Ourselves Alone: Solipsism in Neil Jordan's Novels and Films

Matthew Ryan
Monash University

Abstract
Neil Jordan's work in film and writing has been well received around the world. There is a thematic continuity within that body of work which could explain this widespread popularity. His concern with the figure of the individual, in both film and book, parallels an increasingly globalized cultural image of the 'free-floating' subject. Emerging from the modernist determination to 'form the new', the image of the self-constructing individual is now a familiar one. But Jordan's representations of the individual move beyond that modernist aspiration and towards a portrayal of the individual as not only self-actualising but composed of a totally solitary consciousness; connected to the world only via an idiosyncratic and singular system of meaning. The reader/viewer is presented with a solipsistic construction of self. The popularity of Jordan's work might stem from the way his audience finds itself in a similar predicament: feeling a contraction of shared meaning and facing the difficulty of continuously reconstructing the self-sustaining self. This article takes Jordan's output as a body of cultural work. It is an approach which connects questions of form (differences between film and writing) with questions of content (particularly the use of modern Irish history and the shift in the formation of the individual). The collective past of the nation is channelled through the narrower framework of the individual consciousness. This inverts nationalist tropes of continuity which have used history to legitimate a political present. In Jordan's representations, the individual character orders a chaotic past by incorporating it into a personalised formation of meaning. This thematic content is, in turn, mirrored in the formal process of an aesthetically repackaged past presented to an audience for consumption. Jordan's work offers freedom from the 'nightmare of history', but it is a freedom which exists only as the individual adds aesthetically transformed images to the aggregation of self.

I cannot speak Irish, but during a visit to Dublin I learnt a phrase: *mé féin* or myself alone. With the new affluence that has come to the Republic of Ireland, *mé féin* might be a credo for what has become known as the 'Celtic Tiger'. By writing this I do not want to present a kind of diasporic nostalgia for an imagined or past Ireland which was, actually, far from the communal ideal. *Mé féin* could be short-hand for other cultural

manifestations which mark a shift towards an intense individuation. This fits more generally into a theory of late capitalism and the movement of Ireland into its culture of postmodernity. Considering this cultural shift, I hope to escape the charge of yearning for a parochial 'Oirish' Ireland: a land of comely maidens and sturdy hurling players gathered to receive the wisdom of the hearth. Neil Jordan's novels and films provide some examples of this culture of transition. Like much contemporary cultural work emerging from Ireland, Jordan's output describes and embodies the shift from modern aspirations to postmodern desires. Aside from this relatively uncontentious proposition, I also want to present here an argument for a reading of transformations in form: a triangulation of the interrelated formal structures of the self, society and the aesthetic.

Due to the limitations of space, I will emphasise some works at the expense of others, but I think that my arguments are applicable to Jordan's whole body of work.[1] As an *oeuvre*, Jordan's output has more binding it together than an individual personality presenting thematic preoccupations and recurring imagery; although both these components are imporatant factors in a thorough reading. The common thread which I have found running across both form and content is in fact an ideological one. This means that I read Jordan's work not simply as the product of an individual but as a nexus of the author's particular circumstance and the wider world of ideology and culture which exceeds the individual. I want to develop this theoretical position in the context of my analysis, so I will not labour its intricacies at this stage. The only other theoretical point I want to make here is that I have obviously drawn on the work of Fredric Jameson. As such, my interpretive approach will couple the critique of ideology, which I have mentioned, with the search for traces of the utopian or what Jameson describes as "the deepest and most fundamental hopes and fantasies of the collectivity" (Jameson 1992, 30). But, in Jordan's work, I have found those deep yearnings hidden deep indeed.

In a *New Musical Express* review of Jordan's first feature film, *Angel* (Jordan, 1982 and 1989),[2] it was announced that the director's "first masterstroke is to divorce his scenario from the all-engulfing shadow of The Troubles" (Cook 1982, 27). Indeed, Jordan himself reiterates this sentiment of detachment in an interview in the same issue of *New Musical Express*, asserting: "Irish politics are quite complex and I felt the place to make a comment on them wasn't in a feature film, and tried to concentrate on the consequences of a violent event on one human being" (Smith 1982, 28). It appears that the writers at *New Musical Express* were satisfied to remain ignorant of the way film and Irish politics might mix because they were already equipped with an array of stereotypical images of Irishness. In the two short pieces on *Angel*, many stage-Irish clichés are rehearsed. But the telling observation of *Angel* by *New Musical Express* is the suggestion that the film "seems to come from no clear cinematic tradition" and that "Jordan's

grasp seems entirely instinctual" (Cook 1982, 27). Here the tradition of misascribing Irishness is coupled with a newer blindness towards the ideologically coded aesthetics of globalised 'style'. I would argue that *Angel* sits within a cinematic tradition which draws heavily from styles developed in Britain and the United States. But as John Hill has pointed out in his consideration of images of violence in British, American and Irish film, "The representations of the Irish characteristically associated with sources outside of Ireland have now apparently become so natural and normal that they are providing a framework for certain sections of Irish film-making as well" (Hill 1987, 178).

