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0. Introduction; or, How a Turkish PhD Candidate Studying in the Netherlands Chose to Write a Dissertation on Hollywood.

My earliest memory of going to the movies is of SUPERMAN (Richard Donner, 1978). This must have been at the end of 1979, when the film appeared on the screens in Istanbul, eleven months after its US release. It was a different time; films were not released simultaneously across the world, and there were no pirate copies on every street corner. For many of the urban filmgoers of my generation in Turkey, SUPERMAN was either the first film seen in a movie theater, or at least it was among the most significant. This was partly due to the limited choice available at the time. In November 1979, Superman was released in Turkey along with twenty-four other films. While this may seem like a large number of films to choose from, many of these were popular sex comedies with titles like DÖRTSICAKYATAK (FOUR HOT BEDS), AILEDEBÝRBAKÝRE (A VIRGIN IN THE FAMILY), SEKSTEKNÝÐÝ (SEX TECHNIQUE) and KADINLARAPTALDEÐÝLDÝR (WOMEN ARE NOT STUPID). Another popular genre of the period was the ‘arabesk’ melodramas, several of which were released that month. These were low-budget musicals with a singer in the lead role, and served as vehicles to promote the singers, whose songs were heavily Arab-influenced in terms of music. These songs and the films told of painful love stories, and were aimed mainly at the recent internal migrants from rural areas into the cities. With the decline of Turkish cinema in the late seventies, audiences diminished, and the remaining ‘family audiences’ seemed to prefer Hollywood films. Among the foreign fare released in November 1979 were one Italian-West German co-produced erotic thriller and several Hollywood productions from previous years. It was under these circumstances that I saw SUPERMAN in Istanbul, as a small child with my parents, in a now-defunct movie theater. I was amazed by the special effects, especially by how... “Truth, justice, and the American way”; but to me it was simply wonderful adventures and the smile of Christopher Reeve.

Of course, I was also unaware of the place SUPERMAN would hold in film history. The first of many super-hero films to come over the next decades, SUPERMAN is furthermore considered to be among the leaders of the blockbuster era of Hollywood. As the most popular comic book character, with animations, film serials, TV series and a Broadway musical already produced, SUPERMAN was a pre-sold commodity that had practically guaranteed its audiences. Heralded by its producers Alexander and Ilya Salkind as one of the most expensive movies ever made, SUPERMAN’s budget of US$40 million promised its audiences a lavish spectacle with big stars and state-of-the-art special effects. But perhaps even more importantly, and typically of the later Hollywood blockbusters, the film was being produced and released by Warner Bros., the owner of which, Warner Communications Inc. (WCI), had purchased ten years earlier DC Comics, publisher of the Superman adventures. Not only did this deal facilitate the development of the project, but it also allowed other merchandising possibilities within the conglomerate. The Licensing Corporation of America, a WCI subsidiary, allocated merchandising rights to major companies like Bristol Meyers, General Foods,
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PepsiCo, Lever Bros. and Gillette. Warner Books issued eight Superman-related titles, and Warner Records released a soundtrack album as well as two singles, while another Warner subsidiary, Atari, brought out a Superman pinball machine. This was one of the first instances of synergy at work, which only increased over the subsequent years as all Hollywood studios became part of larger media conglomerates.

In his introduction to Hollywood Abroad, Richard Maltby discusses the reception of Hollywood productions by audiences across the globe, and the extent to which these films are construed as ‘American’. He argues that throughout its history, Hollywood has been identified as ‘American’ largely by its competitors, and by European cultural nationalists, while American supporters, as well as critics of Hollywood ‘do not perceive these products as part of a specifically national culture.” This is a sentiment echoed by more and more film scholars, especially in recent years. Andrew Higson has argued that Hollywood, in addition to being “the most internationally powerful cinema”, has been “for many years […] an integral and naturalized part of the national culture, or the popular imagination, of most countries in which cinema is an established entertainment form”\(^9\). My watching of Superman as a child was a part of this naturalization; how they could make Superman fly was among the hottest topics of debate at my elementary school in Istanbul. However, my early acquaintance with Hollywood is not the main reason why I choose to study it within an academic context. I am a Turkish citizen who has been educated within the German, US, and Dutch systems; and who has lived in the US, Netherlands, Hungary and Turkey. Globalization is not just a buzzword for me; it is part of who I am. And Hollywood is among the showcases for this phenomenon, in terms of production, distribution, exhibition; as well as reception. As Thomas Elsaesser and Warren Buckland have pointed out, “Hollywood cinema is a world industry, just as much as it is a world language, a powerful, stable, perfected system of visual communication”\(^10\). Thus, it is common that this world industry is studied by citizens of the world, regardless of location or nationality.

My fascination with Hollywood’s global directors grew out of these interests in Hollywood and globalization. While I was writing my MA thesis on Dutch-Hollywood director Paul Verhoeven, I noticed that many of the new classics of Hollywood had been directed by non-Americans. I already knew that Hollywood had been a center of attraction for foreign directors from its earliest days. The studios handed these directors all kinds of films, ranging from frivolous comedies to ‘problem pictures’, from ‘weepies’ to action-adventure films. However, the films that have been embedded in the public’s mind have been largely those of the émigré generation, of those directors who have migrated to the US from Europe before the Second World War. It is easier to categorize these directors, since they have been largely credited with giving rise to the film-noir style.\(^13\) Films like Double Indemnity (Billy Wilder, 1944), Laura (Otto Preminger, 1944), The Woman in the Window (Fritz Lang, 1945), Mildred Pierce (Michael Curtiz, 1945), Detour (Edgar G. Ulmer, 1945) and The Killers (Robert Siodmak, 1946) have cemented the image of the dark Hollywood films directed by Europeans.

In the more recent decades, there have been other names that garnered attention, for instance Ridley and Tony Scott from the UK, Ang Lee from Taiwan, John Woo from Hong Kong, Roland Emmerich and Wolfgang Petersen from Germany, and Paul Verhoeven from the Netherlands. The cinema-going public might know that BLADE RUNNER (Ridley Scott, 1982) INDEPENDENCE DAY (Roland Emmerich, 1996), STARSHIP TROOPERS (Paul Verhoeven, 1997) or FACE/OFF (John Woo, 1997) have been directed by a foreign director, even though this is not really an attribute that is highlighted in the marketing of any film. It is very unlikely, however, that anyone in the audience should be aware that the following films were their non-American directors’ Hollywood debuts: the seventh installment of the series STAR TREK: GENERATIONS (David Carson, 1994), the martial-arts genre movie DOUBLE TEAM (Hark Tsui, 1997) Oscar-nominated racial conflict drama MONSTER’S BALL (Marc Forster, 2001), and the comedy hit LEGALLY BLONDE (Robert Luketic, 2001). Incidentally, SUPERMAN is indeed directed by an American director, but it came very close to not being so. The film was initially to be shot in Italy by the British director Guy Hamilton, renowned for his James Bond films. However, when production was moved to the UK, the director’s native country, he had to step down because of tax issues. James Bond, runaway productions and tax issues are all themes that will re-emerge in the following pages.

The films above are only a few of the dozens of Hollywood titles directed by global filmmakers every year, and clearly, they have no thematic or stylistic resemblance to one another; other than being a part of the Hollywood system. This shift that I noticed from earlier eras to the present has convinced me to take up this topic as my dissertation subject, and has resulted in this book. In the following chapters, I will be looking at Hollywood as a global site of production as well as a center of attraction for foreign talent throughout its history. I will discuss other regional and national filmmaking centers and their relationship vis-à-vis Hollywood. Throughout the case studies, I will look at various strategies employed by Hollywood (and the foreign directors) to make cooperation possible. Hopefully, my research will shed a new light on some of the notions taken for granted in discussions of Hollywood, and thereby provide a clearer understanding of the workings of global cinema. The title of the book is suggested by a quotation from British producer Sir David Puttnam. Describing the first day he went to America in 1963, he says he felt that “part of [him] was coming home”\(^11\). I will argue that for many of the directors examined in this book, Hollywood is a part of their cinematic identities, therefore a ‘home away from home’.
Endnotes


2 Out of 195 films produced in Turkey in 1979, 131 were based on sex. Agah Özgüç: Türlerle Türk Sinemasý [Turkish Cinema Genres]. Istanbul: Dînya Kitaplarý, 2005: 150.

3 Two leading sources for discussion on arapesh culture are: Martin Stokes: The Arabesk debate: music and musicians in modern Turkey. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992 and Meral Özbek: “Arabesk Culture: A Case of Modernization and Popular Identity.” In Sibel Bozdoğan, Reşat Kasaba (eds) Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey. Seattle: University of Washington Press: 1997, 211-232. Late seventies are considered to be the end of the ‘Yeşilçam’ era of the sixties, when Turkey had a strong film industry with about 200 films a year. Sex comedies and ‘arapesh’ films are often seen as the main culprits behind the public’s shying away from the theaters.

4 Considering these were more adult fare such as ALL THE PRESIDENT’S MEN (Pakula, 1976), THE DEEP (Yates, 1977) and THE DEER HUNTER (Cimino, 1979); my parents would have been hard-pressed to find suitable entertainment for their children.

5 In 1941, 1948, 1952, and 1966, respectively.


11 I found out later that Superman had literally become a part of the Turkish film culture already in the sixties. See the following adaptations / remakes: SÜPERMEN FANTOMA’YA KARÞI [SUPERMAN VS. FANTOMA] (Kayahan Arýkan, 1969), SÜPERMEN GELÝÞÝR [SUPERMAN IS COMING] (Volkan Kayaýhan, 1972), SÜPERMENLER [SUPERMEN] (Italo Martinenghi, 1979) and SÜPERMEN DÖNÝÞÝR [SUPERMAN RETURNS] (Kunt Tulgar, 1979); where the latter predates its Hollywood namesake by 27 years.


14 Carson is British, Forster is Swiss, Luketic is from Australia and Tsui is from Hong Kong.

1. Starting Out: Definitions, Paradigms and Patterns

This project about directorial talent in Hollywood starts out with an analytical question. The initial goal is to see how we can position this blockbuster-era global talent within a wider historical context of ‘émigré’ directors in Hollywood. I have set off to answer this question through the analysis of the data I have collected. However, while considering various answers, I noticed that a second, more complex issue had arisen: What does the flow of this talent tell us about cinema in the globalized world, especially vis-à-vis the positions of Hollywood and various national cinemas? In the following pages, I will extend my inquiry by also examining the relationship between Hollywood and its ‘other’ as well as emerging patterns in world cinema in relation to filmmakers. My use of the word ‘global’ directors instead of ‘émigré’ or even ‘foreign’ is deliberate, due to a number of reasons. I will not employ the term ‘émigré’, since I aim to distinguish my work from the research done about the earlier generation of filmmakers who emigrated to the US in the 1930s and the early 1940s, also because ‘émigré’ connotes an act of relocating for good, and leaving the old country behind. Many of the directors, especially in the post-1975 era, have chosen to move between countries. The use of ‘foreign’ to describe these filmmakers has been quite common in the last decades. After all, many film professionals work on films in Hollywood, outside of their nation of origin, and to do so, they need a special permit to enter and work in the US, as I will describe below. Nonetheless, while the filmmakers I am concerned with are initially identified by their nationality as ‘foreign’, I will demonstrate that this foreignness does not go beyond a basic preliminary identification.

Aliens of Extraordinary Ability

While the concepts of my topic may appear to be simple, it is nonetheless worthwhile to start by clarifying my terms and definitions. The directors in question here are those who hold the nationality of a country other than the US. Admittedly, I was unable to research the current nationality status of every director involved, so I have included every filmmaker who was born and raised outside of the US. Some of these have later become US citizens, or hold dual citizenship. Essentially, my categorization is one that hinges on the question of nationality and citizenship. Hence, directors with famed roots outside the States, such as the Italian-Americans Martin Scorsese and Francis Ford Coppola are not a part of this research. I am interested in filmmakers who have had to obtain a visa permit to enter the US in order to make films. ‘Aliens of extraordinary ability’ is the official term used by the US Immigration Services for people “with extraordinary ability in the sciences, arts, education, business, or athletics which has been demonstrated by sustained national or international acclaim and whose achievements have been recognized in the field through extensive documentation”. This definition will apply to the objects of this study as well. However, whether these directors really are ‘aliens’ in terms of being alien and therefore foreign to the Hollywood style of filmmaking presents a different issue. As I have just pointed out, I believe that the distinction between
1948, the Paramount decision by the US Supreme Court demanded that the vertical control exercised by the studios over rights of production, distribution and exhibition be dismantled. This court decision was the result of a long struggle by the independent exhibitors and the US government to end the monopolistic practices employed by the majors. All major studios were required to divest themselves of their exhibition arms, which were their profit centers. To face the diminishing profits, studios geared towards fewer productions, which led to a bigger change in the system. Filmmaking personnel was no longer on a payroll; individual projects were put together by producers and brokered through agents, slowly changing the power structures in the industry. ‘New’ waves in European cinema, led by Neorealism in Italy, and technical advancements facilitating location shoots added momentum to these changes. In the 1950s, blacklistig practices caused by theHUAC (House Committee on Un-American Activities) prosecutions and the growing popularity of television left the American film industry in a difficult position. One should note that while these factors are heterogeneous, ranging from economic to political and aesthetic, their combination entirely transformed the filmmaking landscape in Hollywood.

It was only in the 1970s that the studios started to return to their glory days, thanks not only to the lucrative blockbusters they released, but also to acquisition activities by large media conglomerates. While there have been various changes in the industry, primarily related to new technologies such as home theater systems or digitalization, this period of the blockbuster is still ongoing in terms of industry structures.

I aim to discern what is unique to this time period, to see what forces are at play and how they interact. This is not an arbitrary selection. The results of my empirical analysis show an increase in foreign directors starting from the mid-1970s. This rise is intensified by two sharp increases, in 1989-90 and 1996-97. I will be discussing these figures later in this chapter.

The seemingly simpler question, ‘What is Hollywood?’ is one that will not be easily answered. What Hollywood entails and how it functions is too complex an area to be reduced to a passing reference. Although Hollywood and the American film industry are used interchangeably since the mid-1920s, not all the studios have American ownership. The Australian media mogul Rupert Murdoch’s News Corporation started this trend in 1985, when he acquired Twentieth Century Fox. The last stand-alone studio was MGM, which was purchased also by Sony in the summer of 2005. Warner Bros. is a subsidiary of Time Warner Inc., whose chairman stated in 2000: “We do not want to be viewed as an American company.

’native’ and ‘foreign’ are no longer clear categorizations when it comes to studying Hollywood, thus I will prefer using ‘global’ as the key adjective in my discussions of the filmmakers in question. I will demonstrate throughout these pages that Hollywood is no longer a national cinema - and it is debatable if it ever has been, and notions of emigration no longer apply to ‘foreign’ talent in Hollywood. If Hollywood is indeed a global and transnational cinema, one should not even talk of ‘foreign’ talent, since Hollywood cannot be construed as the total other, and “since so much of any nation’s film culture is implicitly ‘Hollywood’”. Hence, the use of ‘foreign’ in this book will be mostly in relation to the discussions of earlier generations, and will be replaced with ‘global’ in contemporary debates.

