusk Till Dawn 3: The Hangman's Daughter.</i>	2000. P.J. Pesce.
<i>Gate, The.</i>	1987. Tibor Takacs.
<i>Get Carter.</i>	2000. Stephen T. Kay.
<i>Ghost of Frankenstein.</i>	1942. Erle C. Kenton.
<i>Ghost Town.</i>	1988. Richard Governor.
<i>Ghoulies Go To College.</i>	1991. John Buechler.
<i>Ginger Snaps.</i>	2000. John Fawcett.
<i>Ginger Snaps: The Beginning.</i>	2004. Grant Harvey.
<i>Ginger Snaps Unleashed.</i>	2004. Brett Sullivan.
<i>Glory.</i>	1989. Edward Zwick.
<i>Godfather, The.</i>	1971. Francis Ford Coppola.
<i>Godfather Part II, The.</i>	1974. Francis Ford Coppola.
<i>Gods and Monsters.</i>	1998. Bill Condon.
<i>God Told Me To.</i>	1976. Larry Cohen.
<i>Good Will Hunting.</i>	1997. Gus Van Sant.
<i>Gorillas in the Mist.</i>	1988. Michael Apted.
<i>Gray Matter.</i>	2004. Joe Berlinger.
<i>Gremlins.</i>	1984. Joe Dante.

<i>Gremlins 2: The New Batch.</i>	1990. Joe Dante.
<i>Greystoke.</i>	1984. Hugh Hudson.
<i>Grinch, The.</i>	2000. Ron Howard.
<i>Grudge, The.</i>	2004. Takashi Shimzu.
<i>Guardian, The.</i>	1990. William Friedkin.
<i>Halloween.</i>	1978. John Carpenter.
<i>Halloween II.</i>	1981. Rick Rosenthal.
<i>Halloween III: Season of the Witch.</i>	1983. Tommy Lee Wallace.
<i>Halloween: The Curse of Michael Myers.</i>	1995. Joe Chappelle.
<i>Halloween H20.</i>	1998. Steve Miner.
<i>Halloween 4: The Return of Michael Myers.</i>	1988. Dwight H. Little.
<i>Halloween 5: The Revenge of Michael Myers.</i>	1989. Dominique Othenin-Girard.
<i>Halloween: Resurrection.</i>	2002. Rick Rosenthal.
<i>Hand that Rocks the Cradle, The.</i>	1992. Curtis Hanson.
<i>Hannibal.</i>	2000. Ridley Scott.
<i>Haunted Mansion, The.</i>	2003. Rob Minkoff.
<i>Haunting, The.</i>	1963. Robert Wise.
<i>Haunting, The.</i>	1999. Jan De Bont.
<i>Haute Tension.</i>	2003. Alexandre Aja.
<i>Haxan.</i>	1922. Benjamin Christensen.
<i>Hellbound: Hellraiser II.</i>	1988. Tony Randel.
<i>Hellboy.</i>	2004. Guillermo Del Toro.
<i>Hellraiser.</i>	1987. Clive Barker.
<i>Hellraiser: Bloodline.</i>	1996. Kevin Yagher.*

<i>Hellraiser III: Hell on Earth.</i>	1992. Anthony Hickox.
<i>Hellraiser: Inferno.</i>	2000. Scott Derrickson.
<i>Henry: Portrait of a Serial Killer.</i>	1986. John McNaughton.
<i>Hidden, The.</i>	1987. Jack Sholder.
<i>Hills Have Eyes, The.</i>	1977. Wes Craven.
<i>Hills Have Eyes, The.</i>	2006. Alexandre Aja.
<i>Hills Have Eyes Part II, The.</i>	1985. Wes Craven.
<i>Hitcher, The.</i>	2007. Dave Meyers.
<i>Hocus Pocus.</i>	1993. Kenny Ortega.
<i>Hostel.</i>	2005. Eli Roth.
<i>House.</i>	1986. Steve Miner.
<i>House II: The Second Story.</i>	1987. Ethan Wiley.
<i>House III: The Horror Show.</i>	1989. Jim Isaac.
<i>House IV: The Repossession.</i>	1992. Lewis Abernathy.
<i>House of Dracula.</i>	1945. Erle C. Kenton.
<i>House of Frankenstein.</i>	1944. Erle C. Kenton.
<i>House of the Dead.</i>	2003. Uwe Boll.
<i>House of Re-Animator.</i>	2008. Stuart Gordon.
<i>House of Wax.</i>	1953. Andre De Toth.
<i>House of Wax.</i>	2005. Jaume Collet-Serra
<i>House on Haunted Hill.</i>	1958. William Castle.
<i>House on Haunted Hill.</i>	1998. William Malone.
<i>House on Sorority Row, The.</i>	1983. Mark Rosman.
<i>Howling, The.</i>	1981. Joe Dante.
<i>Howling II, The: Stirba Werewolf Bitch.</i>	1984. Philippe Mora.
<i>Howling III: The Marsupials.</i>	1987. Philippe Mora.

<i>Howling IV: The Original Nightmare.</i>	1988. John Hough.
<i>Humanoids of the Deep.</i>	1983. Barbara Peters.
<i>Hunchback of Notre Dame, The.</i>	1923. Wallace Worsley.
<i>I Know What You Did Last Summer.</i>	1997. Jim Gillespie.
<i>I Saw What You Did.</i>	1965. William Castle.
<i>Indiana Jones and the Last Crusade.</i>	1989. Steven Spielberg.
<i>Indiana Jones and the Temple of Doom.</i>	1984. Steven Spielberg.
<i>Interview With the Vampire.</i>	1994. Neil Jordan.
<i>In the Name of the King: A Dungeon Siege Tale.</i>	2006. Uwe Boll.
<i>Invaders From Mars.</i>	1986. Tobe Hooper.
<i>Invasion of the Body Snatchers.</i>	1956. Don Siegel.
<i>Invitation to Hell, An.</i>	1984. Wes Craven.
<i>Island of Lost Souls, The.</i>	1933. Erle C. Kenton.
<i>Island of the Alive: It's Alive III.</i>	1986. Larry Cohen.
<i>It.</i>	1990. Tommy Lee Wallace.
<i>It Lives Again.</i>	1978. Larry Cohen.
<i>It's Alive.</i>	1974. Larry Cohen.
<i>Jason and the Argonauts.</i>	1963. Don Chaffey.
<i>Jason Goes to Hell: The Final Friday.</i>	1992. Adam Marcus.
<i>Jason X.</i>	2002. Jim Isaac.
<i>Jaws.</i>	1975. Steven Spielberg.
<i>Jaws 2.</i>	1978. Jeannot Szwarc.