Hill sets out an order of representations of violence in films thematically associated with Ireland: the British tradition shows violence as a self-defeating, momentary disturbance in the status quo; in films from the US, violence serves as a driving narrative force pushing towards resolution and affirmation (Hill 1987, 152). Both uses employ what Hill calls an "individualising logic" which "favours the private and the personal at the expense of the public and the political" (1987, 152). *Angel* not only dissolves social and political questions in a technical play of surreal lighting, indistinct setting and montaged images, as Hill argues; it also effects this transcendence by thematically combining the binary representations which Hill has identified. *Angel* re-creates Northern Ireland as an American fantasy-land (like the wild west) where individual violence can assume the aura of righteousness (Byrne 1997, 94). While at the same time, the figure of the Jewish RUC detective, Bloom, reinstates the British state as the, somehow impartial and legitimate, repository of force by invisibly having the last shot (from outside the frame, like the helicopter we hear throughout the credits) and putting a full stop on this all too Irish excess of passionate vengeance.

It is the way these two stores of images have slipped loose from their original national sources and somehow settled within an Irish self-representation, which directs this analysis towards the global flow of images. We can see something of the dynamics of globalisation in the way *Angel* receives disparate images, repackages them in a hybrid form and re-launches that object into the globally accessible market of cultural commodities. But in the atmosphere of global exchange, narrative structure is not the only thing that is refashioned. The formation of identity is also implicated—and that transformation, in the conditions of self construction, is a motif running throughout Jordan's work. Anthony Giddens connects the problem of constructing self-identity, amidst the movable feast of representative images, with narrative form itself (1991, 181–208). He argues for a reflexive narrativisation of identity to re-establish a kind of personalised ontological order of the self in the world; diminishing the risk of meaninglessness by wrapping identity in a reassuring, self-spun story of continuity and personal development. Scott Lash and John Urry have developed Giddens's idea, positing an "aesthetic or hermeneutic reflexivity" as a way to shore-up the

189

self and community against a possible "postmodern dystopia" of the hyper-*Gesellschaft* type (1994, 322). The organising principle of the aesthetic is presented as an order loose enough to accommodate the constant flow of new permutations of identifying images while remaining sufficiently cohesive to provide a frame of continuity and meaning which can hold self-identity out of madness. There is a striking resonance between this conception of identity in global space and the portrayal of self and action in *Angel*. A key aspect of Jordan's films and writing is the redolence of this aesthetic formation of identity—even going beyond explicit symbolic correlations, like that between the armalite and the saxophone.

It is easy to make a list of the images of aesthetically ordered life which recur throughout Jordan's work. A glance at the novels and stories shows: jazz music and showbands are central to *Night in Tunisia* (1976); as is a travelling theatrical troop to *The Past* (1980); an advertising graphic is embodied in *The Dream of a Beast* (1983); and a kind of political role-play game is acted out (as well as the film, *Gone with the Wind*) in *Sunrise with Sea Monster* (1996b).[3] The films offer a similar array: with musical performance and carnivals in *Angel* (1982 and 1989) and *The Miracle* (1991); sexual role-playing and prostitution in *Mona Lisa* (1986); kareoke and costume changes in *The Crying Game* (1992); tourist entertainment in *High Spirits* (1988); nursery rhymes, pop songs, and folktales shape *The Company of Wolves* (1984) and *In Dreams* (1999); and even *Michael Collins* (1996 and 1996a) has guerilla fighters being briefed for their part inside a disused theatre, sharing the stage with the eponymous 'Big Fella'.