While not only directors, but talent from all sections of the film industry have chosen to work for Hollywood, I have chosen to focus on directors alone. This is not a decision made solely on auteuristic convictions. In the early days of Hollywood, directors, apart from a few exceptions, were seen more as technicians who would fulfill the vision of the studio and the producer. With the fall of the studio system, producers had to become more involved with dealmaking and retreat from the actual production process, while directors filled their void. Although the director is largely regarded as the leading creative force behind a project, his/ her control over production is fragile. Additionally, in a Hollywood studio project, there are so many steps leading up to the green lighting, many of the creative choices are already made before the director comes on board and the actual production process begins. In certain cases, what the directors do provide is their name, for marketing purposes of the film. Although Hollywood studios may tend to import famous names, these names tend to get blurred after their arrival; and furthermore, many of the directors are not well-known directors who are famous before they start working for Hollywood, like Woo, Emmerich, or Verhoeven, are the names everyone remembers, overshadowing dozens of other, lesser-known directors. It is quite interesting to note that while very few directors have been promoted with their national backgrounds, most directors’ nationality is never brought into the spotlight. The existing literature on flows of foreign directors, as I will discuss briefly, provides me with a structure, although it is wanting in various aspects. Looking at directors specifically will not only provide me with a historical consistency and a framework, but it will also question the very nature of the position of directors. Additionally, categorization of directors by nationality will challenge the straightforward definitions of citizenship. Films are also often categorized by their nationality, which is in part defined by the nationality of their directors, but this task has proven to become increasingly difficult in the age of co-productions and transnational corporations, as I will examine shortly.

To narrow my focus, I have chosen to concentrate on the period after the mid-1970s, what some scholars have termed the ‘New Hollywood’. In terms of corporate structures, this is the Hollywood of blockbusters, of mergers and acquisitions, and of giant media conglomerates. In terms of style, this is the post-classical, post-fordist, global Hollywood. In the post-WWII era, Hollywood studios, which had formed an invincible oligopoly from the 1920s on, faced a number of challenges. To begin with, the labor strike of 1945 resulted in a 25% increase in wages the following year, directly increasing costs. Taxes levied upon American films first in Hollywood’s largest overseas market, Britain, were followed by taxes in other countries, resulting in a steep decline of revenues. Even more crucially, in
We think globally.

Similarly, but to a smaller extent, during the second half of the 1990s, Korean business conglomerates (chaebols) like Samsung, Daewoo and SK have invested in independent production companies based in Hollywood in return for exclusive distribution rights in Korea. In view of these changes, Hollywood no longer equals American, at least at the level of ownership. Therefore, I will refrain from using ‘Hollywood’ and ‘American film industry’ interchangeably for the period discussed in this thesis, namely from the mid-1970s on. While an American film industry does consist for the large part of Hollywood companies and is centralized there, Hollywood goes beyond the US and spreads across the globe. One also needs to keep in mind that the discussions in this book will revolve around the transnational nature of Hollywood production. Distribution of these products is often done through studios themselves or their subsidiaries. Among the leading distribution companies is United Pictures International (UPI), jointly owned by Paramount and Universal, based in London, with offices in 26 countries, representation in 23 others, and business involvement in nearly 200 other countries.

That the exhibition of these films is also global hardly needs any explanation. The terms ‘studios’ or ‘majors’ are also frequently used in the same sense as Hollywood. The word studio in its most simple sense means “a place where motion pictures are made”. And while there are a large number of studios in and around Hollywood, this term has been closely associated with the major studios that have been producing the films with the high production values that are now expected of Hollywood. As Ben Goldsmith and Tom O’Regan put forth in their study of contemporary international studios, a ‘Hollywood studio’ now refers not to the physical plant but to the ‘command and control’ distribution and financing operations of the major studios. These major studios, ownership of some of whom have discussed above, are the members of Motion Pictures Association of America (MPAA), the leading trade organization founded in 1922. While mergers and acquisitions frequently reshape the proprietary landscape, the members at the present time are: Walt Disney Company, Sony Pictures Entertainment, Inc., Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Inc., Paramount Pictures Corporation, Twentieth Century Fox Film Corp., Universal Studios, Inc., and Warner Bros. According to Allen J. Scott, the production system of Hollywood now consists of three tiers. In addition to the majors and the independent production companies, there is also an “intermediate circle of companies as represented by the majors’ own subsidiaries combined with independents allied to the majors”. For the purposes of this thesis, ‘working in Hollywood’ means making a film that is being produced by a production company from any of these three tiers. While most global directors work for the majors or their subsidiaries, there have been occasions of smaller independent films directed by a global filmmaker. Nonetheless, even these smaller films are distributed worldwide by distribution arms of Hollywood studios.

As Tom O’Regan argues, Hollywood is “[s]imultaneously, [...] a national film industry; an international film financing, production and distribution facility; and a name for globally popular English-language cinema”. Working in / with / for Hollywood does not necessarily mean working physically in Southern California. Hollywood studios make films across the globe, and directors who become a part of this world work wherever the production takes place. Hence, another question arises: does working in Hollywood also mean working for the American film industry? Especially since the mid-1970s, when major studios started being acquired by transnational media corporations, it has become almost impossible to call Hollywood films ‘American’. Jonathan Rosenbaum asserts in an essay about the European filmmakers Verhoeven and Emmerich, that blockbusters, the identifying products of Hollywood, stopped being American some time between Star Wars (George Lucas, 1977) and ihnen (1979). He argues that while American pop cinema used to be an American product, by the 1990s, “it belong[ed] mainly to global markets and overseas investors, and because so-called ‘American cinema’ is the brand name that sells best in those markets and for those investors, that’s what it says on the label”. He continues that what’s inside this ‘American’ package has an identity that “is multinational, not national”.

Similarly, Frederick Wasser argues that Hollywood studios “ceased to be institutions of national culture” around the mid-1970s. He points out that long before Japanese corporations started buying American studios, European producers like Dino De Laurentiis, Arnon Milchan and Mario Kassar produced films in Hollywood, with largely European money. These were “Hollywood” pictures independent of American companies and of American financing. Because these were ‘event’ films, blockbusters with enormous budgets, they needed to do well not only in the US market, but globally. Wasser calls this the transnationalization of Hollywood, borrowing the term from Danish media scholar Preben Sepstrup. According to Sepstrup, ‘international flow’ and ‘transnationalization’ need to be distinguished from one another. To quote Wasser, “[t]ransnationalization is the first order effect of the international flow on the production, supply and consumption of the messages”.

Yet others praise Hollywood for having become a global aesthetic, reckoning its “transnational appeal” to this quality. I agree with Rosenbaum and others that Hollywood in the blockbuster era is no longer purely American, but multinational, and even transnational. In my discussion, I will prefer to employ the term ‘transnational’. Transnational corporations have been defined by the United Nations in relation to four criteria: size, oligarchic nature, a large number of foreign subsidiaries and branch offices, and origins in the developed countries. As far as alternative terms go, multinational implies “the economic interests of several countries are involved as equal partners”, and international also implies “equal principles based on internationalism”, both of which are rare in reality. Hence, also considering that the media conglomerates which now own Hollywood studios are transnational corporations, and that Hollywood has always employed talent from around the globe and does increasingly so, it is plausible to call Hollywood a transnational cinema. Aihwa Ong elaborates on the meaning of ‘trans’, which denotes both a movement and a change. She argues that “transnationality also alludes to the transversal, the transnational, the translational, and the transgressive aspects of contemporary behavior and imagination that are incited, enabled, and regulated by the changing logics of states and capitalism.” Likewise, global directors traverse borders and translate between cultures; they transgress the boundaries set by their original filmmaking environments to reach greater audiences.
While the definitions of transnational cinema have often limited it to “the films of diasporic subjects living in cosmopolitan First World cities”, co-productions and crossovers between film industries are also termed transnational throughout the literature. I believe that despite the current connotations of the term, “transnational cinema” is also, if not more suitably, applicable to Hollywood. In the introduction to their comprehensive transnational cinema reader, Elizabeth Ezra and Terry Rowden define the transnational as “the global forces that link people or institutions across national borders” and assert that it comprises globalization, “in cinematic terms, Hollywood’s domination of world film markets”.

The authors call attention to the role of the transnational as a category in recognizing the hybridity of many of New Hollywood’s products, especially in terms of style. The ubiquitous example Ezra and Rowden use is the influence of Asian martial arts films on Quentin Tarantino’s work. What they fail to mention is that this influence is not only in terms of style. For his Kill Bill films, Tarantino employed the legendary Chinese fight choreographer Yuen Woo-Ping, as well as renowned Chinese martial artist/actor Gordon Liu Chia-hui, and realized a large portion of the production in China.

Andrew Higson also points out that the nature of cinema itself is transnational, both in terms of production and reception. He gives examples of two Hollywood productions from the 1990s, Evita (Alan Parker, 1996) and The English Patient (Anthony Minghella, 1996), whose identities can “be called nothing but transnational”.

The transnational model in sociology is an extension of the global system. Hence I am using ‘transnational’ and ‘global’ largely interchangeably, as suggested by Leslie Sklair. Ulf Hannerz suggests the use of ‘transnational’ instead of ‘global’, since globalization is used “to describe just about any process or relationship that somehow crosses state boundaries”, while “many such processes and relationships obviously do not at all extend across the world”. He argues that ‘transnational’ highlights the fact that states have been replaced by “individuals, groups, movements and business enterprises” as corporate actors. In this sense, transnationality of Hollywood is connected with that of its corporations, managers, producers, filmmakers and agents. Nonetheless, I will favor using ‘global’ in reference to the subjects of this book, taking into account not only the production sites, but also the distribution net cast wide over the globe.

In 2004, the debates surrounding the nationality of a film sparked a significant controversy in France. The film in question was French director Jean-Pierre Jeunet’s Un Long Dimanche de fiançailles (A Very Long Engagement), an adaptation from a French novel, shot in France and in French, with French cast, crew and lab. When the film’s producers applied for financial support, an ‘agreement’, from the Centre National de la Cinémagraphie, they were initially granted one. An agreement is issued to all films with a French or European producer that qualify for the government’s audiovisual support fund, and its criteria are based on a ‘barometer’ system of points assigned by the nationalities of a film’s participants. However, a group of French producers went to court to block the support for the film, and the court ruled that Un Long Dimanche was not a French film, because its French production company 2003 Productions, although based in France, was partly owned by Warner Bros. In addition to the 52% directly owned by Warner France, another 43% of the shares was divided among the senior executives of Warner France. The court ruled that 2003 Productions was created solely “to benefit from [state] financial help even though [the fund] is reserved for the European cinematographic industry”. Around the same time, Oliver Stone’s Alexander (2004) did receive the financial support that was denied to Un Long Dimanche.

Alexander was shot mostly in Morocco, in English, with an international cast and crew. Nonetheless, one of its producers was the French Pathé, its post-production was completed in France, and Oliver Stone has dual citizenship from France and the US, thus holds a French passport. This incident underlines where the nationality of a film matters today: not its cultural content as a reflection of the society, but its funding. A film that scored ninety-nine out of a hundred points on the ‘barometer’ in terms of being French can be at the same time a product of Hollywood.

Nevertheless, the perception of Hollywood as the American national cinema still persists, and it is this perception that places Hollywood at the center of debates around globalization and Americanization. G.O.R.A. (Ömer Faruk Sorak, 2004) is a science-fiction comedy, one of the largest box-office hits in the history of Turkish cinema. After many adventures in space and a love affair with an alien princess, the leading character played by Cem Yılmaz, a Turkish comedian, looks straight at the camera in one of the many self-reflexive moments of the film and says: “American cinema, I’m talking to you! All these years you’ve represented aliens as evil to us. But don’t forget, alien or not, we’re all human!” These lines come towards the end of the film, which mimics and parodies a number of Hollywood blockbusters. The production values of G.O.R.A. are much higher than any other production in the country, and the film clearly emulates the Hollywood style. The above lines, set in a parody of Hollywood films, symbolize the love-hate relationship various national cinemas have with Hollywood. Indeed, the very existence of a national cinema is often defined against the dominance of Hollywood.

I will further discuss various theories concerning what makes Hollywood so popular around the globe, and how other film industries cope with it in the following chapter. However, at this juncture, I would like to examine Hollywood’s history on the basis of its talent influx.

Brief History of Foreign Talent in Hollywood

It is possible to periodize the history of Hollywood through different criteria. One can base it on technological changes, or the transformations in the industry. Since these different criteria also affect one another, the periodizations sometimes share certain milestones. I propose a periodization in terms of the influx of global directing talent coming into Hollywood. Such a periodization, not surprisingly, turns out to be parallel to one made based on the ups and downs of the studios. Roughly, the first period corresponds to the “golden age” of Hollywood, where studios functioned in a vertically integrated system from the early 1910s until the mid-1940s. The second period is ‘the slump’, when the studios were trying to adjust to the new realities brought on by a combination of reasons discussed in the previous section. The final period is the era with which this thesis is concerned, namely the ‘New’ Hollywood era starting in the mid-1970s, and also identified in the previous chapter.

Looking at the earliest days of American cinema, before there were any established directors to speak of, one must first consider the ‘founding fathers’ of Hollywood, the entrepreneurs who founded the studios. A very large majority of these businessmen were East European Jews who had emigrated to the US as children or teenagers. Carl Laemmle, who founded Universal Pictures, came to
New York from Germany at the age of seventeen. William Fox was born as Wilhelm Fried in Hungary, then went into the business of film exhibition in New York. Adolf Zukor from Paramount Pictures emigrated from Hungary to Chicago, founders of the future Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Samuel Goldwyn (né Goldfisch) from Poland, Louis B. Mayer, Nicholas and Joseph Schenck from Russia, Marcus Loew from Austria. Sometimes called the ‘inventors’ of Hollywood, these producers opted to make their own backgrounds invisible, by making their films visibly ‘American’. In a way, they are also reminiscent of Joe Shuster and Jerry Siegel, the two young friends, both children of Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe, who created Superman.

The large studios have seen Europe as a hotbed for fresh talent starting from the 1920s. Even earlier, one of the greatest future directors, the British Charles Chaplin, was snatched from his touring vaudeville company in 1914. Ufa, the heart of the German film industry, was where the producers looked primarily for new talent. Germany had the largest film industry in Europe, and was the only one that could possibly challenge Hollywood. The high inflation and the volatile financial markets at the end of WWI made it possible for the German production companies to produce films very cheaply. High-level executives of the American studios made frequent trips to Europe for ‘trophy-hunting’, as Fritz Lang called them. These hunts served two purposes: one, to make American pictures more popular worldwide, and two, to diminish Germany’s strength in the film industry. It helped that in the mid-1920s, when the national economy started to expand, the German film industry was faced with a major financial crisis. The American studios put the market in an even tighter spot by flooding the German market with their films. On the brink of bankruptcy, Ufa was forced to accept the four million dollar loan offered by Paramount and MGM. In exchange, these studios owned all cooperation rights with Ufa, covering production, exhibition and most importantly for the purposes of this book, personnel. The Panufnét agreement, named after the studios involved, was signed in early 1926 and was clearly to the advantage of its American partners.