<i>Jaws 3-D.</i>	1983. Joe Alves.
<i>Jaws: The Revenge.</i>	1987. Joseph Sargent.
<i>Jim: The World's Greatest.</i>	1976. Don Coscarelli.
<i>Johnny Mysto: Boy Wizard.</i>	1996. Jeff Burr.
<i>Jurassic Park.</i>	1993. Steven Spielberg.
<i>Jurassic Park III.</i>	2001. Joe Johnston.
<i>Kenny and Company.</i>	1976. Don Coscarelli.
<i>Kinsey.</i>	2004. Bill Condon.
<i>King Kong.</i>	1933. Merian C. Cooper.
<i>King Kong.</i>	1976. John Guillermin.
<i>King Kong.</i>	2005. Peter Jackson.
<i>Lake Placid.</i>	1999. Steve Miner.
<i>Land of the Dead.</i>	2005. George A. Romero
<i>Last House on the Left.</i>	1972. Wes Craven.
<i>Leatherface: The Texas Chainsaw Massacre III.</i>	1990. Jeff Burr.
<i>Lethal Weapon.</i>	1988. Richard Donner.
<i>Legend of Hell House, The.</i>	1973. John Hough.
<i>Leprechaun.</i>	1993. Mark Jones.
<i>Leprechaun 3.</i>	1995. Brian Trenchard Smith.
<i>Leprechaun in Space.</i>	1996. Brian Trenchard Smith.
<i>Les Diaboliques.</i>	1955. Henri-Georges Clouzot.
<i>Lifeforce.</i>	1985. Tobe Hooper.

<i>Look What's Happened to Rosemary's Baby.</i>	1976. Sam O'Steen.
<i>Macabre.</i>	1957. William Castle.
<i>Manhunter.</i>	1986. Michael Mann.
<i>Maniac Cop.</i>	1988. Bill Lustig.
<i>Maniac Cop 2.</i>	1990. Bill Lustig.
<i>Maniac Cop 3: Badge of Silence.</i>	1992. Bill Lustig.
<i>Martin.</i>	1976. George Romero.
<i>Maximum Overdrive.</i>	1986. Stephen King.
<i>Meet the Feebles.</i>	1989. Peter Jackson.
<i>Memoirs of an Invisible Man.</i>	1992. John Carpenter.
<i>Metallica: Some Kind of Monster.</i>	2004. Joe Berlinger.
<i>Mimic.</i>	1997. Guillermo Del Toro.
<i>Mimic: Sentinel.</i>	2003. J.T. Petty.
<i>Mindripper.</i>	1995. Joe Gayton.
<i>Mission Impossible 2.</i>	2000. John Woo.
<i>Monster From the Ocean Floor.</i>	1954. Wyott Ordung.
<i>Mr Sardonicus.</i>	1961. William Castle.
<i>Mummy, The.</i>	1999. Stephen Sommers.
<i>Music of the Heart.</i>	1999. Wes Craven.
<i>Never Say Never Again.</i>	1983. Irvin Kershner.
<i>Nightbreed.</i>	1990. Clive Barker.
<i>Nightmare on Elm Street, A.</i>	1984. Wes Craven.

<i>Nightmare on Elm Street 2: Freddy's Revenge, A.</i>	1985. Jack Sholder.
<i>Nightmare on Elm Street 3: Dream Warriors, A.</i>	1987. Chuck Russell.
<i>Nightmare on Elm Street 4: The Dream Master, A.</i>	1988. Renny Harlin.
<i>Nightmare on Elm Street: The Dream Child, A.</i>	1989. Stephen Hopkins.
<i>Night of the Demons 2.</i>	1994. Brian T renchard Smith
<i>Night of the Living Dead.</i>	1968. George A. Romero.
<i>Night of the Scarecrow.</i>	1995. Jeff Burr.
<i>Offspring, The.</i>	1987. Jeff Burr.
<i>Old Dark House, The.</i>	1932. James Whale.
<i>Omen, The.</i>	1976. Richard Donner.
<i>Omen IV: The Awakening.</i>	1991. Jorge Montesi.
<i>Orca.</i>	1977. Michael Anderson.
<i>Our Town.</i>	1940. Sam Wood.
<i>Paradise Lost.</i>	1996. Joe Berlinger.
<i>Paradise Lost 2: Revelations</i>	2000. Joe Berlinger.
<i>Pet Sematery.</i>	1989. Mary Lambert.
<i>Pet Sematery 2.</i>	1992. Mary Lambert.
<i>Phantasm.</i>	1978. Don Coscarelli.
<i>Phantasm II.</i>	1988. Don Coscarelli.
<i>Phantasm III: Lord of the Dead.</i>	1994. Don Coscarelli.
<i>Phantasm: OblIVion.</i>	1998. Don Coscarelli.
<i>Phantom of the Opera.</i>	1925. Rupert Julian.

<i>Phantom of the Opera.</i>	1989. Dwight H. Little.
<i>Pink Flamingos.</i>	1972. John Waters.
<i>Piranha.</i>	1978. Joe Dante.
<i>Piranha II: Flying Killers.</i>	1981. James Cameron.
<i>Planet of the Apes.</i>	1968. Frankin J. Schaffner.
<i>Planet of the Apes.</i>	2000. Tim Burton.
<i>Player, The.</i>	1992. Robert Altman.
<i>Phantom Town.</i>	1999. Jeff Burr.
<i>Poltergeist.</i>	1982. Tobe Hooper.
<i>Poltergeist II: The Other Side.</i>	1986. Brian Gibson.
<i>Poltergeist III.</i>	1988. Gary Sherman.
<i>Producers, The.</i>	1968. Mel Brooks.
<i>Prince of Darkness.</i>	1987. John Carpenter.
<i>Prison.</i>	1988. Renny Harlin.
<i>Private Files of J. Edgar Hoover, The.</i>	1977. Larry Cohen.
<i>Prom Night.</i>	1980. Paul Lynch.
<i>Prophecy.</i>	1995. Greg Widen.
<i>Prophecy 2.</i>	1998. Greg Spence.
<i>Prophecy 3.</i>	2000. Patrick Lussier.
<i>Sycho.</i>	1960. Alfred Hitchcock.
<i>Sycho.</i>	1998. Gus Van Sant.
<i>Sycho II.</i>	1983. Richard Franklin.
<i>Sycho III.</i>	1986. Anthony Perkins.
<i>Sycho IV: The Beginning.</i>	1990. Mic k Garris.
<i>ulp Fiction.</i>	1994. Quentin Tarantino.
<i>ulse.</i>	2006. Jim Sonzero.