These are Jordan's explicit representations of how aesthetic forms give shape to life and identity, but if we prize open the imagery we begin to see an internal tension. With theatres, carnivals, showbands … we can read a play of surfaces: a fluidity of representation settling only in performance and having little continuity between that moment and the next enactment. So, in the imagery, there is a correlation with the aestheticised subject as described by Giddens, Lash and Urry. Jordan's characters orchestrate themselves and their world of objects around an aesthetic order which frames their actions as performance and their identity as changeable role. It would seem that Jordan presents us with the triumph of the de-centred subject: the ubiquitous hero of postmodernity's apologists. But if we lever the imagery away from the form we see that the celebration of fluidity is bothered by a relatively old fashioned search for authenticity.

The Crying Game is perhaps the clearest example of this pull between the apparent fluidity of identity under present globalised conditions and the high bourgeois fantasy of the essential self. Jordan, attempting to defend himself against feminist critique, has described the way he sees the characters choosing to escape the prescriptive binds of gender—violent/men and passive/women (Burke 1993, 17–20). He emphasises what he sees as the emancipatory power of an individual choice. In *The Crying Game*, singular

force of will is presented as transcendent of any bodily, social or political designation (Dunne 1997, 25). But this determinedly non-fixed construction of individual identity is coupled with a motif which is strangely contradictory in its essentialism. The parable of the frog and the scorpion, told twice in the film, points to the inescapable determinancy of one's 'nature'. So, as other commentators have uncritically observed (Byrne 1997, 93–7), we have characters who are 'essentially' non-violent, others who are 'naturally' blood-thirsty, and still others who seem programmed for selfless love. We see a similar drive towards authenticity in *The Dream of a Beast*. There a character undergoes a metamorphosis; an animistic essence bubbles through the surface of personality as some bestial spirit dissolves the body, revealing a new self which appears to be a 'truer self'. These kinds of naturalised resources of identity are a step beyond the structural dispositions instilled by culture, they seem rather to be carried in the genes or perhaps some immutable soul. How can this determinism sit along side the radical relativism of aesthetic order? How can the natural, essential, self be coupled with the self encoded in changeable surfaces?

This is of course an old question for the history of Western philosophy, and I do not want to venture too far into that terrain. But the problem of self representation, played out as freedom versus determinism, is given renewed urgency by the accelerated and expanded transformations of cultural life which characterise the late twentieth century. Zygmunt Bauman has described the way this problem has accompanied modernity from its beginning. He sums up the paradox: "endemic indetermination renders man free to choose, yet this freedom is invariably deployed in frenzied efforts to foreclose the choice" (1995, 143). Bauman argues that the freedom to choose—to construct both a self and a world—is experienced "not as a liberation, but as bereavement: identity appeared in human view first as the need to *fill a void*" (1995, 146). In Jordan's work, the void at the centre of modernity is articulated as desire. It is a desire which is instilled in both the ephemeral liberation of aesthetic surfaces as well the reassuring enclosure of authentic, unchanging, essence. But where Bauman has described a historical desire to augment the self through a relation with the world, which can be recognised as identity, Jordan's desire appears as a sufficient condition of identity itself. As a shamanistic bat tells the reader in *The Dream of a Beast*, "To fly cleanly you must learn pure desire, a desire that has no object" (Jordan 1983, 84).

Contrary to this objectless desire, I would argue that Jordan's combination of fluidity and fixity represents a 'cycle' of desire requiring a procession of objects which can know no end. If choosing identifying images, and collecting them in a loosely bound aesthetic order, is plagued by an elusive essence, then the result can only be yearning and a non-identical self. In this, Jordan's representations of identity manifest the conditions under which, and from which, they are formed; as image commodities in the

global cultural market. Just as the detachment from the circumstance of place made for an easy mix of British- and US-style imagery in the aestheticised world of *Angel*, a detachment of the individual from the circumstances of place facilitates a contradictory blend of essence and artifice. Desire is kept in motion by the individual constantly processing new identifying images—forever stitching together and then unpicking a fetish-self in a representation of the search for the absent, 'true' self. Jordan's desiring subject begins to look like an archetype for consumption, with the individual body becoming the place where globally available objects—language, culture, identity—touch down and make their market. A case of reification pushing back the frontiers and finding purchase in the areas once guarded by gender, nationality, class or ethnicity: all categories which have been exploited by capital before, but now, on the whole, superseded by the generic right of the individual to consume.