By the end of the year, Ufa’s losses had reached twelve million dollars. The trophy hunts and Panufnét agreement resulted in the first big wave of European personnel in Hollywood.

One of the facilitating factors for the move of the Ufa directors was the German producer Erich Pommer, who was active in Hollywood already between 1926-27. As a German Jew, Pommer was to be forced to leave Germany for good in the following years, and relocate frequently between several European countries and the US. Despite the exceptions of Ernst Lubitsch, and Michael Curtiz (Mihály Kertész), many of the directors who worked in Hollywood as a result of the Panufnét agreement were not able to deliver the success expected of them. Friedrich Wilhelm Murnau passed away at a young age in the US as he was preparing to return to Germany, where Paul Leni lost his life at a similarly young age. Alexander Korda and Lothar Mendes went to the UK, while Ludwig Berger returned to Germany. Ewald André Dupont, who returned to the US in the 1930s because of the war after a brief stint in Europe, never became popular as a director. Around the same time, the ‘founders’ of Scandinavian cinema, Victor Seastrom (Sjöström) and Mauritz Stiller, were also invited to work for American studios. However, by the end of the decade, Seastrom retired himself and Stiller died after directing several run-of-the-mill productions. Jacques Feyder, Pal Fejös and Benjamin Christensen all returned to their native countries as well, France, Hungary and Denmark respectively, after a few years in Hollywood at the end of the 1920s.

In terms of artistic freedom and the success (or lack thereof) of these directors in the US, it would be rather confining to limit the explanation for their failure to the opposing binaries of Hollywood / European styles of filmmaking and to argue that after possessing absolute freedom in Europe, they were oppressed in the American studio system. Nonetheless, one could argue that these directors, invited to Hollywood on the strength of the films they made in Europe, were expected to remain European and be ‘exotic’ on the one hand, while adapting to the norms and expectations of the American studios. These ‘temporary’ residents of Hollywood are often neglected in accounts of foreign talent, which often focus on Germans before and during WWII.

The rather large number of directors flowing from Europe to Hollywood is an indication that the ‘émigré paradigm’ had been flawed to begin with, since it fails to explain the talent movement within these earlier generations, as well as in the later generations. A significant aspect of the international movement is the accompanying personnel alongside the filmmakers. Popular European stars were desirable assets for Hollywood studios, and certain directors were considered to be capable of delivering these stars. Elsaesser notes that Lubitsch brought along Emil Jannings as well as Pola Negri, whereas Mauritz Stiller was responsible for Greta Garbo’s arrival to Hollywood. Less visible than the stars, nonetheless, more significant, were the producers. Erich Pommer’s role as a facilitating factor has already been mentioned in the previous pages. His “vast network of contacts and incessant travels” in France, England and the US enabled many German filmmakers to move beyond Germany. Similarly, it was Pommer’s predecessor at UFA, Paul Davidson, who helped Lubitsch get to Hollywood. Paul Kohner, another European hired by Laemmle in 1920, worked as a supervising producer in a number of films directed by fellow Europeans for Universal. He later became an agent and was instrumental for the careers of many of the émigrés in Hollywood during the 1930s and 1940s. The importance of the producers cannot be overestimated; while the power structures evolved in Hollywood, their role evolved, but never diminished. As I will demonstrate in the following chapters, to this day, producers are key players in international talent flows.

While the focus was on German and Scandinavian filmmakers during the 1920s, the initial group of political émigré filmmakers arrived in Hollywood within the same decade. These directors, often neglected in film history, left their country for reasons just as political as the later, more famous Western European émigrés. They are the Russian refugee directors who came to the US via Europe in the second half of the 1920s. Having fled from Russia to Paris and Berlin, these filmmakers kept their belief that the Bolsheviks were to be defeated one day. In this regard, they aimed to shelter their culture in Hollywood, for as long as it would take to return to their homeland. Obviously, this remained an unfulfilled dream. Russian directors such as Richard Boleslavski, Fyodor Otsep and Dimitri Buchovetski adapted to their new land, even modifying the classically tragic endings of their films to the happy endings preferred by Hollywood. This extended even to an Anna Karenina script worked on by Buchovetski, where Anna appeared to be actually dreaming that she jumped in front of the train.

The switch from silent film to sound, at around the same time as the first big
wave of Europeans hit Hollywood, was less influential for the directors from abroad than it was for the actors. In fact, several directors, including Warner Bros.’ imports from Germany, William Dieterle and Günther von Fritsch, were specifically hired to direct foreign-language versions of American films, aimed at the foreign markets. Before the advent of technology for subtitled and dubbing, the same script and sets were used to shoot various versions of a film in several different languages. These were called multiple language versions (MLVs), and although the practice was abandoned after a few years, many of these MLV directors remained in Hollywood. However, Hollywood was not the only location where the studios produced MLVs. In 1930, Paramount purchased the Gaumont-St. Maurice studios at Joinville near Paris and quickly equipped them for sound production. Joinville became the primary location for European MLVs, producing the same script by different crews in up to 14 languages. Paramount’s financial troubles in the US and the move towards subtitled and dubbing cut the studio’s French involvement short. Nonetheless, Joinville can be considered one of the earliest examples of a substantial overseas investment for a major studio, anticipating the current situation, wherein Twentieth Century Fox owns studios in Australia and Mexico, and Sony Pictures Entertainment has “motion picture operations” worldwide, including “Columbia Pictures Film Production Asia in Hong Kong, Columbia Films Producciones Espanolas in Madrid, Columbia Pictures Producciones México in Mexico City and operations in the United Kingdom, Brazil and Japan.”

The second large wave of directors to arrive in Hollywood during the heyday of the studios headed West following the Nazi party’s (NSDAP) seizure of power in Germany in 1933. Still, one should keep in mind that although these directors left Germany, Austria, and in the later years, France, the Netherlands for political reasons and to flee from war, some of these names probably would have come to Hollywood even if there had been no different political climate. For instance, Fritz Lang fled Germany right after being offered to cooperate with the Nazi regime, but when he signed his deal with David O. Selznick in 1934, he was aware that there were other producers interested in him, and was likely to arrive in the US at some point in his career. Alfred Hitchcock, possibly the most famous foreigner of the later years, came to Hollywood after the start of the war in Europe. Nonetheless, when he visited America in 1938, it was quite clear that he would accept Selznick’s offer of four films, and his delay was caused largely by administrative rather than political troubles.

Nonetheless, to this day, when one talks of ‘émigré directors’, it is frequently assumed that one is referring to this second wave. Among the first to arrive was Billy Wilder, then just an aspiring scriptwriter. He became the iconic figure of these directors for his Jewish roots, early arrival, and subsequent success. Fred Zinnemann, who is often included in the émigré groups, arrived in the US as early as 1929 in order to find work as a cameraman. Following the pioneers such as Lang and Otto Preminger throughout the 1930s were Robert Siodmak, Curtis Bernhardt, John Brahm and Wilhelm Thiele. This entire group had already left Germany and came to the US via Paris. Having waited in Paris for the conditions to return back to ‘normal’, and initially having no intention of emigrating to the US, these directors can be seen as the ‘true’ political émigrés. The latest group included Reinhold Schünzel, Frank Wisbar and Douglas Sirk from Germany, and Max Ophuls, Jean Renoir and René Clair from France. Most Germans and Austrians arriving at this time acquired American citizenship. While Sirk’s name became synonymous with classical Hollywood melodramas, Preminger made his fame with films involving the social problems of his new homeland. The French on the other hand, considered themselves to be in exile and made films aiming to support their fatherland from afar. As expected, they returned to France after 1945, but never again could achieve the status they had had before the war. Fritz Lang also went back to Germany in the late 1950s to direct several films, but eventually returned to Los Angeles. Although most of the directors who had arrived in the US before and during the war remained there afterwards, the period between WWII and the mid-1970s was the most barren for global directors going to work in Hollywood. On the contrary, a reverse stream was started by Joseph Losey, who moved to Britain to avoid the blacklisting. Richard Lester and in later years, Stanley Kubrick were other directors who left the US. Opportunities provided by British studios and the internationalization of film production during these decades resulted in many American directors preferring Europe as their shooting location. Some of these émigré directors had already had great influence on the European film culture during this period, even before working in Europe again. Authors of *Cahier du Cinema*, birthplace of ‘la politique des auteurs’ in the 1950s, had canonized a number of Hollywood directors, including Europeans such as Lang, Wilder, Preminger and Hitchcock. The concept of director as the artist, reserved for European ‘art’ films until then, was thereby adapted to directors of the studio system, whose films were openly cited by the directors of Nouvelle Vague. In the later decades of European film movements, it has been argued that the directors of the New German Cinema adopted Hollywood directors such as Murnau, Lang, Wilder, Preminger and Hitchcock. The concept of director as the artist, reserved for European ‘art’ films until then, was hereby adapted to directors of the studio system, whose films were openly cited by the directors of Nouvelle Vague. In the later decades of European film movements, it has been argued that the directors of the New German Cinema adopted Hollywood directors such as Murnau, Lang, Wilder, Preminger and Hitchcock. The concept of director as the artist, reserved for European ‘art’ films until then, was hereby adapted to directors of the studio system, whose films were openly cited by the directors of Nouvelle Vague.
Brambilla, in their transfers to the US, and is still active in both advertising and filmmaking. During the same period, famed names of European ‘art cinema’ such as Ken Russell and Richard Attenborough from Europe joined the Hollywood fold. Russell directed BLOW UP (1966), ZABBIESKE POINT (1970), and THE PASSENGER (1975); Attenborough directed SHERPENT’S EGG (1970). In this case, it was Ponti who played the European facilitator.

This brings us to New Hollywood; the third, and continuing era in terms of filmmaker traffic towards Hollywood. The enormous popularity of Steven Spielberg’s JAWS in 1975 is frequently seen as a milestone for the ‘blockbuster era’, characterized by huge productions and substantial investments in promoting these films. The massive amounts of capital required for blockbusters could only be afforded by large studios. The box-office success of blockbuster completed the circle, bringing the studios back to their former glory days. And by the rebirth of the studios, talent from all over the world started flowing into Hollywood once again.

**Talent Flows in ‘New’ Hollywood**

There are several characteristics identifying these post-1975 flows. Firstly, in the earlier years, a large portion of these directors came from the UK, as a continuation of the 1960s and the early 1970s. Britain had always been the major foreign market for Hollywood, until Japan became a major player in the last few years. The common language and Anglo-Saxon culture have resulted in British being viewed almost as an extension of the American film industry, starting from the early 1920s. From 1916 on, the percentage of Hollywood films screened in British cinemas has never been below 50%, frequently exceeding 90%. In the 1960s, Britain became the ‘mod’ with aid from The Beatles and James Bond, but this popularity was less a reason for studios’ shooting in the UK than were the affordable production conditions in the new British studios. In 1966, 75% of the production financing in Britain came from Hollywood companies, and this number reached 90% the following year. As a result, the bonds between the two industries, already strong, continued growing and paved the way for the ‘British invasion’ in the late 1970s and the early 1980s.

Famous names from the advertising industry, Alan Parker, Hugh Hudson, Adrian Lyne and Ridley Scott were already anticipating invitations from Hollywood in the late 1970s. David Puttman, the producer whose name is often mentioned together with these directors, has become a key figure for this group because of the international productions he put together and his brief stint as the chairman and CEO at Columbia Pictures. Parker and Lyne directed their feature debut in Hollywood, where they had been invited by the studios, whereas R. Scott had only directed one feature in Britain before his arrival in the US. Mike Newell and John Irvin, both with television backgrounds, also directed their first feature films in Hollywood. In the following years, R. Scott founded his own production company, helping other European directors, including his brother Tony Scott and Marco Brambilla, in their transfers to the US, and is still active in both advertising and filmmaking. During the same period, famed names of European ‘art cinema’ such as Ken Russell and Richard Attenborough from Britain, Louis Malle from France and Wim Wenders from Germany also worked on various projects in Hollywood. This should not come as a surprise if one remembers the similar pattern in the 1920s, when importing ‘arty’ directors from Europe was a source of prestige for the studios. What is surprising, however, is that the studios had now become willing to import directors who had made their fame only through advertisement films, with no feature film success to their credit. This is indeed one of the major changes in transferring talent to ‘new’ Hollywood. Although the practice is essentially the same, fresh blood needs to be found and snatched as quickly as possible, at least before the next studio gets their hands on it. In the 1980s and the 1990s, music video directors joined these advertising directors, along with directors whose short films or feature debuts had created a stir in festival circles.

Another differentiation in recent years is that the source for new talent is no longer limited to Europe and now covers nearly the entire globe. While there was no flow towards Hollywood from anywhere outside Europe until the 1980s, this was changed by the boom in Australian film industry. Led by Bruce Beresford, Fred Schepisi and Peter Weir, every acknowledged director from Australia has eventually worked in the US. The next shining continent was Asia, which faced a similar pattern. Especially the dominant Hong Kong film industry saw its directors go to Hollywood, either early on (Corey Yuen, John Woo) or after the transfer of sovereignty to China (Hark Tsui, Stanley Tong, Ronny Yu). Although most of these directors did eventually return to Hong Kong, their influence on young American filmmakers is still visible. Lately, Latin American directors, especially the Southern neighbors of Hollywood in Mexico are acquiring their share of Hollywood’s labor globalization: Luis Mandoki, Alfonso Cuarón, Alejandro Gonzalez Îñárritu and Guillermo Del Toro are the leading names who started working for the Hollywood studios.

As I have stated before, talent transfer to Hollywood from other countries is not a new concept. The changes in the last few decades lie in the shortening of directors’ ‘discovery time’ and widening of geographical domain, both natural results of globalization and technological developments. Technology also facilitated directors’ ability to move between continents and alternate between production bases. The distance that separates continents now ranges between only a few hours by plane and none, considering the new communication technologies. Furthermore, films are now frequently shot on locations in numerous different countries. This mobility allows directors such as Michael Apted, Brambilla and Del Toro to work in entirely different styles in almost the same year. Apted does frequent work in Hollywood (NEIL, 1994; EXTREME MEASURES, 1996; ENOUGH, 2002), while continuing his British documentary career with the Up series, as well as filming co-produced projects such as ENEMA (2001) in Britain. After shooting DEMOLITION MAN (1993) and EXCESS LUGGAGE (1997) in Hollywood, Brambilla has focused on advertisements and conceptual art projects. In 2001, Del Toro directed both the sequel to BLADE, and the Spanish production EL ESPINAZO DEL DIABLO. The post-WWII changes within the studio system have also facilitated this mobility. While in the classical studio era the studios had to keep a director on a payroll, or to make multiple-picture deals with filmmakers, they now work on individual projects.
Europeans in Hollywood found “themselves defined as ‘alien’ in Hollywood culture and in turn produce representations often driven to define […] American culture itself as ‘other’.” Morrison applies concepts from Mikhail Bakhtin to cinema, where he argues that through films made by European directors, a “dialogue between Hollywood-as-institution and European art-cinemas” occurs, constituting an “instance of ‘polyglossia’,” where ‘language-codes’ migrate across ‘language systems’. While this may have been true for the time period in question, it is no longer possible to distinctly categorize films by foreign directors as having a different style than that of Hollywood. Quite the opposite, I would like to argue that these films are more typically ‘Hollywood’ than films made by the young independent American directors. Morrison himself notes that the situation may have changed, especially with the influx of directors from areas other than Europe. At this point, there is no study that takes into account all the directorial talent flowing to Hollywood. While my scope may be seen as too wide, I think such a survey is the only way to get a clear picture of talent flows within a globalized Hollywood, moving beyond older paradigms.