<i>Pumpkinhead.</i>	1988. Stan Winston.
<i>Pumpkinhead II: Blood Wings.</i>	1994. Jeff Burr.
<i>Puppetmaster.</i>	1989. David Schoemoller.
<i>Puppetmaster II.</i>	1990. Dave Allen.
<i>Puppetmaster 4.</i>	1993. Jeff Burr.
<i>Puppetmaster 5: The Final Chapter.</i>	1994. Jeff Burr.
<i>Quatermass and the Pit.</i>	1967. Roy Ward Baker.
<i>Quatermass II.</i>	1957. Val Guest.
<i>Rabid.</i>	1977. David Cronenberg.
<i>Rambo III.</i>	1988. Peter MacDonald.
<i>Rambo: First Blood Part II</i>	1985. George P. Cosmatos.
<i>Rage: Carrie II, The.</i>	1999. Katt Shea Ruben.
<i>Re-Animator.</i>	1985. Stuart Gordon.
<i>Red Dragon.</i>	2002. Brett Ratner.
<i>Red Eye.</i>	2005. Wes Craven.
<i>Repossessed.</i>	1990. Bob Logan.
<i>Resident Evil.</i>	2002. Paul W.S. Anderson.
<i>Return, The.</i>	2006. Asif Kapadia.
<i>Return of A Man Called Horse, The.</i>	1976. Irvin Kershner.
<i>Return of the Living Dead.</i>	1985. Dan O'Bannon.
<i>Return of the Living Dead Part II.</i>	1988. Ken Wiederhorn.
<i>Return of the Living Dead 3.</i>	1993. Brian Yuzna.

<i>Return to Salem's Lot, A.</i>	1987. Larry Cohen.
<i>Revenge of the Creature.</i>	1955. Jack Arnold.
<i>Ring, The.</i>	2002. Gore Verbrinski.
<i>Ring 2, The.</i>	2005. Hideo Nakata.
<i>Ringu.</i>	1998. Hideo Nakata.
<i>Road Games.</i>	1981. Richard F ranklin.
<i>Robocop.</i>	1987. Paul Verhoeven.
<i>Robocop 2.</i>	1990. Irvin Kershner.
<i>Rocky II.</i>	1979. Sylvester Stallone.
<i>Romeo and Juliet.</i>	1996. Baz Luhrmann.
<i>Rosemary's Baby.</i>	1968. Roman Polanski.
<i>Savage Bees, The.</i>	1976. Bruce Geller.
<i>Saw.</i>	2004. James Wan.
<i>Saw II.</i>	2005. Darren Lynn Bousman
<i>Saw III.</i>	2006. Darr en Lynn Bousman
<i>Scanners II: The New Order.</i>	1992. Christian Douguay.
<i>Scanners III: The Takeover.</i>	1992. Christian Douguay.
<i>Scars of Dracula.</i>	1970. Roy Ward Baker.
<i>Scary Movie.</i>	2000. Keenen Ivory Wayans.
<i>Scream.</i>	1996. Wes Craven.
<i>Scream 2.</i>	1997. Wes Craven.
<i>Scream 3.</i>	2000. Wes Craven.
<i>Scream, Blacula, Scream.</i>	1973. Bob Kelljan.
<i>Season of the Witch.</i>	1972. George A. Romero.

<i>Seed of Chucky.</i>	2004. Don Mancini.
<i>Se7en.</i>	1995. David Fincher.
<i>Seven Faces of Dr Lao, The.</i>	1964. George Pal.
<i>Serpent and the Rainbow, The.</i>	1987. Wes Craven.
<i>Seventh Voyage of Sinbad, The.</i>	1958. Nathan Juran.
<i>Shaun of the Dead.</i>	2004. Edgar Wright.
<i>Shining, The.</i>	1980. Stanley Kubrick.
<i>Shining, The.</i>	1997. Mick Garis.
<i>Shivers.</i>	1975. David Cronenberg.
<i>Shocker.</i>	1989. Wes Craven.
<i>Silence of the Lambs, The.</i>	1991. Jonathan Demme.
<i>Silent Night, Deadly Night.</i>	1984. Charles E. Sellier Jr.
<i>Silent Night, Deadly Night II.</i>	1987. Lee Harry.
<i>Silver Bullet.</i>	1985. Daniel Attias.
<i>Skeleton Key, The.</i>	2005. Iain Softley.
<i>Skinwalkers.</i>	2006. Jim Isaac.
<i>Sleepwalkers.</i>	1992. Mick Garris.
<i>Sleepaway Camp.</i>	1983. Robert Hiltzig.
<i>Sleepaway Camp 2: Unhappy Campers.</i>	1988. Michael A. Simpson.
<i>Sleepaway Camp 3: Teenage Wasteland.</i>	1988. Michael A. Simpson.
<i>Sleepy Hollow.</i>	1999. Tim Burton.
<i>Snakes on a Plane.</i>	2006. David R. Ellis.
<i>Society.</i>	1989. Brian Yuzna.
<i>Soft For Digging.</i>	2001. J.T. Petty.
<i>Sometimes They Come Back Again.</i>	1996. Adam Grossman.
<i>Sometimes They Come Back For More.</i>	1999. Daniel Zelik Berk.