Keeping in mind the representation of self-formation, which I have described, I will consider the way it informs Jordan's treatment of nationalism in the novel *Sunrise with Sea Monster* and the film *Michael Collins*. The problem of nationalism distills the paradox of desire which lies at the heart of a subjectivity formed under the conditions of late twentieth-century globalisation. It resides in the knowledge that national location now neither contains nor creates us, yet no durable social forms quite fill the space left by that powerful absence. In both film and novel, Jordan articulates the anxiety inherent to a global identification which is conscious of modernist failures and is structured on the presumption that we stand hubristically upon ourselves alone. The modernity wrought by nationalism, in particular, betrayed the society of the future with its impossible desires.

Sunrise with Sea Monster, largely set in Ireland during the 'Emergency', is narrated in the first person by a character living in nationalism's betrayed future. He attempts to devise an ontology based on that present sense of lack. The modern moment of authenticity has passed with the Irish War of Independence and now only a fetish can fill the gap between a prosaic present and an exotic past. A gun becomes the connecting object, but, as it endures outside its time, it can only give a *sense* of that concrete experience (Jordan 1996b, 52–53). The gun becomes a simulacrum of a now vanished authenticity. As such it is a ready property for a kind of political role-play game involving 'cloak and dagger' meetings with comically caricatured IRA men. Such is the state of revolutionary politics in the fallen present.

The novel follows Jordan's established narrative device of conspicuous aestheticisation, with an alienated character patching images together to form identity. In this way it fits the category of *Bildungsroman*, with the implications of personal development. But here the idealisations of voluntarist self-will to which that form is predisposed are coupled with a kind of mytho-poetic movement towards integration with the eternal. We are

192

presented with a supernatural dénouement in the form of a reconciliation with a dead father, redolent with animist and Christian imagery. The father, emerging from the sea, assures the son that all the possibilities of the self, all the other desires which might have been pursued, but were limited by the exigencies of the body, are enacted after death. Like an inversion of old Hamlet's Ghost,[4] tailored to the postmodern age, the dead father decrees: free your self from 'purpose' (which is only certainty masking randomness) and change your self at every turn, but maintain your desire for integration by imagining a space beyond 'accidence' where all things are placed and all actions purposeful. It is a philosophy of *being* which denies its desire for *becoming*, a hymn to the potential of fluidity which continues to hold authenticity at its core. Again we see the immutable and the changeable bonded together. One might read this as a persistent representation of psychological need, an intensely personal progress of a wounded personality (Byrne 1997, 105). But why the need for this recourse to the mythic?—or at least to the late modern approximation of mythic form in the surreal (McIlroy 1988, 114). This narrative course could be read as an acknowledgement of the unrepresentability of the psyche. But, following Jameson, it could further be read as an utopian infiltration. The supernatural resolution would then be seen within a scope which includes the psychological by exceeding it (Jameson 1981, 23). The utopian frame encompasses the totality of the social or the history of culture, which Jameson describes as the "untranscendable horizon" (1981, 9–10). In this Jamesonian allegorical mode, the Romantic imagery of an afterlife which fulfills the self, located in the expanses of a numinous sea, could be read as the human totality of social relations and history—the inescapable scope of language and culture. The longing for a resolution of self in that sum of all possibilities would then be the yearning for a realisation of the, as yet unimagined, potential of our need for community. But that utopian hope would have to be seen beneath the other fantasy, presented here, of the enduring sovereign self.

The nostalgia for integration, which began as desire for the past, is recast and contracted to a bodily image. The free-standing individual forms a bodily integrated synthetic self, using *but defusing* those residual historical images which still hold the integrative aura of collective imaginings. In this way Jordan subverts the Romantic nationalist attempt to integrate individual and collective desires under the mystical bond of land and cultural continuity. But, writing in 1994, Jordan fictively injects a postmodern sensibility into a historical moment that can already be seen as the beginning of the end of that nationally-centred self which had been advocated in the postcolonial project. The theory of the de-centred self—the "poststructuralist position" (Jameson 1983, 115)—is properly a critique of the historical construction of the bourgeois individual subject. That subject position never had a particular foothold in the nationalist formation of Irish identity and was certainly not the ideal citizen of the postcolonial state (Eagleton 1995, 149

and 277). In any case, I have indicated how Jordan tenaciously holds to the essential self, which is surely only a thin 'New Age' guise for the "unique, autonomous, self-identical and self-determining individual" which, as Terry Eagleton notes, "remains a political and ideological requirement of the system" even as it appears "embarrassingly out of gear with certain versions of subjectivity which arise more directly from the late capitalist economy itself" (Eagleton 1990, 374–77). In his rendering of the decomposition of nationalism, Jordan adopts the poststructuralist position, but rather than responding to the legacy of Romantic nationalism, he seems to be re-fashioning the mechanisms of identification in exactly that binary image of the late capitalist economy. Here post-nationalism slips towards celebratory globalism.