While the political émigré narrative is insufficient to explain the talent flows certainly of today, it may have already been inadequate as far back as the silent period. Thomas Elsaesser has reinvestigated why so many talented European filmmakers have ended up in Hollywood starting from the very early days of cinema. Aiming to “complicate the picture” set forth by the political émigré thesis, Elsaesser extends the emigration period backwards to cover those directors from the 1920s, and brings trade and competition into the picture. This is essential for an analysis of the migration flows of recent eras, as the political motives have been practically non-existent since the time when the emigration of directors as the generation of the silent period was still a major phenomenon. Even from the countries that may be considered to be totalitarian regimes, where the state imposes limitations on filmmakers, like China, there has been hardly any ‘émigration’ in a political sense. More recently, Elsaesser has put forward an ‘emulation / émigré’ model, where he proposes that some European, in this case German, directors such as Roland Emmerich and Wolfgang Petersen adopt a Hollywood-like style which makes it possible for them to be noticed by the American studios. He argues that “these directors and directors of photography […] practiced a deliberate and open emulation of Hollywood: their dream was to make films that either found a large popular audience or pleased an American distributor, in order then to set off and emigrate to New York and Los Angeles.” The tendency to mimic Hollywood style is not unique to our times. Kristin Thompson points out that Lubitsch often declared that “he was strongly influenced by Hollywood films”, and that the influence of these Hollywood films in Germany during the first half of the 1920s was often underestimated, even disregarded. Similarly, taking advantage of a German tour Mary Pickford and Douglas Fairbanks were on, Murnau hired Pickford’s cameraman Charles Rosher as an advisor for his next film to be shot in Germany, Faust (1926). Charles Rosher recalled that Murnau would constantly ask questions about how things were done in Hollywood; as a result, Murnau was already fluent in Hollywood style when he was offered a contract by William Fox in 1926.

Other research has frequently been limited to directors from a single country, exemplified by Peter Krämer’s work on German directors. Krämer looks into directors from before and after the émigré generation, thereby providing a wider...
given year started to increase during the mid-1970s and reached a level of at least 6-8 directors a year by the early 1980s.

Nearly all these works continue using the migration discourse. However, my research has shown that the ‘migration’ to Hollywood is not a final one, nor does it always require a physical relocation. Contemporary directors who have moved to the US in order to work in Hollywood can and do return to their home countries to make other films. This has been the case for Alejandro Amenábar, Paul Verhoeven, as well as a number of Hong Kong directors like Ringo Lam, Stanley Tong and Hark Tsui. Even John Woo, the ‘poster boy’ of Asian directors, has returned to China to shoot THE BATTLE OF RED CLIFF, based on an epic battle from 208 AD. There is a change in the flow of talent, a change of origin, which appears not to be sufficiently analyzed in any existing literature. In addition, existing studies are largely focused on individual directors and forego the larger picture. As I have stated earlier, since my analysis is not an auteruristic one, I will pay more attention to general patterns that have arisen during the last decades. This will also highlight the role played by the producers, who have been instrumental throughout the history of talent flows across Hollywood. Below are the primary patterns that my research shows.

Contemporary Patterns

In conducting research, my initial step has been a fundamental one. I have compiled an inventory of all non-American directors working for Hollywood studios during the given time period, as well as of the films they made. To do this, I have surveyed lists of yearly cinematic releases by Hollywood studios and determined the origin of their directors. I have employed a number of online references such as the Internet Movie Database, as well as trade papers like Variety and Hollywood Reporter. Hollywood productions directed by these filmmakers have made up my second inventory, numbered close to eight hundred. Next, I have performed some quantitative analyses on these inventories in terms of the directors’ national and professional backgrounds and the year of their first Hollywood features. These analyses were aimed at finding out how many global directors made their Hollywood debuts, and how many films were made by them at any given year; analyzed further by filmmakers’ origins. In order to obtain these results, I have employed basic analytic tools found in Microsoft Excel such as pivot tables and charts. The results of my analyses have determined the scope of my research, as well as my case studies. Although initially I did not have a specific timeframe in mind, my results revealed that a divide had occurred in the late 1970s. Not surprisingly, this divide coincides with New Hollywood, as well as the increasing globalization of world economy. As seen in Figure 1.1, the number of directors who make their first Hollywood film in
Hollywood for at least several years, and their number accumulated. This resulted in Figure 1.2, which shows the number of films made by global directors in Hollywood each year. This number has increased over the last three decades, occasionally surpassing 80. Out of approximately 450 new films yearly released in the US, about 250 are domestic. In the face of these numbers, the proportion made by global directors is not to be underestimated: it varies roughly between 10-20%. A crucial point one can see through this particular chart is that the number of films made by global directors reaches an all-time high in the late 1990s and stabilizes thereafter. The change in the number of these films is a function of the number of inflowing directors. If all the filmmakers had continued their careers in Hollywood, the number of films made by global directors would continue increasing, assuming they continue making films at their usual pace. This plateau shows us that this is not the case and that there appears to be a large turn-over in the global talent in Hollywood. This outcome is also backed up by specific data.

In terms of their backgrounds, these directors are increasingly diverse, a fact that I had already presumed, but one that became clearly visible once I had compiled my lists. Until the 1970s, Europe was the only source of talent for Hollywood. In Figure 1.3, one can see how the balance has shifted in terms of percentages. I have divided the directors into five categories. The first category is comprised of directors from English-speaking countries that have had traditionally strong ties to the American film industry: mostly UK, but also Ireland and Canada. This category has always provided Hollywood with the largest number of talent, due to their ties and their linguistic affinity. These three countries have also been on the receiving end of many runaway productions, making it even easier for filmmakers today to cross over to Hollywood. In the second category are the Europeans, who have also had relatively strong ties with the majors since the silent days of cinema. These are followed by filmmakers from Australia and New Zealand, where one can see a significant increase in the early 1980s, immediately following the ‘boom’ of the Australian film industry. The last two categories, Asian and Latin American directors, start becoming visible already in the 1980s, but the noteworthy influx happens after the mid-1990s, when Asian filmmakers, followed by Latin American filmmakers, started garnering accolades at film festivals around the world. The fact that the national backgrounds of these directors are now so varied, along with the changed structure of Hollywood indicate that the keyword to be examined in this context should be globalization, and how it influences and is shaped by Hollywood.

Compared with this geographical diversity, however, the lingual diversity is less observable. Figure 1.4 shows that directors from English-speaking countries form a clear majority among filmmakers transferred to Hollywood. Similarly, one can see in Figure 1.5 that almost every year, more than half of the Hollywood films made by global filmmakers are helmed by directors whose native language is English. This also indicates that a higher rate of the English-speakers continue working in Hollywood, compared to directors from non-English speaking countries.
put projects together bringing in European directors, working often with filmmakers such as Paul Verhoeven, Adrian Lyne, Alan Parker, and George Cosmatos. More recently, Mike DeLuca who is known for “taking chances on no-names and first-timers” has consistently worked with global directors during his tenure at New Line. Harvey and Bob Weinstein, founders of Miramax, one of the most influential distribution and production companies in the last decades, have also played a pivotal role in terms of talent flows. Initially a specialized art house and foreign language films distributor, Miramax opened the US market to a number of European and Asian films. Their first foreign film Oscar, for the Danish PELLE THE CONQUEROR (Bille August, 1987), was immediately followed with the great success of MY LEFT FOOT (Jim Sheridan, 1989). After being purchased by Disney in 1993, Miramax started producing films as well, often working with international directors. Even though the Weinstein brothers have often been accused of interfering with the films they distribute or produce, they have also been powerful facilitators of filmmakers’ mobility.

Agents play a similar part in terms of building projects and networks, but are less visible. A classical example is Paul Kohner, who has already been mentioned as a producer in the 1920s, and founded his own Kohner Productions. ... the 1930s and 1940s, there was hardly a renowned European film artist who was not a part of the “Kohner family.” It was Paul Kohner who allowed Max Ophuls to obtain a US visa and a French exit visa by cabling him a non-committal, yet still sufficiently convincing offer. Among the directors included in my study, nearly all who still work for Hollywood have an agent representing them. Out of the 143 global directors who do have agents, 85% are represented by one of the five major agencies: CAA (Creative Artists Agency), ICM (International Creative Management), WMA (William Morris Agency), Endeavor and United Talent Agency. Certain names are repeated, however, and the fact that these names have signed more than one director from the same country on various occasions seems to point at the effectiveness of networking in Hollywood. For example, Robert Newman at ICM is known for his ability to spot talent early. He has brokered deals with studios for his clients, most of whom were known widely in Hollywood at the time he started working with them. These include Jean-Pierre Jeunet, Danny Boyle, Alex Poyas and Lee Tamahori. Another one of his clients, Baz Luhrmann, argues that Newman “directly contributed to the phenomenon of outsiders being able to tap into Hollywood’s resources in order to make the films they want.” Similarly, John Pulk at CAA represented Ridley Scott, Tony Scott, Peter Weir and Bruce Beresford among others at the beginning of their Hollywood careers. As Michael Storper also notes, despite its similarities to other industries in economic terms, film production functions differently, relying heavily on “interpersonal relational networks and conventional reputations.” Even if the directors are not physically present in Hollywood, these agents stand for their presence.

Conclusion

With the current number of global directors working in Hollywood and the present rate of mobility, it is quite a challenge to come up with a single model that explains everything. Of the two major existing paradigms I have presented above, the political émigré paradigm supported by studies limited to...
have already demonstrated. Nevertheless, its current transnationality extends to ownership, production (including pre- and post-), distribution, exhibition and reception. Within this global network, filmmakers are more analogous to mobile human capital employed by transnational corporations than they are to ‘émigré’ directors of the earlier decades. In the following chapter, I will be looking at Hollywood and the role of the directors within it, taking into account Hollywood’s interactions with the other film industries of the world.

Global talent flow towards Hollywood has always had rather clear reasons. Hollywood offers them more possibilities, financial and otherwise. This means not only higher fees, but larger production and marketing budgets. Even in Germany, where there is an established film (or at least television-) industry, directors complain about the low pay they receive in their home country. Majors can also provide the filmmakers with more advanced technologies, access to world-famous stars, and a possibility to reach much larger audiences through their globally supplied and locally established distribution networks. In return, the directors are expected to make films that earn well and to play the game by the rules.

Hollywood wants and needs the global talent for a number of reasons. Clearly, human capital, no matter of what nationality, is desirable for producing high-quality output in entertainment industries. For the studios, the rational path of action has often been hiring directors who have already demonstrated a full grasp of the Hollywood style, as suggested by the emulation model. Hollywood has another motivation in importing talent: it has been to weaken the various local film industries that can pose a threat, a practice dating back to the 1920s and the German and Swedish industries. An added advantage to employing global talent is in servicing the local markets of the filmmakers’ native countries. In the 1920s, this was achieved through employing directors like Dieterle and von Fritsch to film German-language versions of Hollywood pictures, aimed at the German markets. Currently, studios’ interest in East Asian source materials and filmmaking personnel, to be explored in chapter five, can be explained through the substantial Japanese market and potentially enormous Chinese market.

As I said at the beginning, my aim is to (re)conceptualize the international flow of directors towards Hollywood. Through the analyses in the following chapters, I hope to expose the complex nature of contemporary talent flows. Tim Bergfelder has argued that “the influence of exile and immigration have been readily acknowledged as essential to the multicultural composition of Hollywood”. It may have been acknowledged, but I believe that it has not been sufficiently examined. It is time we go beyond the ‘émigré directors’ clichés and look at this phenomenon on a truly global scale. I would now like to return to a concept I introduced in the previous pages, and propose that we look at the ‘global director’ through the lens of transnational structures Hollywood studios have become a part of. Hollywood has always been international, as the examples from the 1920s throughout this chapter
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MPAA), the average negative cost of a film made by its members was US$60 million in 2005. With the marketing costs, this number comes up to almost US$100 million. For more details, see Motion Picture Association: “US Theatrical Market: 2005 Statistics”. 2006.

Oliver Hirschbiegel, director of DER UNTERGANG (2004), quoted in “Geld ist auch ein Argument”. In Der Tagesspiegel, 12.02.2006: 29.

2. Looking at the Bigger Picture: Hollywood and the World

Leading Brazilian director of the 1960s, Glauber Rocha wrote: “Every discussion of cinema made outside Hollywood must begin with Hollywood”. Indeed, as I have discussed in the previous chapter, Hollywood plays a vital role as the signpost against which to define all national cinemas. But where does one begin the discussion of Hollywood itself? Hollywood is not simply a location, as John Ford said over forty years ago: “Hollywood is a place you can’t geographically define. We don’t really know where it is”. Nor is it just a moniker for the American film industry. There have been multiple definitions of what Hollywood is and how it works. To quote another filmmaker, Miloš Forman: “[…] it’s a mistake to regard Hollywood as one entity. Hollywood doesn’t exist – hundreds of Hollywoods exist, and behind every door you’ll find a different Hollywood”. In this chapter, I will first outline the leading discourses of globalization, within which I shall discuss Hollywood. A brief survey of how recent paradigmatic changes in Hollywood have been approached within film studies, as well as different disciplines, will be followed by an investigation of Hollywood’s relationship with other film industries around the world. The chapter will conclude with a discussion of the strategies employed by global directors to access Hollywood and overstep the barriers of entry.

David Hesmondhalgh discusses the major changes that the cultural industries have undergone since the early 1980s in his book, *The Cultural Industries*. One of the most significant changes, as already mentioned, is in the ownership and organization of the cultural industries. Conglomerates that specialize in multiple fields are in competition with each other, but they are also “connected in complex webs of alliance, partnership and joint venture”. Nonetheless, there are more small and medium-sized companies than ever that are in relationship with the larger companies. This point is reflected in Alan J. Scott’s model of the three-tiered Hollywood, which consists of majors, independents, and subsidiaries; as shown in the previous chapter. Hesmondhalgh also highlights the globalization of the cultural industries, pointing at the increased circulation of cultural products across national borders, as well as increased borrowings and adaptations of “images, sounds, and narratives” across cultures. Another change is the in terms of approaching audiences, with “greater emphasis on audience research, marketing and addressing ‘niche’ audiences”. The focus on audiences is a key element of contemporary culture and media environments, and has picked up speed with the spread of the Internet. These defining changes, especially globalization and conglomerization, are tropes that will be the focus of further discussions throughout this book.