<i>Son of Frankenstein.</i>	1939. Rowland v. Lee.
<i>Son of Kong.</i>	1933. Ernest B. Schoedsack.
<i>Sorority House Massacre.</i>	1987. Carol Frank.
<i>Space Camp.</i>	1986. Harry Winer.
<i>Species 2.</i>	1998. Peter Medak.
<i>Spellbound.</i>	1945. Alfred Hitchcock.
<i>Spider-Man.</i>	2002. Sam Raimi.
<i>Spider-Man 2.</i>	2004. Sam Raimi.
<i>Splatter University.</i>	1984. Richard W. Haines.
<i>Spoiler.</i>	1998. Jeff Burr.
<i>Stakeout on Dope Street.</i>	1958. Irvin Kershner.
<i>Stand, The.</i>	1994. Mick Garris.
<i>Starship Troopers 2: Heroes of the Federation.</i>	2004. Phil Tippett.
<i>Star Wars: Episode IV: A New Hope.</i>	1977. George Lucas.
<i>Star Wars Episode V: The Empire Strikes Back.</i>	1980. Irvin Kershner.
<i>Star Wars Episode VI: Return of the Jedi</i>	1983. Richard Marquand.
<i>Stepfather, The.</i>	1987. Joseph Ruben.
<i>Stepfather II.</i>	1989. Jeff Burr.
<i>Stepfather III.</i>	1992. Guy Magar.
<i>Straight-Jacket.</i>	1964. William Castle.
<i>Straight into Darkness.</i>	2005. Jeff Burr.
<i>Straight Story, The.</i>	1999. David Lynch.
<i>Subspecies.</i>	1991. Ted Nicolaou.
<i>Summer of Fear.</i>	1978. Wes Craven.
<i>Sundown: The Vampire in Retreat.</i>	1989. Anthony Hickox.
<i>Superman.</i>	1978. Richard Donner.

<i>Superman II.</i>	1982. Richard Lester.
<i>Superman III.</i>	1983. Richard Lester.
<i>Superman IV: The Quest For Peace.</i>	1987. Sidney J. Furie.
<i>Survival Quest.</i>	1989. Don Coscarelli.
<i>Swamp Thing.</i>	1982. Wes Craven.
<i>Teaching Mrs Tingle.</i>	1999. Kevin Williamson.
<i>Ted Bundy.</i>	2002. Matthew Bright.
<i>Tentacles.</i>	1977. Ovidio G. Assonitis.
<i>Terminator, The.</i>	1984. James Cameron.
<i>Terminator 2: Judgement Day.</i>	1991. James Cameron.
<i>Terminator 3: Rise of the Machines.</i>	2003. Jonathan Mostow.
<i>Terror Train.</i>	1979. Roger Spottiswoode.
<i>Texas Chainsaw Massacre The.</i>	1974. Tobe Hooper.
<i>Texas Chainsaw Massacre, The.</i>	2003. Marcus Nispel.
<i>Texas Chainsaw Massacre: The Beginning.</i>	2006. Jonathan Liebesman.
<i>Texas Chainsaw Massacre 2, The.</i>	1986. Tobe Hooper.
<i>Texas Chainsaw Massacre: The Next Generation.</i>	1994. Kim Henkel.
<i>They.</i>	2002. Robert Harmon.
<i>They Live.</i>	1988. John Carpenter.
<i>They Shoot Divas Don't They?</i>	2002. Jonathan Craven.
<i>Thing, The.</i>	1982. John Carpenter.
<i>Thing From Another World, The.</i>	1951. Christian Nyby.
<i>This Film is Not Yet Rated.</i>	2006. Kirby Dick
<i>Tingler, The.</i>	1959. William Castle.

<i>Total Recall.</i>	1990. Paul Verhoeven.
<i>Toy Story.</i>	1995. John Lasseter.
<i>Titticut Follies.</i>	1967. Frederick Wiseman.
<i>Trancers.</i>	1985. Charles Band.
<i>Transformers.</i>	2007. Michael Bay.
<i>Tremors.</i>	1990. Ron Underwood.
<i>Tremors 3: Back to Perfection.</i>	2002. Brent Maddock.
<i>Trick or Treat.</i>	1986. Charles Martin Smith.
<i>Troll.</i>	1986. John Carl Buechler.
<i>28 Days Later.</i>	2002. Danny Boyle.
<i>2000 Maniacs.</i>	1964. H.G. Lewis.
<i>Underworld.</i>	2003. Len Wiseman.
<i>Unnameable, The.</i>	1988. Jean-Paul Oullette.
<i>Unnameable Returns, The.</i>	1993. Jean-Paul Oullette.
<i>Urban Legend.</i>	1998. Jamie Blanks.
<i>Valentine.</i>	2001. Jamie Blanks.
<i>Vampire in Brooklyn.</i>	1995. Wes Craven.
<i>Vampires: Los Muertos.</i>	2002. Tommy Lee Wallace.
<i>Vanishing, The.</i>	1988. Georges Sluzier.
<i>Van Helsing.</i>	2004. Stephen Sommers.
<i>Vault of Horror.</i>	1973. Roy Ward Baker.
<i>Virgin Spring, The.</i>	1960. Ingmar Bergman.

<i>Waiting, The.</i>	2007. Alexandre Aja.
<i>Warlock: The Armageddon.</i>	1993. Anthony Hickox.
<i>Warlock III: The End of Innocence.</i>	1999. Eric Freiser.
<i>Waxwork.</i>	1988. Anthony Hickox.
<i>Werewolf Reborn, The.</i>	1998. Jeff Burr.
<i>Waxwork II: Lost in Time.</i>	1992. Anthony Hickox.
<i>Wes Craven's New Nightmare.</i>	1994. Wes Craven.
<i>When a Stranger Calls.</i>	1979. Fred Walton.
<i>When A Stranger Calls.</i>	2006. Simon West.
<i>Wishmaster.</i>	1997. Robert Kurtzman.
<i>Wishmaster 2: Evil Never Dies.</i>	1999. Jack Sholder.
<i>Witchboard.</i>	1986. Kevin Tenney.
<i>Witchboard 2.</i>	1993. Kevin Tenney.
<i>Wolf.</i>	1994. Mike Nichols.
<i>Wolf Creek.</i>	2006. Greg McLean.
<i>X-Men.</i>	2000. Bryan Singer.
<i>X-Men: The Last Stand.</i>	2006. Brett Ratner.
<i>Xtro.</i>	1982. Harry B. Davenport.
<i>Zombie Flesh Eaters.</i>	1979. Lucio Fulci.
<i>Zardoz.</i>	1974. John Boorman.
<i>ZigZag.</i>	2002. David S. Goyer.

Appendix II: Bibliography

Andrews, Nigel. *Horror Films*. London: Admiral, 1985.

Andrews, Nigel. *Jaws*. London: Bloomsbury, 1999.

