

2010年考研英语冲刺：经典例题剖析及答案解读考研 PDF转换可能丢失图片或格式，建议阅读原文

https://www.100test.com/kao_ti2020/606/2021_2022_2010_E5_B9_B4_E8_80_83_c73_606938.htm A sample text of high quality

Hollywood ' s New Model [1] Film has traditionally been a good business and a bad investment. The dream machine has been oiled by sources as varied as property developers, tax-averse Germans and the Baptist church. But returns have usually been disappointing. The inherent riskiness of the film business is one reason. another is the studios ' accounting practices, which, until recently, were as laden with special effects as the films they produced , 100test.com。从传统上讲，电影是一项不错的事业，但不是最佳投资。使这台梦机器顺利运转的投资者像房地产商一样形形色色，有厌恶税费的德国人和浸会教堂。但是，回报通常是令人失望的。一是因为电影业存在潜在风险.另一个原因是电影公司以前的会计实务有很多特技，就像他们制作的电影一样。 [2] The need for serious money has changed all that. The big studios now spend an average of just over \$100m making and selling each film. Led by Disney, they are cutting back on the number of movies they produce, making the gambles they do take all the more risky. The studios ' corporate parents would prefer it if their financial reports were a little less suspenseful. Hence the new, more open and honest attitude to private investors。对严肃投资资金的需求改变了所有这一切。大的电影公司现在平均花一亿多美元制作和营销每部电影。在迪斯尼的领导下，他们减少了电影制作量，赌注的风险就更大了。电影公司的母公司希望财务报告少让人

担心些。因此，对待私人投资者就会有新的、更加开放和诚实的态度。 [3] For the past few years the big studios have encouraged hedge funds and other investors to back “ candidates ” of several dozen films spread over more than a year. Although the financiers are not allowed to get their hands on reliable money-makers such as “ Harry Potter ” or “ Spider-Man ” , they still find the candidates less risky, and hence more appealing, than individual films. Last September Merrill Lynch estimated that outsiders cover more than 30% of the cost of film production。 在过去的几年中，大的电影公司鼓励对冲基金和另外一些投资者对分散在一年多内拍摄的几十部影片的“ 候选制片人 ” 进行投资。虽然金融家不能插手象《哈里波特》或《蜘蛛人》那样的肯定能赚钱的影片，但他们还是发现对制片人投资风险更少，因此，比投资私人电影更加吸引人。去年九月，估计30%多的电影制作成本来自外部资金。 [4] One result is that Wall Street now knows much more about how the film business works. As their experience grows, some investors are beginning to think they can “ beat the house ” , as John Burke, a Hollywood dealmaker, puts it. Rather than backing every film put out by a studio, they are investing in producers with good records. Michael London, who specialises in making family dramas, and Joel Silver, who is notably good at blowing things up, are among the recent recipients of such largesse. Several more such deals are rumored and the pace may increase if JPMorgan goes ahead with its plan to set up a film-finance arm。 结果是华尔街现在对电影业的运作有更多的了解。好莱坞的风险投资人约翰伯克说，随着他们对经验

的积累，一些投资者开始认为他们可以“赢庄家”。他们对以往成绩优秀的电影制片人进行投资，而不资助电影公司拍摄的每部电影。专长于拍摄家庭剧的麦克伦敦和明显擅长于拍摄爆炸场景的乔西尔沃就是最近接受如此慷慨援助的人。据谣传，还有几个更多的类似交易，而且如果摩根大通银行想设立电影资助部门的计划照常进行的话，步伐可能加快。

[5] This has changed the arc of Hollywood careers. Not so long ago, producers and film stars who fell out with studio bosses might retire to write books with titles like “ You ’ ll Never Eat Lunch in This Town Again ” . These days they round up some private equity and get back to work. Thanks to Goldman Sachs, Bob and Harvey Weinstein were able to set up a new film studio just two months after they angrily left Disney in 2005。 这改变了好莱坞的职业轨迹。以前，与电影公司老板闹翻的制片人和影星也许退休后写书，题目是“你将永远不在这个城镇吃中饭”。如今，他们聚积了一些私人资产，又回来工作了。多亏了高盛公司，鲍伯和哈维温斯丁能够在2005年气愤地离开迪斯尼两个月后就建立一个新的电影公司。 100Test 下载频道开通，各类考试题目直接下载。详细请访问 www.100test.com