Jordan contracts the nationalist figuration of identity—recoiling from the betrayal of its revolution and stultifying cultural paralysis in the formation of its State—and he relocates its integrative aspirations within the individual alone. The single figure unifies a procession of allusions and images—here historical and political—in the manner of the typical protagonist of the *Bildungsroman*, binding the language and motifs of a disparate cultural inheritance into the formal whole of the novel. The realisation of self-identity remains the goal but the location of authenticity has contracted from the continuity of land and people, and become the enduring desire itself, somehow located at the heart of the autonomous self. This is a total kind of individualism, which recognises only the indissoluble solidarity of the self and the body, conflating all else (history, ideology, society) under the terms of individual desire. In this way, Jordan's work exemplifies what has been described, in another context, as the "crisis of nihilism within postmodernism—its weakening of the subject, its erasure of difference and the establishment of the economy of the global mall" (Richards 1994, 208). Jordan's postmodern nihilism, and its formation of the solipsistic desiring self, stem from the way he dismantles the idea of the national subject, without erasing its sustaining myth of integration. In *Sunrise with Sea Monster*, the critique of nationalism mutates into an apology for exactly the kind of postmodern dystopia which Lash and Urry warn against. The novel offers simultaneously the fluidity of identity and a re-establishment of the sovereignty of the individual (celebrating choice as it forecloses it, as Bauman has it). It is, in the end, a conservative amalgam. The order of the desiring self remains unchanged in the course of the novel. In *Sunrise with Sea Monster* the formal romance of character development borrows authenticity from the utopian desire for natural and historical integration—all in an effort to endorse, or to frame, the condition of identity as continuous consumption.

But perhaps Jordan's most ambitious attempt at combining postmodernity's figure of the free-floating subject with the pure internal order of authentic self-identity is presented in the film *Michael Collins*.[5] Like

in *Sunrise with Sea Monster*, lived authenticity is safely locked in the past. The setting is a historical moment in which identity has coalesced with political commitment: a difficult combination for Jordan, resolved through jump-cut scenes of justified violence. Recalling John Hill's description of US-style uses of violence as narrative propellant, the first half of this story is told in the globally recognisable film language of underdog-strives-and-wins.[6] But, like *Angel*, a British-style conclusion to violence marks the final shot. It ends the war (and the moment of authentic politics), showing up the whole bloody episode as largely futile: leaving behind a de Valera almost as repellent in his bathos as the Castle British were in their detached cruelty. Violence gives urgent movement to the narrative and consolidates viewer sympathy with the committed hero. Violence also concludes the delirium of its own presence—a momentary unity of action and self—halting the dangerous momentum and leaving everything almost exactly as it was. This modulation of narrative is characteristic of the way the image commodity repeats recognizable traits and regulates desire by rehearsing satisfaction even as it forestalls fulfillment and reproduces the conditions of consumption. Here Jordan has joined that principle of the transnational film market with stock-in-trade images of Irish violence.

Collins, as the *masculine* controller of violence (clearly delineated against the shrieking and *hysterical* Dev), is able to traverse this two-way narrative modulation. As the man of action he cuts across the genre requirements of the transnational film mode while also serving Jordan's thematic binary of authentic self and fluid subject. The figure of Collins as rebel rather than politician contrasts the film image against the historical one. It is an ambitious narrative trick to distance Collins from the power of the State, even as he launches the attack on the Republicans in the Four Courts. The same armoured cars which had earlier embodied the grey face of imperial domination later enforce the power of the postcolonial State, already distant and anonymous. Collins emerges as the man of action whose pure energy is diluted in the service of a State. The image is of an individual simply swept up and cut down in the machinations of political consolidation. Jordan's Collins dances between image and history: maintaining the aura of organic rebel even as he actually personifies the new State. In this way the character of Collins binds the narrative need for the modulation of violence with the identity theme of a dualism unified by desire: enacted in an aesthetic resolution where the victim of history can, as image, escape history. But it is not a disregard for historical truth which launches *Michael Collins* as global image commodity, it is rather the way the film structurally incorporates those globalised conditions of its production. Globalisation is evident in the way a film, set amongst the massed mobilisation of a Romantic nationalist movement and the revolutionary birth of a postcolonial state, can be displaced and formed into a generic representation of the late capitalist construction of the desiring subject. Jordan tells us that the test audience in

195

New York gave a ninety percent approval rating (1996a, 65). I would agree that the film is a tight aesthetic mesh of form and content, but perhaps that audience recognised a contradiction which is woven into the fabric of themselves. Vanessa Redgrave emerged from the screening "actually weeping" (Jordan 1996a, 65); perhaps she was crying over the irreconcilable contradiction of globalised identity which she had just witnessed: one of perpetual lack centred on a hermetic core.