Anson, Jay. *The Amityville Horror*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1977.

Arroyo, Jose (Ed). *Action / Spectacle Cinema: A Sight and Sound Reader*.
London: BFI Publishing, 2000.

Barker, Clive. *The Hellbound Heart*. New York: Harper, 1986 and 1991.

Baxter, John. *Steven Spielberg: the unauthorised biography*. London: Harper
Collins, 1996.

Beard, William. *The Artist As Monster: The Cinema of David Cronenberg*.
London: University of Toronto Press, 2001.

Benchley, Peter. *Jaws*. London: Pan Books, 1975.

Benshoff, Harry M. *Monsters in the Closet: Homosexuality and the Horror Film*.
Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997.

Berenstein, R J. *Attack of the Leading Ladies: Gender and Spectatorship in
Classic Horror Cinema*. Columbia: Columbia University Press, 1996.

Bergan, Ronald. *Anthony Perkins: A Haunted Life*. London: Little, Brown & Co., 1995.

Biskind, Peter. *Easy Riders, Raging Bulls*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1998.

Biskind, Peter. *Down and Dirty Pictures: Miramax, Sundance and the Rise of the Independent Film*. London: Bloomsbury, 2004.

Black, Andy. *Necronomicon 5*. Hereford: Noir Publishing, 2001.

Blandford, Steve; Grant, Barry Keith and Hillier, Jim. *The Film Studies Dictionary*. London: Arnold, 2001.

Blatty, William Peter. *The Exorcist*. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

Blatty, William Peter. *Legion*. Glasgow: Fontana Collins, 1984.

Blatty, William Peter. *Before the Exorcist; William Peter Blatty's own story of taking his novel to film*. Eye, Suffolk: Screen Press, 1998.

Bliss, Michael. *Brian De Palma*. London: Scarecrow Press, Inc, 1983.

Bliss, Michael. *What Goes Around Comes Around: The Films of Jonathan Demme*. 1996.

Bloch, Robert. *Psycho*. London: Corgi, 1985.

Bloch, Robert. *Psycho 2*. London: Corgi, 1982.

Bloch, Robert. *Psycho House*. New York: T. Dougherty Associates, 1990.

Bradley, Doug. *Sacred Monsters: Behind the Mask of the Horror Actor*. London: Titan, 1996.

Brandner, Gary. *The Howling*. Middlesex, England: Hamlyn, 1982.

Brandner, Gary. *The Howling III: Echoes*. London: Hamlyn, 1985.

Brandner, Gary. *The Return of the Howling*. Middlesex, England: Hamlyn, 1982.

Branston, Gill. *Cinema and Cultural Modernity*. Buckingham and Philadelphia: Open University Press, 2000.

Britton, A (Ed). *American Nightmares: Essays on the Horror Film*. Toronto: Festival of Festivals, 1979.

Brode, Douglas. *The films of Steven Spielberg*. New York: Carol, 1995.

Brosnan, John. *Scream*. London: Bantam, 2000.

- Budra, Paul. Schallenberg, Betty R. *Part Two: Reflections on the Sequel*. Toronto, London: Toronto University Press, 1998.
- Bussing, Sabine. *Aliens in the Home: The Child in Horror Fiction*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1987.
- Butler, Ivan. *The Cinema of Roman Polanski*. London: A Zwemmer Ltd, 1970.
- Butler, Ivan. *Horror in the Cinema*. London: Barnes, 1979.
- Carroll, Noel. *The Philosophy of Horror*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Caruso, Giacomo. *George A. Romero*. Venezia : Comune di Venezia, 1992.
- Clarens, Carlos. *Horror Movies: An Illustrated Survey*. London: Secker & Walburg, 1968.
- Clark, Randall. *At A Cinema or Drive-in near you: The History, Culture and Politics of the American Exploitation Film*. London and New York; Garland, 1995.
- Clover, Carol, J. *Men, Women and Chainsaws: Gender in the Modern Horror Film*. London: British Film Institute, 1992.
- Cochrane, Emma (Ed). *Empire: The Greatest Horror Movies Ever*. Emap élan Network Ltd, 1998.

Collins, Michael R. *The Films of Stephen King*. Mercer Island, Washington: Starport Press, 1986.

Cook, Pam. Bernink, Mieke (Eds). *The Cinema Book (Second Edition)*. London: British Film Institute, 1999.

Cooper, Jeffrey. *The Nightmare on Elm Street Companion*. New York: St Martin's Press, 1987.?

Cooper, Jeffrey. *The Nightmare on Elm Street: Parts I, 2, 3: The Continuing Story*. London: Futura, 1987.

Coubro, Gerry. *Hammer and Horror: Bad Taste and popular British Cinema*. Sheffield: Pavic, 1991.

Crane, Jonathan Lake. *Terror and Everyday Life: Singular Moments in the History of the Horror Film*. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 1994.

Creed, Barbara. *The Monstrous-Feminine: Film, Feminism and Psychoanalysis*. London: Routledge, 1993.

Cumbow, Robert C. *Order in the universe: the films of John Carpenter, second edition*. Lanham, MD; London: Scarecrow Press, 2000.

Curtis, James. *James Whale: A New World of Gods and Monsters*. Boston and London: Faber & Faber, 1998.

Davis, Wade. *The Serpent and the Rainbow*. Glasgow: Fontana/Collins, 1988.

Derry, Charles. *Dark Dreams: A Psychological History of the Horror Film*. New York and London: Barnes and Yoseloff, 1977.

Derry, Charles. *The Suspense Thriller*. Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Co, 1988.

Dettmann, B. Bedford, M. *The Horror Factory: The Horror Films of Universal 1931-1955*. New York: Gordon Press, 1976.

Dick, Bernard F. *Anatomy of Film*. New York: St Martin's Press, 1990.

Dika, Vera. *Games of Terror: Halloween, Friday the 13th and films of the Stalker Cycle*. New Jersey and London: Associated University Press, 1990.

Druxman, Michael B. *One Good Film Deserves Another*. London and New York; Barnes, Yoseloff, 1977.

Dyson, Jeremy. *Bright Darkness: The Lost Art of the Supernatural Horror Film*. London and Washington: Cassell, 1997.

EVERSON, WILLIAM K. *More Classics of the Horror Film*. Secaucus, NJ: Citadel Press, 1986.