Discourses of Globalization

Before I discuss recent theories on Hollywood’s position vis-à-vis globalization, an overview of some of the debates on globalization is in order. While I am concentrating on the culture industries and the media, globalization makes itself felt
equally in the business and finance world, if not more. Financial crises at the end of the 1990s, which started in East Asia in 1997 and then spread to Russia, and later to Latin America, have proven this all too clearly. For better or for worse, global financial systems like the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank and the World Trade Organization (WTO) have led to a greater interaction between the financial systems of individual countries. Transnational corporations (TNCs), including those in the media sector, have become the key players in this process. In their attempt to minimize cost, TNCs often turn to outsourcing, and spread their production bases around the world. Outsourcing is defined as the delegation of non-core operations or jobs from internal production within a business to an external entity that specializes in that operation. Offshore outsourcing is when these operations are delegated to a business in a different country, resulting in the production and sales of a variety of goods and services to be spread around the world. Additionally, TNCs expand their presence across the world via foreign direct investment by opening fully-owned local subsidiaries or international joint ventures.

Theodore Levitt, among the earliest advocates of globalization, spoke of “the liberating and enhancing possibilities of modernity”, and argued that the persistence of national preferences are inefficient, costly and confined. Similarly, taking his cue from Levitt, who says “the earth is flat”, Thomas Friedman claims in his book, *The World is Flat*, that the playing field is now level. He argues that individuals from anywhere in the world, and especially from India, China and the former Soviets, are now able to globalize and become part of a global competitive work force. This sense of globalization’s equalizing qualities is reflected in other globalists’ works as well; for instance, Tyler Cowen remarks that “individuals are liberated from the tyranny of place more than ever before”. According to Cowen, cross-cultural exchange is part of globalization’s nature will “support innovation and creative human energies”. These idealizations of a global and equal work force may hold true to some extent for the transnational capitalist class, “vanguard of corporate executives, globalizing bureaucrats and politicians, globalizing professionals, and consumerist elites” as defined by Leslie Sklair. Nevertheless, the playing field is nowhere near level for the millions of employees performing outsourced tasks across the globe. Offshore outsourcing by the US companies has increased largely for both service and manufacturing industries over the last decade. Offshore outsourcing of information technology (IT) jobs is estimated to be currently around 5%, but it is expected to rise to 30% within the next decade.

There are other concerns regarding globalization, in particular over its homogenizing effects on culture. Among the strongest skeptics of globalization, Benjamin Barber has coined the term ‘McWorld’, arguing that the global corporate culture, rooted in consumption and profit, will lead to a culturally homogenized world. Barber’s point of view is reflected by other critics of globalization, particularly with respect to cultural imperialism. In the 1970s, media scholars like Herbert Schiller expressed concerns about cultural aspects of globalization. Schiller used cultural imperialism to explain how the large multinational corporations of developed countries dominated developing countries, especially in the media. However, the notion of cultural imperialism was criticized on multiple levels in the following decades. The rise of the newly industrialized countries such as the Asian tigers, China, and India, and the proliferation of their cultural products indicates that “the West” or the core countries, including Japan, are no longer in a position to impose their culture on the rest. The cultural component of imperialism is much harder to measure than the economic; and the reception of cultural imports need to be analyzed separately. Furthermore, the creative usages of cultural goods across the globe should not be overlooked. While the TNCs control a large portion of media distributed across the globe, how these media are consumed, and how meaning is created does not necessarily depend on the producers alone. And as Internet usage increases and allows for the free circulation of media in its different forms, including home-made and pirated, cultural imperialism discourses are challenged even further.

**Changing Paradigms of New Hollywood**

It is against this backdrop that I will raise the issue of Hollywood within globalization. In chapter one, I have argued that the rules of the game have changed in Hollywood; hence a new paradigm is needed to look at its foreign talent. These changing rules have already been the subject of scholarly work over the last few years. While Thomas Elsasser in the 1970s referred to the ‘New Hollywood’ of the 1960s as a cinema self-conscious of its heritage and inspired by the European directors, this style of filmmaking was only the initial phase of New Hollywood. Noel King points out that New Hollywood “does not remain the same object across its different critical descriptions” ranging from the “adventurous” filmmaking of the late 1960s and the early 1970s, to the arrival of the “movie brats”, graduates of newly established film schools. I would like to avoid confusion by using Diane Jacobs’ term ‘Hollywood Renaissance’ when referring to the late 1960s and the early 1970s; and reserve New Hollywood for the later era as described below. King contends that the next distinctive moment of New Hollywood begins with the release of *JAWS*, ushering in the blockbuster era, as briefly mentioned in chapter one. New Hollywood in this sense has been initially theorized by Thomas Schatz, who has identified the rise of the blockbuster as “the key to Hollywood’s survival and the one abiding aspect of its postwar transformation”. Following Schatz, Murray Smith defined New Hollywood as a “reorientation and revitalization of the film industry” achieved after 1975, “a return to genre filmmaking. But now marked with greater self-consciousness, as well as supercharged by new special effects, saturation booking, engorged production budgets and, occasionally, even larger advertising budgets’. Elsasser offered a number of key characteristics, identifying “a new generation of directors”, “new marketing strategies”, and “new media ownership and management styles” as the three key elements that make up the New Hollywood.

While there is an abundance of literature on individual films made by New Hollywood, the availability of studies concerned with the structure of the industry are somewhat more limited. In her book *Hollywood in the Information Age*, Janet Wasko identifies New Hollywood through the changes in technologies employed in the entertainment and information industries. These changes also coincide with the conglomeration of media companies, simultaneously strengthening an existing trend towards mergers and acquisitions. Wasko defines Hollywood as “a set of corporations” “at the heart of the entertainment business” not only in the US,
but also in much of the world; and points out that these corporations are transnational conglomerations that are involved in more than just filmmaking activities. Wasko further states that “technological developments, commercial motivations, and globalization trends” have turned Hollywood into “one of the focal points of cultural industries”. While it can be argued that these reasons are inextricable, in this book, I am more interested in the latter two; namely the commercial interests and the effects of globalization in the context of New Hollywood. Other recent scholarly works in film studies have also looked at these two concepts closely together; where the growing international markets for film and related products such as TV productions, DVDs, and merchandising is the fundamental connection. Like Wasko, Tino Balio argues that with the increase in worldwide demand for entertainment, Hollywood entered its age of globalization; ushered in by multiple international mergers brought up in the previous chapter. According to Balio, this increase in demand is a result of multiple factors, such as “economic growth in Western Europe, the Pacific Rim, and Latin America, the end of the Cold War, the commercialization of state broadcasting systems, and the development of new distribution technologies”. Balio locates this globalization process in the 1980s, less than a decade after the beginning of the blockbuster era. Hence, it would be correct to assume that globalization is the next step in the development of New Hollywood.

One of the most influential works on the globalization of Hollywood focuses on the international division of labor as a site of Hollywood’s globalization. In Global Hollywood 2, Toby Miller, Nitin Govil, John McCurrie, Richard Maxwell, and Ting Wang argue that “Hollywood’s 'real' location lies in its division of labor” and that dispersing various stages of production throughout the world is not only how Hollywood is structured, but it is also the source of its continuing domination across the world. Their research is largely based on employment, in terms of both above-the-line and below-the-line labor; but they also discuss the dispersal of shooting locations. They see Hollywood’s globalization more in terms of economic relations, where Hollywood “sells its wares in every nation, through a global system of copyright, promotion and distribution that uses the NICL [New International Division of Cultural Labor] to minimize cost and maximize revenue.” Their discussions often concentrate on their agenda, which is a call for reforms in cultural policy, copyright and marketing. The fundamental question asked in Global Hollywood, whether Hollywood is global, and in what sense, is one of the main issues my book is concerned with; and Global Hollywood’s focus on labor shows parallels with my work. However, Miller et al. are interested in all labor, whereas I am specifically concerned with one portion of above-the-line talent, namely the directors. Their research is a far larger project than my own, but I also believe that in an industry that is almost entirely project-based, where personalities are crucial both in terms of deal-making and marketing, one has to pay special attention to the individuals. I will shortly return to the question of labor within the context of Hollywood.

Defining Hollywood and its position within globalization has recently been a field pursued not only by film scholars, but also by academics from other disciplines. These analyses look at all levels of filmmaking: production, distribution and exhibition. Literary scholar Franco Moretti’s study focuses almost solely on the exhibition aspect of cinema, but provides some useful insights nonetheless. Moretti looks at a ten-year period between 1986-95, charting the international performances of five most successful Hollywood films of each year across the globe. However, as he also admits, his data is limited, and excludes some of the major countries like India, China and Russia. A more significant shortcoming of the analysis is that Moretti does not go into any details in terms of production. This results in some indistinct generalizations in terms of the films’ nationalities, as he uses ‘American’ and ‘Hollywood’ interchangeably, in an age when this is no longer the case. Nonetheless, his observation regarding the diffusion of Hollywood films raises interesting questions, as he shows that different genres are popular in different areas of the world.

Aida Hozic approaches the globalization of Hollywood from a political scientist’s perspective. In her book Hollyworld, she examines the causes of industrial change in Hollywood, and traces these changes through the conflicts between manufacturers (producers) and merchants (distributors and exhibitors). She argues that domination of Hollywood relies largely on owning the channels of distribution and divides Hollywood’s history into three phases: Hollywood in the studio, on location, and in cyberspace. This categorization, although done on somewhat different criteria, corresponds to other histories of Hollywood, where the studio era dominates the industry from the 1910s until the Paramount decree in 1948, followed by a slump in the 1950s and the 1960s in terms of studios, and takes us to New Hollywood. In her periodization, Hollywood has lost its geographical importance starting with the 1960s, when studios’ productions became dispersed across the globe. Hozic argues that the dispersal of ‘manufacturers’ across the world led to the rise of ‘merchants’ in Hollywood, resulting in a strong network of not only distributors and exhibition, but also one of agents and independent producers, ushering in the era of ‘package’ deals. While Hozic’s analysis of Hollywood’s presence and influence over the globe is thorough, her investigation of how the rest of the globe is affecting Hollywood is much more limited, and she appears to consider Hollywood to be a distinctly American industry. Even though she points out that the transnational links among the merchants help them dominate the industry, she limits the discussion of these links mostly to runaway productions.

One discipline that has seen extensive research specifically on Hollywood has been economic geography. While Hollywood as ‘a set of corporations’, to quote Wasko, may be global, Hollywood is also a specific place, and recent books have emphasized its function and value as a location. Some scholars see Hollywood as a typical example of a cluster, defined as “[a] geographically bounded concentration of similar, related or complementary businesses with active channels for business transactions, communication and dialogue that share specialized infrastructure, labor markets, and services and that face common opportunities and threats.” Clustering as a phenomenon has been observed as early as the late nineteenth century, under different names such as agglomeration and geographical concentration. More recently, Michael Porter has conducted extensive research on various local industries that show how clustering works as an effective model of industrialization. It may seem like a contradiction to discuss the global nature of Hollywood alongside its local concentration. Porter argues that since clustering causes constant interaction and therefore increased innovation among firms, companies can make more productive use of their inputs. Companies can “mitigate many input-cost disadvantages through global sourcing” yet maintain their
headquarters within a cluster. What Porter calls “global sourcing” is a euphemism for what Miller et al have termed the New International Division of Labor, as their model is a response and a rebuttal to the cluster model.

Similarly, Michael Storper and Susan Christopherson have also analyzed Hollywood in terms of agglomeration and have developed a model using the ‘flexible specialization’ theory, arguing that Hollywood has successfully made the transition from the mass production system of the studio era to a system of flexible specialization in New Hollywood. This change is analogous to the transition made in other industries, from Fordist to post-Fordist mode of production. Flexible specialized industries are defined by their ability to produce a wide range of products for differentiated markets, by their more flexible division of labor than that of the Fordist system, and by their balancing of competition and cooperation among firms. They argue that after the studio era, Hollywood has survived by turning towards flexible specialization, and when the major studios had to divert their exhibition arms in the 1950s, the industry structure started to change. By the 1970s, many films in Hollywood were being made by independent production companies which subcontracted work to smaller, specialized firms. Since the film industry is largely project-based and “consists of short-term contracts, individual workers experience considerable variation in and uncertainty about the amount of work they are offered”; this uncertainty is a major factor in the agglomeration, since “workers offset the instability of short-term contractual work by remaining close to the largest pool of employment opportunities in the industry”. Similarly, economist Tyler Cowen argues that because of the dynamic nature of film projects, studios “need to assemble a large number of skilled employees on very short notice,” which is why they would “fish for talent in a common, clustered pool.”

Storper and Christopherson show that agglomeration has continued throughout the 1970s and the 1980s, even though the actual filming process has moved largely outside Southern California. Storper concedes that the major studios, and not the smaller independent companies, are still dominant in the industry; and he argues that through flexible specialization and the increase in intermediary firms, the centralization in the industry demonstrates itself largely in distribution activity, and not as much in production. Allen J. Scott continues this tradition to demonstrate that Southern California continues to be “a center for the more creative segments of motion picture production.” He argues that runaway productions have so far failed to pose a vitally serious threat to Hollywood, and “may well never become life-threatening, at least in the more creative segments of the industry.” According to Scott, “pronouncements” that suggest Hollywood’s existence to have spread worldwide, such as those by Asu Aksoy and Kevin Robins and by Hozic are “exaggerated and premature”. It is within these arguments of Hollywood’s global spread where the clustering model has its strongest opponents. In addition to, and preceding, Hozic and Miller et al., Asu Aksoy and Kevin Robins have challenged Storper directly; arguing that seeing Hollywood as a local industry is impossible in an age when Hollywood is run by global “entertainment megacompanies”. They contend that the giant media conglomerates controlling Hollywood can structure the audiences’ choices and produce films according to their own needs, and that this synergy and control over ancillary markets are the key to understanding how Hollywood structures. Indeed, Christopherson and Storper fail to address the issues of “film distribution, exhibition, and finance”, which are paramount to the industry. Aksoy and Robins also note that the film industry cannot and should not be seen as just any industry, and that the particular logics of cultural industries must not be overlooked.

Within the last decades, all major studios have become part of greater media conglomerates. And while some of the studios are still located in Southern California, others are dispersed around the globe, and companies’ headquarters are frequently in New York rather than in Los Angeles. Fox Filmed Entertainment, home to Twentieth Century Fox and itself owned by News Corporation (founded in Adelaide, Australia; incorporated in Wilmington, Delaware; currently headquartered in New York), is based in New York, with studios in Los Angeles, Mexico, and Australia. Viacom (owner of Paramount Pictures and DreamWorks SKG) and Time Warner (owner of Warner Bros.) also have their headquarters in New York. Sony Pictures Entertainment’s parent company, Sony is based in Tokyo, and NBC Universal is now owned by General Electric, headquarters of which are located in Fairfield, Connecticut. National executive director and chief executive of Screen Actors Guild (SAG) Robert Pisano complains: “When Lew Wasserman was head of Universal/MCA, he was here in Los Angeles. Today, the key decision maker sits in Paris”. Additionally, these conglomerates have been commissioning and building ‘location-based entertainment’ such as theme parks, real estate projects and stores. The projects are spread not only all across the US, but also around the globe; putting Hollywood in the ‘place’ business, allowing it to sell “a synopsis of itself and its labors as an attraction”.