NOTES

[1] I have included here only Jordan's fiction and the films which he both wrote and directed.

[2] *Angel* was released in the United States under the title *Danny Boy*.

[3] *Sunrise with Sea Monster* was released in the United States under the title *Nightlines*.

[4] See *Hamlet* (I, v, 1–91). Instead of being called to filial duty by his father's ghost, the son in Jordan's novel is freed from fate and encouraged to pursue the *actualisation* of his 'indomitable self'.

[5] The analysis of *Michael Collins* presented here is a development from a review which first appeared in *Arena Magazine* (Ryan 1997).

[6] See the *Rocky* or *Karate Kid* series. As an advertisement in Australia assured: "If you liked *Braveheart*, then you'll love *Michael Collins*".

WORKS CITED

Bauman, Zygmunt. 1995. "Searching for a Centre that Holds". *Global Modernities*. Eds. Mike Featherstone, Scot Lash, Roland Robertson. London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage.

Burke, Marine. 1993. "Celtic Dreamer". *Film Ireland* April-May: 16–21.

Byrne, Terry. 1997. *Power in the Eye*. London: Scarecrow Press.

Cook, Richard. 1982. "Angel of Death". *New Musical Express* 13 November: 27.

Dunne, Sean. 1992. "Reviews: *The Crying Game*". *Film Ireland* November-December: 24–25.

Eagleton, Terry. 1995. *Heathcliff and the Great Hunger*. London and New York: Verso.

———. 1990. *The Ideology of the Aesthetic*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Giddens, Anthony. 1991. *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Stanford: Stanford UP.

Hill, John. 1987. "Images of Violence". *Cinema and Ireland*. Eds. Kevin Rockett, Luke Gibbons and John Hill. London: Routledge. 147–93.

Jameson, Fredric. 1992. *Signatures of the Visible*. New York: Routledge.

———. 1983. "Postmodernism and Consumer Society". *The Anti-Aesthetic: Essays on Postmodern Culture*. Ed. Hal Foster. Seattle: Bay Press. 111–25.

———. 1981. *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. London: Routledge.

Jordan, Neil. 1976. *Night in Tunisia*. Dublin: Writers and Readers Publishing Cooperative.

———. 1980. *The Past*. London: Cape.

———. 1982. *Angel*. Motion Picture Corporation.

———. 1983. *The Dream of a Beast*. London: Chatto and Windus.

———. 1984. *The Company of Wolves*. Co-scripted with Angela Carter. The Cannon Group.

———. 1986. *Mona Lisa*. Co-scripted with David Leland. Handmade Films Ltd.

———. 1988. *High Spirits*. Tristar Pictures.

———. 1989. *Angel*. London and Boston: Faber.

———. 1991. *The Miracle*. British Screen Productions.

———. 1992. *The Crying Game*. Channel 4 Films.

———. 1996. *Michael Collins*. Geffen Pictures and Warner Brothers.

———. 1996a. *Michael Collins Screenplay and Film Diary*. London: Vintage.

———. 1996b. *Sunrise with Sea Monster*. London: Vintage.

———. 1997. *The Butcher Boy*. Co-scripted with Patrick McCabe. Butcher Boy Film, Geffen Pictures and Warner Brothers.

———. 1999. *In Dreams*. Co-scripted with Bruce Robinson. Dream Works SKG.

Lash, Scott and John Urry. 1994. *Economies of Signs and Space*. London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage.

McIlroy, Brian. 1988. *Irish Cinema: An Illustrated History*. Dublin: Anna Livia Press.

Richards, Shaun. 1994. "Yeats's Theatre and the Contemporary 'Crisis of Nihilism'". *Irish University Review* 24.2: 198–211.

Ryan, Matthew. 1997. "Michael Collins—Hollywood Hero". *Arena Magazine* 27. February-March : 44–45.

Smith, Monty. 1982. "Debut of Style". *New Musical Express* 13 November: 28–29.