FISCHER, DENNIS. *Horror Film Directors 1931-1990*. Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Co, 1991.

FLEISCHER, RICHARD. *Just Tell Me When To Cry*. New York: Carroll and Graf, 1993.

FORREST, JENNIFER. KOOS, LEONARD R (Eds). *Dead ringers: the remake in theory and practice*. Albany, NY : State University of New York Press, 2002.

FOSTER, ALAN DEAN. *Alien 3*. London: Warner, 1992.

FRANK, ALAN. *Horror Films*. London: Hamlyn, 1977.

FRANK, ALAN. *The Films of Roger Corman: Shooting My Way Out of Trouble*. London: Batsford, 1998.

FREELAND, CYNTHIA A. *The Naked and the Undead: Evil and the Appeal of Horror*. Boulder, Colorado and Oxford: Westview Press, 2000.

FREER, IAN. *The Complete Spielberg*. London: Virgin, 2001.

FRENCH, CARL. *Screen Violence*. London: Bloomsbury, 1996.

- Friedman, Lester D (Ed). *Steven Spielberg: Interviews*. Jackson, MS : University of Mississippi, 2000.
- Gagne, Paul. *The Zombies That Ate Pittsburgh: The Films of George Romero*. New York: Dodd / Mead, 1987.
- Geduld, Harry M (Ed). *Film Makers on Film Making*. London: Indiana University Press, 1967.
- Gelder, Ken (Ed). *The Horror Reader*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Goldberg, Lee. L'Officier, Randy. L'Officier, Jean-Marc. *The Dreamweavers: Interviews with the Fantasy Filmmakers of the 1980s*. Jefferson , North Carolina: McFarland & Co, 1995.
- Golden, Christopher (Ed). *Horror Writers on Horror Film*. New York: Berkeley Books, 1992.
- Goldman, William. *Which Lie Did I tell? Or More Adventures in the Screen Trade*. New York: Pantheon, 2000.
- Gottlieb, Carl. *The Jaws Log*. New York: Dell, 1975.
- Grant, Barry Keith (Ed). *The Dread of Difference: Gender and Horror*. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1996.

Grant, Barry K (Ed). *Planks of Reason: Essays on the Horror Film*. Metuchen, New Jersey: Scarecrow Press, 1984.

Grant, Michael (Ed). *The modern fantastic: the films of David Cronenberg*. Trowbridge, Wilts : Flicks Books, 2000.

Gray, Beverley. *Roger Corman: An Unauthorized Biography of the Godfather of Indie Filmmaking*. Los Angeles: Renaissance Books, 2000.

Halbertsam, Judith. *Skin Shows: Gothic Horror and the Technology of Monsters*. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press, 1996.

Hanke, Ken. *A Critical Guide to Horror Film Series*. New York and London: Garland, 1991.

Hanke, Ken. *Tim Burton: An Unauthorised Biography of the Filmmaker*. Los Angeles: Renaissance, 1999.

Hardy, Phil. *Horror Films*. London: Aurum Press, 1986.

Hardy, Phil. Milne, Tom. Willeman, P (Eds). *The Aurum Film Encyclopaedia*. London: Aurum Press, 1985.

Harris, Thomas. *Hannibal*. London. Heinemann, 1999.

Harris, Thomas. *Red Dragon*. London: Corgi, 1991.

- Harris, Thomas. *The Silence of the Lambs*. London: Mandarin, 1991.
- Hayes, R.M. *3-D Movies: A History and Filmography of Stereoscopic Cinema*. London: St James Press, 1989.
- Hayward, Susan. *Cinema Studies: The Key Concepts (Second Edition)*. London; Routledge, 2000.
- Heard, Christopher. *Dreaming aloud: the life and films of James Cameron*. Toronto: Doubleday Canada, 1997.
- Horsely, Jake (Ed). *The Blood Poets: A Cinema of Savagery 1958-1999. Vol 2: Millenial Blues*. London: Scarecrow, 1999.
- Hicken, Mandy E. *Sequels*. London: Association of Assistant Librarians, 1982.
- Holsten, Kim R. Winchester, Tom. *Science-Fiction, Fantasy and Horror Film Sequels, Series and Remakes*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland &Co, 1997.
- Horton, Andrew, McDougal, Stuart Y. (Eds). *Play It Again, Sam: Retakes on Remakes*. London: University of California Press, 1998.
- Howard, Joseph. *Damien: Omen II*. London: Futura, 1990.

Humphries, Reynold. *The American Horror Film: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2002.

Hutchings, Peter. *Hammer and Beyond: The British Horror Film*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993.

Iaccino, James F. *Psychological Interpretations on Cinematic Terror*. Westport, CT. and London: Praeger, 1994.

Jancovich, Mark. *Horror*. London: Batsford, 1992.

Jancovich, Mark (Ed). *Horror: The Film Reader*. London: Routledge, 2001.

Jaworzyn, Stefan. *The Texas Chainsaw Massacre Companion*. London: Titan, 2003.

Jaworzyn, Stefan (Ed). *Shock Express 2*. London: Titan, 1994.

Jones, Stephen. *Clive Barker's A-Z of Horror*. London: BBC Books, 1997.

Jones, Stephen. *Creepshows: The Illustrated Stephen King Movie Guide*. London: Titan, 2001.

Kagan, Jeremy (Ed). *Directors close-up: interviews with directors nominated for outstanding directorial achievement in a feature film by the Directors Guild of America*. Boston; Oxford: Focal Press, 2000.

Kahn, James. *Poltergeist*. London and New York: Granada, 1982.

Katz, Ephraim. *The Macmillan International Film Encyclopedia / Revised by Fred Klein and Ronald Dean Nolan. - 3rd Edition.* London; Basingstoke: Macmillan: 1998.

Kaufman, Lloyd. Gunn, James. *All I need to know about filmmaking I learned from the Toxic Avenger*. New York : Berkley Boulevard Books, 1998.

Kermode, Mark. *The Exorcist*. London: British Film Institute, 1998.

King, Geoff. *New Hollywood Cinema: An Introduction*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2002.

King, Stephen. *Carrie*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1990.

King, Stephen. *Pet Sematery*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1989.

King, Stephen. *Salem's Lot*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1987.

King, Stephen. *Danse Macabre*. London: Warner Books, 2000.

King, Stephen. *On Writing*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 2000.