**Hollywood and Labor**

In this discussion of Hollywood’s position as a global construct versus a specific location, but above all as an industry, one also needs to take labor into consideration, especially bearing in mind the central topic of this book. Within this context, one needs to focus on Hollywood as a location; not surprisingly, since discussions of labor are concerned with the production stage of film industry. As Storper, Christopherson and Scott have all demonstrated, production is still largely centralized in California. To quote a Hollywood screenwriter: “There is still some truth to the notion of Hollywood as a place located in Southern California. The district of Hollywood is still more or less the geographic center of a cluster of production facilities, soundstages, office buildings, and studio ranches […] […] At one point, every major figure in world entertainment has to come to Hollywood, if only to accept an Academy Award”. Hollywood is a cultural industry system that “can be conceived as a social structure, as a configuration of social actors joined together by basic ties.” At this point, it is useful to go back to a distinction I made earlier about the different levels of employees in Hollywood, termed above-and below-the-line. On both levels, the MPAA has estimated that 382,900 people were employed in the US motion picture industry (including video rental employees) as of 2002. Labor unions in film industry have a long and colorful history, going back to the days before film. National Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees, now called the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees (IATSE), the largest below-the-line labor union with approximately 100,000 members, was founded in 1893.
Having survived a major racketeering and bribery scandal in the early 1940s, and despite a deterioration of power in the 1980s, IATSE is still influential in the industry. In fact, this influence is one of the reasons studios choose to move their production overseas, to countries with looser labor regulations and lower labor costs. In the concluding chapter of *Global Hollywood*, Miller et al. stress the difficult position in which runaway productions have put Hollywood’s local below-the-line labor. It is the “proletariat [of Hollywood] on the margins of the ‘creative class’” that have felt the effects of globalization most severely. Unlike the directors that are the subject of this book, this technical and other personnel is immobile, unable to move where the productions go, at least not without losing their bargaining power, salary level and rights. In this sense, below-the-line work force is not much different than the workers of any other manufacturing industry. Members of IATSE include not only creative personnel such as art directors, story analysts, animators, set designers and decorators, scenic artists, graphic artists, but also artisans and craftspersons like set painters, grips, electricians, property persons, set builders, teachers, costumers, make-up artists, hair stylists, camerapersons, sound technicians, editors, script supervisors, laboratory technicians, projectionists, first aid employees, inspection, shipping, booking and other distribution employees within theater, film and television production. A former studio executive proclaims: “[IATSE] is worse than the United Auto Workers in having rules designed to ensure mediocre work as well as getting benefits to the sky”. If this is the general view held by the studios, it is not surprising that runaway productions are on the rise. In terms of below-the-line personnel, runaway productions are the equivalent of outsourcing seen in other industries. 

More recently, outsourcing has been quite common in animation. US animation is frequently outsourced to India, and Japanese studios have started outsourcing parts of their works to the Philippines and South Korea. For Hollywood, this is largely the case for television productions of the studios, which require traditional 2D animation no longer used in feature films. High-end 3-D animation by Pixar and the other companies is developed. While Miller et al. argue that runaway productions (and post-productions) result in a substantial loss of jobs for Hollywood, others have pointed out that outsourcing, because it saves money for the companies, can result in the creation of new jobs in the original country. Similarly, Allen J. Scott, who rejects the seriousness of any possible threat posed by runaway industries, asserts that even though Hollywood is likely to lose projects to lower-cost locations, this will not “imply any reversal of growth at the managerial-cum-creative” level. Unlike the proletariat on the margins of Hollywood’s creative class, this level is its nexus. Scott argues that to ensure continued growth, Hollywood needs to make sure that “its central deal-making and innovative capacities remain healthy”, in order to “safeguard its position as the world’s leading center of conception, design and content development of popular culture”. This dependence on its managerial and above-the-line talent is resonant of an increased reliance on producers and agents, brought on by the flexible specialization, as well as a reflection of a greater change towards knowledge-based economies on a global level. Peter Drucker suggests that “knowledge is now fast becoming the one factor of production, sideling both capital and labor”. Within this context, global filmmakers lie between the central and the periphery; while they are members of the creative class, they need not be constantly at the center of the decision-making process. Unless a director is part of this process by commanding power either through great previous box-office success, or acting simultaneously as a producer, he/she can be also easily pushed to the margins and proletarianized, which is the case with many of the global directors. Concurrently, the administrative class, namely the studio executives, agents and managers who make the deals, put the projects together and make the Hollywood machine run smoothly need closer inspection. Hollywood functions as a network of connections, and as in most industries, but here more so than any other: whom you know is the key to survival. In an industry primarily dependent on relationships, a very large role is played by producers and agents. After the studios lost their dominance, independent producers gained importance, and with the rise of dealmaking in the blockbuster era, agents came into the game as major players. In this three-leveled model of administrative, above- and below-the-line labor, directors are within the most mobile level: above-the-line talent. The administrative level is located in and around Hollywood, because that is where the deals are made; the dealmaker has to be “at the right dinner parties, at the right cocktail parties” to make the right connections and secure the necessary financing. Below-the-line talent needs to be in the same area as well, due to the reasons I have just discussed in terms of clustering. Administrators are part of management, thus they do not have a labor union. Producers on the other hand, have founded the Producers Guild of America in 1962, through the merger of Screen Producers Guild and Television Producers Guild. However, they have not been recognized by the studios as a union on the grounds that “producers are part of management”. More clearly, above-the-line talent has a different status. As I have discussed earlier, this group includes producers, directors and stars; all the figures whose salaries are individually negotiated, and who stand as individual items in a film’s budget. These are also the names expected to draw the audiences to see the completed film. The three major unions representing these workers are Screen Actors Guild (SAG), Directors Guild of America (DGA) and Writers Guild of America (WGA); founded in 1936, 1937 and 1954, respectively. Above-the-line talent, especially stars, who at times have been pointed at by leaders of below-the-line unions as the real source of high cost of moviemaking, hold much more power in negotiations. Looking at runaway productions, one can see that above-the-line talent is largely part of a negotiated deal by the studio, and is taken to the shooting location, whereas below-the-line workers are supplied by the host country. Hence, above-the-line talent is more mobile than either of the two other classes discussed above. For these members of the filmmaking community, actual presence in Hollywood can be delegated through agents. Membership to the DGA is another type of delegation. Alan Paul and Archie Kleingartner draw attention to the position of the labor unions in Hollywood, and how these unions have played a role in the transition from the studio system to flexible production. The DGA is located in Los Angeles, and 82% of the global directors researched for this book are members of this 13,100-member union. By being members, directors have a presence in Hollywood, even if they are not there physically. Members include Michael Apted, who was selected as the DGA President for a second term in 2005. The British-born director, who holds dual citizenship, is the first non-American to hold the position.
Faulkner and Anderson propose that filmmakers, as well any other artists or technicians in the film business, accumulate "a history of performance results." These results are "part economic, part artistic, and part collegial industry-relevant outcomes imputed or attributed to the contributions of an individual in the community." According to Faulkner and Anderson, industry players acquire "performance 'ratings' by the film community," akin to Pierre Bourdieu's notion of cultural and social capital. They argue that these ratings frequently result in recurrent patterns, where the same names are frequently entrusted with major blockbusters. When global directors are recognized and invited to work in Hollywood, it is because of a certain reputation they have already built. No global director is likely to be bestowed with a mega-budget for their Hollywood debut. Even the big players of today, like the Scott brothers, Emmerich, or Petersen, have started smaller and have had to gain the confidence of the industry as they went along. As the visibility and value of talents increase, they will be pursued by agents regardless of nationality and country of residence. Festival circles and the music video and commercials industries also need to be included in this circle of rating-construction, since they function similarly to a cluster. While these may not be clusters in the traditional sense, festivals bring industry people close together for short but intense periods of time, facilitating a network of personal deal making and creating possibilities for future projects. The music video and commercials industry is also an increasingly mobile global network that allows new directorial talent to be recognized with speed.

Above-the-line workers of the film industry, along with the executives, the decision-makers, and the facilitators, are a part of a different class that has been named but not expanded upon in the previous pages. Richard Florida points out that "migratory patterns of the Creative Class cut across the lines of race, nationality and sexual orientation," and this takes us back to the initial definitions of this project. In the music video and commercials world, artists, designers, performers, sports stars, spiritual gurus, ... anyone with the capacity to generate exceptional value added in any market. He points out that while this class is not large in numbers, it is "decisive for the performance of business networks, of media networks, and of political networks" and that the market for this labor is becoming globalized.

As I claim that the directors who constitute the subject of this thesis are a part of this new class, and that this increased flow of talent is a result of globalization, I find it very useful to employ a study that looks at the same subject, albeit through a wider lens. Saskia Sassen's work on international investment and labor flows is essentially concerned with migrants and largely with the working class. However, her findings are also applicable to my research. Sassen makes the connection between international labor migration and the internationalization of production. I believe the same holds true for the globalization of Hollywood and the flow of global talent. Sassen's research also shows that the relationship relies largely on direct foreign investment, and that the "major immigrant-sending countries are among the leading recipients of the jobs lost in the US and of US direct foreign investment." Replacing US with Hollywood, the analysis later in this chapter will show the relationship between countries that receive runaway productions, which stand for 'direct foreign investment' in this analogy, and directors who work in Hollywood, corresponding to Sassen's 'immigrants'. I would like to recall once more, that while 'working in Hollywood' often denotes an actual presence in Hollywood, it is no longer an absolute necessity. The difference between Sassen's research and mine lies in the distinction between migrant labor and mobile creative class; while these two groups are distinguished on a class level, their movement patterns demonstrate clearly discernible similarities.

At the same time, the international talent working in Hollywood can be situated within a larger context of mobile skilled labor. Film is not the only industry in the US that attracts global talent. 'Brain drain' from various industries and from the academia around the world is caused by skilled labor choosing to work in the States. The US is the primary destination for foreign skilled workers; "40% of its foreign-born adult population have tertiary level education." Carlos Holguin reports that the US "allocates 57.2 percent of its annual labor-based immigration quota of 140,000 visas to aliens of 'extraordinary ability in the sciences, arts, education, business or athletics'", and that 'the United States' labor-based immigration policy encourages not so much the migration of labor, as the import of human capital". This tendency to import labor and human capital appears to have increased over the past decades, as the rate of foreign-born labor in the American work force increased from 6.4% in 1980 to 9.7% in 1994. Similarly, foreign-born workers have constituted nearly half of the net labor force increase between 1996 and 2000. Research also indicates that more educated labor with more specialized skills "do tend to exhibit greater geographical mobility measured by migration rates." Since filmmaking requires a very specific set of skills, it is at the same time a project-based profession, filmmakers are in an ideal position to move across borders and continents. In the 1980s, in view of concerns voiced by organized labor, Immigration and Naturalization Services (INS) commissioned a study of nonimmigrants with working permits. The study showed that cultural workers had become the largest vocational grouping of temporary foreign workers admitted in 1986-87. While the study found no adverse impact on US workers, including entertainers and professionals, the unions, represented by Jack Goldner, then president of the Department of Professional Employees AFL-CIO, requested a role in the process of granting visas to workers in the arts, entertainment and mass media sector. This function was granted by the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1990, and requires visa petitioners to obtain "a written advisory opinion or consultation letter from an appropriate arts union." Hollywood unions, especially those for above-the-line workers, clearly still have a strong position, despite the anti-union spirit of 1980s.

Richard Florida points out that "migratory patterns of the Creative Class cut across the lines of race, nationality and sexual orientation," and this takes us back to the initial definitions of this project. In the previous chapter, I stated that my categorization hinges on the problematic issue of nationality and citizenship. However, like the nationality of a film, nationality of individuals is no longer (if it has ever been) an uncomplicated matter. Recent debates in citizenship have centered on alternative notions of belonging. The internationalization of capital has led to a denationalization process, especially in large cities where capital is concentrated. While my main concern here is the denationalized creative class; there are other...
forms of transnational identities, as posited by Linda Bosniak, such as EU citizenship; citizenship within transnational civil societies, transnational communities constituted through transborder migration and a global sense of solidarity through humanitarian concerns111.

Hollywood’s work on transnationality is useful here, as she suggests the term ‘flexible citizenship’ as a way to theorize contemporary practices. This flexible notion of citizenship “refers to the cultural logics of capitalist accumulation, travel, and displacement that induce subjects to respond fluidly and opportunistically to changing political-economic conditions”112. In a world where the nation-state is no longer fixed and unchanging, passports become “less and less attestations of citizenship, let alone of loyalty to a protective nation-state than of claims to participation in labor markets”113. In this sense, Michael Apted’s dual citizenship is less a statement on where his loyalties lie, and more a matter of convenience. Global directors are members of a creative class with flexible citizenships. As Cowen suggests, they are relatively liberated from the tyranny of place. Nonetheless, while as Miller et al. argue, Hollywood’s labor is spread across the world, Scott’s insistence on the importance of Hollywood, California as a location is not entirely diminished, and the two are hinged in the networks provided by the DGA as well as agents and producers.

**Hollywood and the Others**

Whether one defines Hollywood by its location, as a set of corporations, or as a style of filmmaking, the undeniable issue is its global popularity. Film scholars have long tried to explicate the reasons that lie behind Hollywood’s worldwide appeal. The most frequent line of argument is that Hollywood films are as popular as they are, because they come from a country where the multicultural ‘melting pot’ audience, comprised of all kinds of different peoples, acts as a microcosm to develop and create productions that will be to the liking of audiences everywhere114. Along these lines, the easily comprehensible plots and transparent film language of ‘classical Hollywood style’ are seen to have contributed to the popularity of Hollywood products115. These explanations are not enough however, and have on occasion been rejected to be too simplistic116 at a time when the global spread of Hollywood has come to a point where Hollywood is inscribed in practically every nation’s film culture. Alternatively, even when Hollywood is seen as the absolute other for any national cinema117, it approaches all its global viewers as “potentially equal customers”118 reflecting the idealized democracy constructed in its films’ texts, thereby confirming its popularity.

Hollywood’s dominance has been enhanced in the blockbuster era. The advantages that come along with the global financing strategies employed by the studios enable Hollywood films to be made and marketed on budgets that far surpass those of any other film industry. Blockbusters are designed to reach the maximum number of audiences, and released with elaborate marketing schemes, with full market saturation119. The enormous production and marketing costs involved function as a barrier of entry to the film market, leaving the few giant studios that can afford to make blockbusters without any other substantial rivals. The synergy created by the studios and the other subsidiaries under same ownership helps to “anticipate, nurture and challenge” consumer preferences, thus ideally maximizing box office revenues120. This is aided by the centrally organized and locally specified massive advertising campaigns. Films are often marketed on whatever their strong suit is in a specific country, be it its stars, director, or subject121; and they can be popular in different markets for different reasons.