Leigh, Janet. Nickens, Chris. *Psycho: Behind the Scenes of the Classic Chiller*.

New York: Harmony Books, 1995.

Levin, Ira. *Rosemary's Baby*. London: Pan Books, 1968.

Levin, Ira. *Son of Rosemary*. London and New York: Dutton, 1997.

Limbacher, James L. *Haven't I Seen You Somewhere Before: Remakes, Sequels and Series in Motion Pictures Videos and Television 1896-1990*.

Lloyd, Ann. *The Films of Stephen King*. London: Brown Books, 1993.

Loynd, Ray. *The Jaws 2 Log*. New York: Dell, 1978.

McBride, Joseph. *Steven Spielberg*. London: Faber and Faber, 1997.

McCabe, Bob. *The Exorcist: Out of the Shadows*. London: Omnibus, 1999.

McCarty, John. *The Fearmakers: The Screens' Directorial Masters of Suspense and Terror*. London: Virgin, 1995.

McCarty, John. *The Official Splatter Movie Guide*. New York: St Martin's Press, 1989.

McCarty, John. *The Modern Horror Film: 50 Contemporary Classics*. London: Carol, 1990.

McCarty, John. *Movie Psychos and Madmen; Film Psychopaths from Jekyll and Hyde to Hannibal Lecter*. New York: Carol, 1992.

McCarty, John. *Psychos: Eighty Years of Movies, Maniacs and Monstrous Deeds*. New York: St Martin's Press, 1996.

McCarty, John. *The Sleaze Merchants*. New York: St Martin's Press, 1995.

McCarty, John. *Splatter Movies: Breaking the Last Taboo off the Screen*. Bromley, Kent: Columbus Books, 1984.

McDonagh, Maitland. *Filmmaking on the Fringe: The Good, the Bad, and the Deviant Directors*. New York: Carol, 1995.

McDonald, Paul. *The Star System: Hollywood and the Production of Popular Identities*. London: Wallflower, 2000.

McGill, Gordon. *The Abomination: Omen V*. London: Futura, 1985.

McGill, Gordon. Birkin, Andrew. *The Final Conflict*. London: Futura, 1980.

McGill Gordon. *Omen IV: Armageddon 2000*. London: Futura, 1983.

Mendix, Xavier (Ed). *Shocking Cinema of the Seventies*. Hereford: Noir, 2002.

- Mettler, E., Forbes, T., Ormsby, A. *Horror*. London: British Film Institute, 1998
- Milberg, Doris. *Repeat Performances: A Guide to Hollywood Movie Remakes*. New York: Broadway Press, 1990.
- Miller, Frank. *Censored Hollywood: Sex Sin and Violence on the Screen*. Atlanta, GA: Turner Publishing, 1994.
- Morrison, James. *Passport to Hollywood: Hollywood Films, European Directors*. 1998.
- Muir, John. *The Films of John Carpenter*. Jefferson, NC; London: McFarland, 2000.
- Muir, John. *Wes Craven: The Art of Horror*. Jefferson, NC and London: McFarland, 1998.
- Murdock, Andrew. Aberley, Rachel. *The Making of Alien Resurrection*. London: Titan, 1997.
- Naremore, James (Ed). *Film Adaptation*. London: The Athlone Press, 2000.
- Nelmes, Jill (Ed). *An Introduction to Film Studies*. London; Routledge, 1996.
- Newman, Howard. *The Exorcist: The Strange Story Behind the Film*. New York: Pinnacle Books, 1974.

Newman, Kim. *The BFI Companion to Horror*. London: Cassell and BFI, 1996.

Newman, Kim. *Nightmare Movies: A Cultural History of the Horror Film 1968-88*. London: Bloomsbury, 1988.

Nowlan, Robert A., Nowlan, Gwendolyn, W. *Cinema Sequels and Remakes, 1903-1987*. London; McFarland, 1989.

O'Brien, Daniel. *The Hannibal Files*. London: Reynolds & Hearn, 2001.

Pallenberg, Barbara. *The Making of Exorcist II: The Heretic*. New York: Warner, 1977.

Paul, W. *Laughing Screaming: Modern Hollywood Horror and Comedy*.

Columbia: Columbia University Press, 1994.

Perozich, Faye. *Anne Rice's The Vampire Lestat: A Graphic Novel*. New York: Innovation, 1991.

Pinedo, I C. *Recreational Terror: Women and the Pleasures of Horror Film Viewing*. New York: State University of New York Press, 1997.

Praver, S S. *Caligari's Children*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980

Pye, Michael. Myles, Linda. *The Movie Brats: How the Film Generation Took Over Hollywood*. London: Faber and Faber, 1979.

Quackenbush, Robert. *Movie Monsters and their Masters: The Birth of the Horror Film*. Chicago: Albert, Whitman & Co, 1980.

Quarles, Mike. *Down and Dirty: Hollywood's Exploitation Filmmakers and their Motives*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co, 1993.

Rasmussen, Randy Loren. *Children of the Night: The Six Archetypal Characters of Classic Horror Films*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co, 1998.

Ray, Fred Olen. *The New Poverty Row; Independent Filmmakers as Distributors*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co, 1991.

Rebello, Stephen. *Alfred Hitchcock and The Making of Psycho*. New York: Dembner Books, 1990.

Rice, Anne. *Interview With the Vampire*. London: Futura /Warner Books, 1995.

Rice, Anne. *The Queen of the Damned*. London: Warner Books, 1995.

Rice, Anne. *The Vampire Lestat*. London: Warner Books, 1995.

Rigby, Jonathan. *English Gothic; A Century of Horror Cinema*. London: Reynolds & Hearn, 2000.

Robb, Brian J. *Screams and Nightmares: The Films of Wes Craven*. London: Titan, 1998.

Rodley, Chris. *Cronenberg on Cronenberg*. London: Faber and Faber, 1993.

Romero, George. Sparrow, Susan. *Dawn of the Dead*. London: Sphere, 1979.

Russo, John. *Return of the Living Dead (Original)*. Middlesex, England: Hamlyn, 1979.

Russo, John. *Return of the Living Dead (Film Edition)*. London: Arrow Books Ltd, 1985.

Russo, John. *The Complete Night of the Living Dead Film Book*. New York: Harmony Books, 1985.

Russo, John. *Scare Tactics: The Art, Craft and Trade Secrets of Writing, Producing and Directing Chillers and Thrillers*. New York: Dell, 1992.