Hollywood has no rivals that pose a threat to its dominance on a global scale. Nevertheless, various film industries attempt to compete with Hollywood within their national borders and in their regions; and some of these have been successful at different times. These attempts come in different shapes. Some filmmakers emulate, copy, and / or parody Hollywood pictures, reaffirming the impossibility of “maintaining a strict dichotomy between Hollywood cinema and its ‘others’”122; whereas others distinguish themselves through ‘heritage’ cinema123. Countries like India and South Korea keep hold of their markets through quotas, despite recent changes. Within discussions of a globalized cinema world, I would like to reiterate Tom O’Regan’s point that “generalized cultural matters such as gender, sexual preference, political orientation, psychological type and social class” constitute a more relevant point of discussion and that “national and ‘international’ issues are not the important fault lines for distinguishing between Hollywood and other cinemas”124.

Nonetheless, I find it useful to categorize the world’s film industries into a few groups in terms of their relationships with Hollywood, forming categories that are established by several determinants. Among them are the proportion of Hollywood productions screened in these countries, the frequency with which they are used as shooting locations by major studio productions, and most importantly for this thesis, the amount of talent they supply for Hollywood. It is my conviction that there is a strong correlation between Hollywood’s local market penetration and the finding of local talent working in Hollywood. This is not the only factor to explain why one country or another tends to export more talent, but it seems to be a noteworthy one. The first category covers the countries seen as ideal runaway destinations, those in very close contact. The second category is that of ‘New Wave’s’, up-and-coming film industries that provide Hollywood with fresh hunting grounds for talent. These first two groups are not mutually exclusive, and do sometimes overlap. The last category consists of countries which have either reasonably large film industries of their own, and/or have been home of a new wave of films, but have not sent a considerable number of directors to Hollywood.

**Runaway Destinations**

Historically, Hollywood has been in close contact with two film industries: British and Canadian. Since nearly the beginning, these two industries have been defined in terms of their relation to Hollywood, on occasion referred to as Hollywood’s backyards. Both countries suffer from having the same language as the US. As British producer Leon Clore said in 1982, “If the United States spoke Spanish, we would have a film industry.”125 In fact, there is a film industry in Britain; it just happens to be largely financed by transnational Hollywood corporations. Similarly, Canada’s film industry both suffers and profits from its geographical proximity to Hollywood. It is an ideal destination for runaway productions because of its proximity, its language and its lower labor costs, but has too small a market to be self-sufficient for films produced by Canadian companies and thus it is
practically dependant on Hollywood. Britain has long had the reputation of boasting the best technicians in the world. Its major studios, namely, Pinewood, Elstree and Twickenham, have consistently produced films, albeit mostly financed with Hollywood money. What has been a historical reality for Britain has become a new condition for Canada. I have briefly defined "runaway productions" in the previous chapter, but there is more to be said about the subject. According to the Monitor Report prepared for DGA and SAG, there are two types of runaway productions. "Creative" runaways depart because "the story takes place in a setting that cannot be duplicated or for other creative considerations," and "economic" runaways depart to lower production costs. The sharp increase in the number of economic runaways in the last decade caused alarm in the American film industry, becoming a top priority for the DGA. While runaway productions are one of the ways in which Hollywood has become more global, these productions mean a direct loss of business for filmmakers, especially for below-the-line talent based in the US. In addition to British studios substituting for their American counterparts, more and more Canadian cities are posing as American cities. So much so, that Justine Elias of the New York Times has called Vancouver "The city that can sub for all of America."

Beyond the seemingly simple decision to cut costs, there are numerous other factors that bring about runaway productions. In addition to costs of production facilities and labor costs, favorable exchange rates, government rebates, and various tax incentives draw producers to the outside of the US. Canada started the 1990s as the prime destination for most economic runaway productions, and its share grew even larger, now frequently called "Hollywood North." The chart in Figure 2.1 is derived from the Monitor Report data, covering only the theater releases and not the TV films, TV series and mini-series. The Monitor Report does not feature Ireland as a separate destination, but it has also become an attractive locale due to a tax incentive law passed in 1997, allowing filmmakers to recoup up to US$2 million as shooting begins. Two other countries have become popular destinations for Hollywood productions in the last few years. Australia and New Zealand have both been attractive because of their reportedly low labor costs, English-speaking, skilled crews, reverse seasons and a variety of locations. These two countries, whose cinemas gained international acclaim in the 1980s, will also be touched upon in the next category. Similarly, South Africa has become a prime destination, at this point more for advertising productions than feature films. With South African films receiving major international awards, it is likely that directors from this country will be obtaining Hollywood contracts in the near future. All of these countries are a good indication that familiarity with Hollywood filmmaking, on the levels of both exhibition and production, is an important factor in the transfer of local talent to Hollywood. I have shown in the previous chapter that when grouped together, Anglophone directors comprise the majority of global talent. They are studied less than their counterparts, nor are they seen as 'émigrés'; their English names make them less easily identifiable as 'foreign'. And due to the frequency of runaway productions in their own countries, many of these directors do not have to leave their homes to work for Hollywood. Mexico must also get a special mention, for becoming the first country to host a Hollywood studio (Twentieth Century Fox in Baja) with a native language other than English. Although already popular as a filming location, particularly for below-the-line talent based in the US, in addition to British studios substituting for their American counterparts, more and more Canadian cities are posing as American cities. So much so, that Justine Elias of the New York Times has called Vancouver "The city that can sub for all of America."

Beyond the seemingly simple decision to cut costs, there are numerous other factors that bring about runaway productions. In addition to costs of production facilities and labor costs, favorable exchange rates, government rebates, and various tax incentives draw producers to the outside of the US. Canada started the 1990s as the prime destination for most economic runaway productions, and its share grew even larger, now frequently called "Hollywood North." The chart in Figure 2.1 is derived from the Monitor Report data, covering only the theater releases and not the TV films, TV series and mini-series. The Monitor Report does not feature Ireland as a separate destination, but it has also become an attractive locale due to a tax incentive law passed in 1997, allowing filmmakers to recoup up to US$2 million as shooting begins. Two other countries have become popular destinations for Hollywood productions in the last few years. Australia and New Zealand have both been attractive because of their reportedly low labor costs, English-speaking, skilled crews, reverse seasons and a variety of locations. These two countries, whose cinemas gained international acclaim in the 1980s, will also be touched upon in the next category. Similarly, South Africa has become a prime destination, at this point more for advertising productions than feature films. With South African films receiving major international awards, it is likely that directors from this country will be obtaining Hollywood contracts in the near future. All of these countries are a good indication that familiarity with Hollywood filmmaking, on the levels of both exhibition and production, is an important factor in the transfer of local talent to Hollywood. I have shown in the previous chapter that when grouped together, Anglophone directors comprise the majority of global talent. They are studied less than their counterparts, nor are they seen as ‘émigrés’; their English names make them less easily identifiable as ‘foreign’. And due to the frequency of runaway productions in their own countries, many of these directors do not have to leave their homes to work for Hollywood.

Mexico must also get a special mention, for becoming the first country to host a Hollywood studio (Twentieth Century Fox in Baja) with a native language other than English. Although already popular as a filming location, particularly for below-the-line talent based in the US, in addition to British studios substituting for their American counterparts, more and more Canadian cities are posing as American cities. So much so, that Justine Elias of the New York Times has called Vancouver "The city that can sub for all of America."

Beyond the seemingly simple decision to cut costs, there are numerous other factors that bring about runaway productions. In addition to costs of production facilities and labor costs, favorable exchange rates, government rebates, and various tax incentives draw producers to the outside of the US. Canada started the 1990s as the prime destination for most economic runaway productions, and its share grew even larger, now frequently called "Hollywood North." The chart in Figure 2.1 is derived from the Monitor Report data, covering only the theater releases and not the TV films, TV series and mini-series. The Monitor Report does not feature Ireland as a separate destination, but it has also become an attractive locale due to a tax incentive law passed in 1997, allowing filmmakers to recoup up to US$2 million as shooting begins. Two other countries have become popular destinations for Hollywood productions in the last few years. Australia and New Zealand have both been attractive because of their reportedly low labor costs, English-speaking, skilled crews, reverse seasons and a variety of locations. These two countries, whose cinemas gained international acclaim in the 1980s, will also be touched upon in the next category. Similarly, South Africa has become a prime destination, at this point more for advertising productions than feature films. With South African films receiving major international awards, it is likely that directors from this country will be obtaining Hollywood contracts in the near future. All of these countries are a good indication that familiarity with Hollywood filmmaking, on the levels of both exhibition and production, is an important factor in the transfer of local talent to Hollywood. I have shown in the previous chapter that when grouped together, Anglophone directors comprise the majority of global talent. They are studied less than their counterparts, nor are they seen as ‘émigrés’; their English names make them less easily identifiable as ‘foreign’. And due to the frequency of runaway productions in their own countries, many of these directors do not have to leave their homes to work for Hollywood.
if ever, with talent, fall under the third category. When a series of acclaimed films start emerging from one particular country’s film industry, Hollywood tends to take notice. Soon, production companies start making lucrative offers to the filmmakers of that country. As I have mentioned before, this is nothing new. Executives’ ‘trophy-hunting’ trips to Europe in the 1920s were common, and in 1930, Sergei Eisenstein was invited for a contract with Paramount. This helped not only in bringing fresh talent to Hollywood, but also in halting the local rise in film production. It is ironic then, that most, if not all, upward trends in local film industries are largely supported and caused by the local governments, but eventually result in the draining of talent.

Britain was home to a number of young, talented advertising directors in the 1970s. I have already briefly discussed the arrival of these directors to Hollywood earlier in this chapter. Although British cinema was largely aided by financing support from Channel 4 and the British Film Institute (BFI) in the 1980s, David Puttnam argues that this support was too little, too late: “The British industry and the British government did little or nothing to encourage or invest in this pool of by now unique and skilled talent.” Accordingly, “the cream of Britain’s special-effects industry left, joining other enormously valued British technicians who found Hollywood more receptive and appreciative of their gifts.” Directors like Alan Parker, Ridley Scott and Adrian Lyne had already caught the eye of studio executives, and were given offers to work with the large studios.

With the resources of state television, the Young German Film Board (Kuratorium Junger Deutscher Film) and grants from the Film Subsidies Bill (Filmmförderungsanstalt), the ‘New German Cinema’ of the 1970s was one of the most striking film movements of its time. Its directors, most notably Wim Wenders and Volker Schlöndorff have made forays to the US, with varying degrees of critical and commercial success. Arguably the most famous member of New German Cinema, Rainer Werner Fassbinder, did not live long enough to try his luck in Hollywood, but judging from his quote in FASSBINDER IN HOLLYWOOD (Robert Fischer, 2002), one can presume he meant to go: “I’d rather be unfree that way [in Hollywood] than imagine I was free in Germany.” Even though the directors of New German Cinema mostly stayed away from Hollywood, other personnel was being recruited, like set designer Rolf Zehetbauer, actors Klaus Kinski, Klaus-Maria Brandauer and Armin Müller-Stahl, cinematographer Michael Ballhaus and musicians Giorgio Moroder and Hans Zimmer. This generation was followed in a few years by two of the most notable German directors working in Hollywood today: Wolfgang Petersen and Roland Emmerich. Kraemer argues that it is indeed the New German Cinema that has lead to these directors’ move to Hollywood, because of the attention it drew to the German film industry and because it has allowed many young filmmakers to study and make films from the 1970s on. In terms of exhibition, New German Cinema again plays a significant role, albeit indirectly. After WWII, although Germany was seen as a fertile market for Hollywood films, German films were still popular. Throughout the 1950s, West Germany was the fifth largest producer of films in the world. By the 1970s however, this system had collapsed and the choice of German films at the cinemas were reduced to sex comedies, which were often commercial failures, or products of New German Cinema, which refused to strive for profit. In spite of the critical acclaim abroad for New German Cinema, German films were no longer successful at the home box office, and Hollywood productions poured in to fill the void. As a result, the next generation became more likely to direct films in Hollywood style, or in other words, to emulate Hollywood, and eventually to be ‘discovered’ by the studios. Producer Bernd Eichinger played a pivotal role during this period, reviving the tradition of the powerful European producers with strong international connections. Eichinger is the name behind several large-budget European co-productions, often adaptations of popular novels, shot in English, like THE NAME OF THE ROSE (Jean-Jacques Annaud, 1986) or SMILLA’S SENSE OF SNOW (Bille August, 1997). He was also responsible for a number of diverse Hollywood co-productions, directed by European as well as American filmmakers.

A similar pattern has been the case for Australia. In 1970, following social and economic changes in the 1960s, Australian Film Development Corporation (AFDC) was founded. This was followed by founding of state-funded government film agencies in all states but Tasmania. Second half of the 1970s saw a rise in Australian cinema, led by Bruce Beresford, Fred Schepisi, Peter Weir, George Miller, Phillip Noyce and Gillian Armstrong, all of whom started working for Hollywood in the 1980s. Some of these directors still work for Hollywood studios, but frequently shooting in their native country, contributing to the increase in runaway productions. Australia’s southern neighbor, New Zealand, had a minuscule film industry, having produced only seventeen motion pictures between 1930-1970. Following in Australia’s footsteps, New Zealand founded its own Film Commission in 1978. Within a few years, not only were there a larger number of films produced, but they also received international attention. The first director to be noticed among the new generation was Roger Donaldson, who, after a Hollywood co-production of MUTINY ON THE BOUNTY (1984) shot in New Zealand, left for Hollywood in 1987. New Zealand film industry continued its success throughout the 1990s and supplied Hollywood with fresh talent. Arthouse director Jane Campion and arthouse / science-fiction filmmaker Andrew Niccol are at one end of the spectrum, and Peter Jackson and Ellory Elkayem at the other. Lee Tamahori, whose ONCE WERE WARRIORS (1997) was an international festival hit, and who went on to direct thrillers and a James Bond movie, lies in the middle.

One should not forget however, that Hollywood films have not always dominated the entire globe. Other film industries have been leading in other parts of the world, but mostly to be absorbed by Hollywood. A similar pattern has been the case for Australia. In 1970, following social and economic changes in the 1960s, Australian Film Development Corporation (AFDC) was founded. This was followed by founding of state-funded government film agencies in all states but Tasmania. Second half of the 1970s saw a rise in Australian cinema, led by Bruce Beresford, Fred Schepisi, Peter Weir, George Miller, Phillip Noyce and Gillian Armstrong, all of whom started working for Hollywood in the 1980s. Some of these directors still work for Hollywood studios, but frequently shooting in their native country, contributing to the increase in runaway productions. Australia’s southern neighbor, New Zealand, had a minuscule film industry, having produced only seventeen motion pictures between 1930-1970. Following in Australia’s footsteps, New Zealand founded its own Film Commission in 1978. Within a few years, not only were there a larger number of films produced, but they also received international attention. The first director to be noticed among the new generation was Roger Donaldson, who, after a Hollywood co-production of MUTINY ON THE BOUNTY (1984) shot in New Zealand, left for Hollywood in 1987. New Zealand film industry continued its success throughout the 1990s and supplied Hollywood with fresh talent. Arthouse director Jane Campion and arthouse / science-fiction filmmaker Andrew Niccol are at one end of the spectrum, and Peter Jackson and Ellory Elkayem at the other. Lee Tamahori, whose ONCE WERE WARRIORS (1997) was an international festival hit, and who went on to direct thrillers and a James Bond movie, lies in the middle.