Salisbury, Mark (Ed). *Burton on Burton*. Boston and London: Faber & Faber, 2000.

Sammon, Paul M (Ed). *Alien: The Complete Illustrated Screenplay*. London: Orion, 2000.

Sammon, Paul M (Ed). *Aliens: The Complete Illustrated Screenplay*. London: Orion 2001.

Sammon, Paul M. *Ridley Scott: The Making of His Movies*. London: Orion, 1999.

Sanello, Frank. *Spielberg: the man, movies, the mythology*. Dallas : Taylor, 1996.

Schoell, William. Spencer, James. *The Nightmare Never Ends: The Official History of Freddy Kruger and the Nightmare on Elm Street Films*. New York: Carol, 1992.

Schoell, William. Spencer, James. *Stay Out of the Shower: 25 Years of Shocking Films Beginning With Psycho*. New York: Dembner Books, 1985.

Seltzer, David. *The Omen*. London: Futura, 1976.

Shapiro. Marc. *James Cameron: an unauthorized biography*. Los Angeles, CA: Renaissance Books, 2000.

Sherman, Fraser A. *Cyborgs, Santa Claus And Satan: Science-Fiction, Fantasy and Horror Films Made for Television*. Jefferson, NC and London: McFarland, 2000.

Silver, A., Ursini, J. (Eds). *Horror Film Reader*. New York: Limelight Editions, 2000.

- Simpson, Philip L. *Psychopaths: Tracking the Serial Killer through Contemporary Fiction and Film*. Illinois; Southern Illinois University Press, 2000.
- Singer, Mark. *A Cut Above: 50 Film Directors Talk About Their Craft*. Los Angeles, California: Lone Eagle, 1998.
- Skal, D. J. *The Monster Show: A Cultural History of Horror*. New York: Norton, 1993.
- Soister, John. *Of Gods and Monsters: A Critical Guide to Universal Studio's Science-Fiction, Horror and Mystery Films*. Jefferson, NC and London: McFarland, 1999.
- Soren, David. *The Rise and Fall of the Horror Film*. Baltimore, MD: Midnight Marquee Press, 1997.
- Staiger, Janet. *The Studio System*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1995.
- Stell, John. *Psychos, Sickos and Sequels: Horror Films of the 1980s*. Baltimore, Maryland: Midnight Marquee Press, 1998.
- Sternfield, Jonathan. *The Look of Horror: Scary Moments From Scary Movies*. New York: Moore & Moore, 1990.

Stokes, Melvyn. Maltby, Richard (Eds). *Identifying Hollywood's Audiences: Cultural Identity and the Movies*. London: British Film Institute, 1999.

Svehla, Gary J. Svehla, Susan. *Bitches, Bimbos and Virgins: Women in the Horror Film*. Baltimore, Maryland: Midnight Marquee Press, 1996.

Szulkin, David. *Wes Craven's Last House on the Left: The Making of a Cult Classic*. Surrey: Fab Press, 2000.

Taylor, Philip M. *Steven Spielberg: the man, his movies, and their meaning. - 3rd expanded*. London: BT Batsford, 1999.

Thompson, David. *The Alien Quartet*. London; Bloomsbury, 1998.

Timpone, Anthony. *Fangoria's Best Horror Films*. New York: Crescent, 1994.

Tudor, Andrew. *Monsters and Mad Scientists; A Cultural History of the Horror Movie*. London: Blackwell, 1989.

Twitchell, James B. *Dreadful Pleasures; An Anatomy of Modern Horror*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Underwood, Tim. *Stephen King Goes to Hollywood*. New York: New American Library, 1987.

Underwood, Tim. Miller, Chuck. Conner, Jeff. *Nightmare Movies: A Critical History of the Horror Film*. New York: New American Library, 1987.

Vincendau, Ginette (Ed). *Film/Literature/Heritage: A Sight and Sound Reader*. London: BFI Publishing, 2001.

Von Gunden, Kenneth. *Postmodern Auteurs: Coppola, Lucas, De Palma, Spielberg and Scorsese*. Jefferson, NC; London: McFarland, 1991.

Waller, G Å (Ed). *American Horrors: Essays on the Modern American Horror Film*. Illinois: Illinois University Press, 1987.

Warren, Bill. *The Evil Dead Companion*. London: Titan, 2000.

Warren, Bill. *Set Visits; Interviews With 32 Horror and Science Fiction Filmmakers*. Jefferson, NC; London: McFarland, 1997.

Weaver, James., Tanborini, Ron. *Horror Films: Current Research on Audience Preferences and Reactions*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1995.

Weaver, Tom. *Attack of the Monster Movie Makers; Interviews with 20 Genre Giants*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co, 1994.

Wells, Paul. *The Horror Genre: From Beelzebub to Blair Witch*. London: Wallflower, 2000.

Westfahl, G., Slusser, G. *Nursery Realms: Children in the World of Science-Fiction, Fantasy and Horror*. Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1999.

Weaver, Tom. *Science fiction stars and horror heroes: interviews with actors, directors, producers and writers of the 1940s through 1960s*. Jefferson, NC; London : McFarland, 1991.

Whedon, Joss. *Alien Resurrection: Scriptbook*. London; Titan, 1997.

Williams, Tony. *Hearths of Darkness: The Family in the American Horror Film*. New Jersey: Associated University Press, 1996.

Williams Tony: *Larry Cohen: The Radical Allegories of an Independent Filmmaker*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co, 1997.

Williams, Tony. *The Cinema of George A. Romero*. Columbia: Columbia University Press, 2003.

Willis, Donald C. *Horror and Science-Fiction Films*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 1997.

Winecoff, Charles. *Split Image: The Life of Anthony Perkins*. New York; Dutton, 1996.

Wright Wexman, Virginia. *Roman Polanski*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1985.

Wolf, Leonard. *Horror: A Connoisseur's Guide to Literature and Film*. New York and Oxford: Facts of File, 1989.

Wood, Robin and Lippe, Richard (Eds). *American Nightmare: Essays on the Horror Film*. Toronto Festival of Festivals.

Wood, Robin. *Hollywood From Vietnam to Reagan*. New York and Surrey: Columbia University Press, 1986.

Woods, Paul Anthony. *Ed Gein*. New York: St Martin's Press, 1995.