One should not forget however, that Hollywood films have not always dominated the entire globe. Other film industries have been leading in other parts of the world, but mostly to be absorbed and co-opted by Hollywood eventually. One of the best examples, Hong Kong cinema, has been not only popular all over South East Asia through the 1960s and the 1970s, but also influential in Hollywood. Among the booming economies of South East Asia in the 1980s, mainly Hong Kong, Taiwan, Singapore and South Korea, Hong Kong was the only one to have a matching growth in its film industry. Sek Kei proposes several reasons as to why the film industry blossomed particularly in Hong Kong. In this small, densely populated island, cinema has always been the leading form of mass entertainment, and was not affected by competition from TV or video. Compared to its neighbors, Hong Kong has traditionally had more liberties in terms of freedom of expression. As a Chinese cinema open to Western influences, Hong Kong cinema has succeeded in being both East and West. According to Kei, this has also helped the industry reach all the overseas markets where the Chinese are active. Hong Kong’s close ties with the West and its cinema’s popularity in the US have caused many of its leading directors to move to Hollywood in the 1990s, during the period leading up to, and
around, the Chinese handover in 1997. With many of its major stars gone along with the directors, and the rampant piracy in the region, Hong Kong film industry has been in a slump in recent years. The untapped Chinese market is still unreachable for Hong Kong filmmakers, since in addition to the piracy problem, their films are still classified as "foreign," thus have to compete directly with Hollywood's products; moreover, the films are mostly in Cantonese. Although some of the talent like directors Stanley Tong, Hark Tsui and Ringo Lam have returned to Hong Kong, the industry has already taken a hard blow. Due to its restrictions in terms of location and technology, Hong Kong has not been able to benefit from its migrating directors to direct some of the runaway productions in its vicinity. There are other examples, such as the Taiwanese New Wave, leading to Ang Lee's career in Hollywood. Recent interest in Japanese horror films has brought Hideo Nakata and Takashi Shimizu deals to remake their own films in English, Ring of Fire and Ju-on, respectively. Taiwan and Japan also happen to be two of the largest markets Hollywood has outside of US. In 2003, Japan accounted for over 40% of the Asia-Pacific box office market. Latin American countries, especially Mexico, have also been experiencing a new popularity lately. As I have discussed earlier, Mexican directors have the advantage of being able to work in their own country on Hollywood projects, and being geographically close to the US. In addition to Guillermo del Toro, Alfonso Cuaron, Alfonso Arau and Alejandro Gonzalez Iñarritu have worked on Hollywood projects recently.

Outsiders and Competitors

The third and last category comprises of countries that have an established film industry, and/or have been the home of a new wave, but have not sent a significant number of its personnel to Hollywood. The most significant of these countries have been India, Iran, China and South Korea. The greatest common denominator of these countries is that they have had limited access to Hollywood films due to government regulations. These regulations, quotas or bans on film imports have political and economic reasons, depending on the country, as discussed below. India has been among, and usually leading, the top film-producing countries in the world since WWII. In addition to its huge domestic market, Indian films have drawn audiences from around the world, and more recently, have reached the Western markets, via the Non-resident Indians (NRIs), the Indian diaspora. The Film Finance Corporation (FFC), founded in 1961, was reborn as National Film Development Corporation in the 1980s. NFDC supported local 'quality cinema' through its monopoly on foreign film imports. NFDC's monopoly ended only in 1992, after which there appeared several successful Hollywood films in the Indian market. However, these claimed no more than 10 percent of the box office, due not only to Indian audiences' loyalty to the local productions, but also to the fact that tickets to foreign films cost several times more than those to Indian films. As many as 7 billion tickets are sold yearly in Indian cinemas, making it unnecessary for Indian directors to work for Hollywood to reach large masses. The only Indian directors working in the West today are those who have already had close ties with the Western world. Mira Nair studied at Harvard as a graduate student, and currently goes back and forth between India and the US, where she has worked in film and television industries. Shyamal Kapur, a chartered accountant in London in the 1980s, returned to India to direct films, and has made a name in the West for his British-Hollywood co-produced historical dramas, Elizabeth (1998) and The Four Feathers (2002). The most recent Indian in Hollywood is Tarsem Singh, who went on to becoming an acclaimed music video director after getting an MBA at Harvard, and directed The Cell (2000) for New Line Productions (a unit of Time Warner). This may change however, with the increased interest shown by the studios in the Indian market. Sony and Twentieth Century Fox have announced plans to diversify their India operations in 2003. And as the Indian director Sudhir Mishra pointed out, "The feudal attitude of Indian producers, who will mainly support you if you're so-and-so's son, may force the better talent to veer towards Hollywood companies." With more attention from the studios and an increased exposure to Hollywood films, India may become the ideal talent pool in the coming decades.

In the 1980s, films from two distinct, but in certain ways similar countries created a stir in festival circles. China and Iran were both anti-American regimes undergoing major changes throughout the 1980s. In China, the Beijing Film Academy reopened in 1978. Members of its first graduating class in 1982, along with a few working directors, formed what came to be known as the Fifth Generation. Although they have become world renowned, these directors chose to remain in their homelands. Wu Zhangming, a former actor, emigrated to the US after the Tiananmen Square demonstrations in 1989, but after teaching at some of the prestigious American universities for several years, he returned to China to resume his work as a director. More recently, Chen Kaige became the first mainland Chinese director to work for a major studio when he directed Killing Me Softly (2002) for MGM in London, with a largely British cast and crew. But like the Indian directors discussed above, Chen had briefly lived in New York at the end of the 1980s and his earlier films such as Farewell My Concubine (1993) and The Emperor and The Assassin (1999) were international co-productions. Regrettably for Chen, Killing Me Softly proved to be a commercial and critical disaster. Calling it "a jaw-dropping catastrophe of a movie," Peter Bradshaw of The Guardian added, "Kaige has no feeling for the suspense genre, and clearly no sense of when his English-speaking stars are either being wooden or going way, way over the top." Bradshaw was supported by David Rooney of Variety: "... [Chen]'s first experience with English-speaking actors reveals an uncertain hand with the cast." This erotic thriller went straight to video in the US and fared no better elsewhere. Chen returned to China, where he said he would go, even before the failure of his Western debut.

One must take note that exposure to Hollywood films had been rather limited in China until very recently. In 1994, the Ministry of Radio, Film & Television (MTRFT) issued a reform measure, allowing the annual import of ten international blockbusters, the criteria for which was loosely defined as "reflecting up-to-date global cultural achievement and representing excellence of cinematic art and technique." These include Natural Born Killers (Olive Stone, 1995), Broken Arrow (John Woo, 1995), Twister (Jan De Bont, 1997), Toy Story (John Lasseter, 1995), True Lies (James Cameron, 1995), Waterworld (Kevin Reynolds, 1995), Bridges of Madison County (Clint Eastwood, 1995), and Jumanji (Joe Johnston, 1995); generating huge revenues and accounting for 70-80% of all box-office returns in 1995. This quota has since been increased and was
expected to reach fifty by the end of 2005\(^1\), and although around fifty foreign films were shown, 120 domestic films were also released, and out of the top ten grossing films, six were made in China\(^2\). In addition to accounted-for movie sales, China has the world’s highest amount of piracy. According to International Intellectual Property Alliance’s 2002 report, estimated trade losses due to piracy in motion pictures has reached US$160 million, or 88% of potential earnings in 2001, and many Hollywood films are widely available\(^3\). Stanley Rosen argues that Hollywood films’ popularity has led Chinese cinema “to adopt Hollywood-style narratives.”\(^4\) If this is indeed the case, and continues in this direction, especially now since China has entered the WTO in 2001, we are likely to see a stronger interaction between the Chinese film industry and Hollywood. But this may still be some time away, as the all-time highest grossing Chinese film, Be There or Be Square (Xiaogang Feng, 1998) could not get American distribution, despite a mere US$30,000 price tag\(^5\).

Iran, home to one of the strongest national cinemas to emerge in the 1980s, has had an even more problematic relationship with Hollywood. Immediately after the 1979 Islamic revolution in Iran, foreign films, some of which had been banned under the Shah’s regime, flooded the Iranian market. However, as early as July of the same year, efforts to curb film imports began, with a limitation on B-movies from Turkey, India and Japan, then a ban on ‘imperialist’ and ‘anti-revolutionary’ films, followed by exclusion of all American films\(^6\). This has allowed Iranian filmmakers a space where they could create their own films without having to worry about the market share. In an interview, the famous Iranian director Mohsen Makhmalbaf likens this situation to “bringing up a flower in a greenhouse,” sheltered from the “commercial hurricane” of Hollywood\(^7\). Makhmalbaf argues that having had no choice but to watch non-Hollywood films, the Iranian audiences’ tastes changed, and became more open to Iranian films. That may well be true, but the films that are well received in the West have the hardest time being distributed in Iran\(^8\). This is not only due to governmental restrictions, but also to falling ticket sales; as pirated videos and satellite dishes become more wide-spread, there are alternatives to local films\(^9\). And although there have been a number of Iranian filmmakers popular in the West, none have opted to work for Hollywood so far. While co-productions with Western European or other Middle-Eastern countries have been made, and screened at film festivals, the anti-American feelings in Iran through the 1980s and the 1990s have built too large a gap for the Iranian directors and the studios to feel comfortable working with each other. And now, after 9/11, it has become a challenge for these directors even just to step onto US soil\(^10\).

The most recent example of a blooming film industry is South Korea, which has had a remarkable number of commercial and art-house hits in the recent years. In 2000, domestic share of the market climbed to a record 49.1 percent, and Korean films accounted for six of 2001’s top ten hits\(^11\). Following a flood of Hollywood films on Korean screens in the early 1990s, the government started imposing a quota on locally produced films in order to guarantee their distribution. Western-trained filmmakers and new sources of funding helped boost the industry\(^12\). Local filmmaking is at its highest, both in terms of mainstream action films and art house films gathering awards at international festivals\(^13\). Currently, Korean directors have the large budgets and the large audiences provided for them, without having to go to Hollywood, although some of their films have been purchased in order to be remade into English\(^14\). However, an increasing number of box-office failures have already started damaging the industrial high. Early in 2006, the government announced among protests from filmmakers, that the quotas will be decreased starting July 1, 2006. With pressure from Hollywood rising to abolish the quotas altogether, South Korea’s time in the spotlight may already have ended, causing its leading filmmakers to try their chances in the West. As their films are already being remade in Hollywood, these directors may stand a good chance in Hollywood, much like their Japanese counterparts to be discussed in chapter four.

Conclusion

These categorizations have been aimed at establishing the existing patterns in film industries today. A strong or flourishing industry attracts the attention of Hollywood, which then recruits directors from that local industry. This is not necessarily bad for the local industry however, since having one’s directors work for Hollywood can result in becoming the receiving end of runaway productions, which is not only economically beneficial in the short term, but also results in having well-trained personnel. Among the most representative examples are Australia and Mexico. This system does not work however, if the directors in question are not sufficiently familiar with Hollywood-style filmmaking. Joseph Garncarz claims that a film industry’s economic strength increases proportionally to its audiences’ cultural assimilation: “The greater the global cultural acceptance of US films is, the higher the investments in US films may be”\(^15\). In turn, Garncarz argues, the US film market’s expansion is increased and the globalization process of the film industry is accelerated. While I would refrain from using Hollywood and ‘US film industry’ interchangeably, this is one aspect of understanding how the talent flow between Hollywood and other parts of the world functions. Hollywood is both the agent of transformation and the manifestation of this change in the process of globalization; resulting in a cycle that seems to be operating in favor of Hollywood. Within this context, it appears to be more useful to construe today’s Hollywood as a global filmmaking network rather than just a center where filmmaking activity is agglomerated. Hollywood in Los Angeles County is indeed the primary node within this network; nonetheless, there are other nodes\(^16\). As I will discuss in the following chapters, some of these nodes are other media capitals like London or New York, where executives, producers, and directors are situated. Other key nodes are the festivals; they are mobile and are positioned at different locations only for a brief period of time. Nonetheless, this does not diminish their significance. As Piers Handling, the head of Toronto Film Festival, has noted, festivals have become “an alternative distribution network”\(^17\). They are also showcases for independent productions waiting to be ‘discovered’ and purchased by Hollywood’s distribution companies. This is especially true of the Sundance Festival in Utah, where the careers of American directors like Kevin Smith, Ed Burns and Steven Soderbergh blossomed\(^18\). De Valek points out that the festival system both “counters and works with the hegemony of Hollywood”, offering alternative “platforms for marketing and negotiation”\(^19\). In this regard, Cannes Film Festival plays an enormous role among the festivals, providing an opportunity for the studios not only to encounter global talent, but also to showcase their ‘quality’ products. Every year, global media zestfully cover the Hollywood stars and directors visiting Cannes, supplying their
films with invaluable PR coverage. Stars are often contractually obliged to accompany the films to festivals and give interviews to the press\textsuperscript{174}. An award at one of the major festivals (Cannes, Venice, Berlin, Toronto) means even more international recognition and credibility; and for Hollywood films, attending a festival is an executive decision taken as part of the marketing strategy by the production company\textsuperscript{175}.

In the following chapters, I will look at several case studies which function as sub-networks within the larger Hollywood network. These case studies are not of specific directors, but of groupings that consist of different styles and production conditions. I have chosen examples that represent several significant patterns visible in Hollywood today. These cases also demonstrate some of the strategies adopted by filmmakers, leading them to working in Hollywood. In chapter one, I have already discussed some patterns and some of the networks that facilitate global directors’ work in Hollywood, and looked at the roles played by producers and agents. The best way still seems to earn box-office success in one’s own country, region, or the global festival circuit, often leading to an Oscar nomination, which then regularly translates into a contract with a major studio. Variety reports that out of the 50 director nominees of the last decade for Best Foreign Language Film, almost all “have gotten calls from Hollywood agents testing their interest in coming to California”\textsuperscript{176}. These filmmakers’ reputation helps them become brand names, strongly aiding in the marketing of their Hollywood films\textsuperscript{177}. But there appear to be certain other networks and patterns that have proven useful in becoming a global director.

Many of the global directors experience their first taste of Hollywood through coproductions. Paul Verhoeven directed FLESH+BLOOD (1985) as a Spanish / US / Netherlands co-production shot in Europe, before he moved to Hollywood for ROBOCOP (1987). Roger Donaldson shot THE BOUNTY (1984) as a British / US / Australia / New Zealand / Italian co-production in French Polynesia and his native New Zealand before relocating to Hollywood. Additionally, franchises like the Harry Potter or Batman series are often shot outside the US and employ global directors. A forerunner of both co-production and franchise practices has been the James Bond films, which have become a jumping board for many British directors, and will be the topic of the next chapter.

Another way of being noticed by the studios is by creating a script in order to “have a full hand” and “something to sell”\textsuperscript{178}, but for non-native speakers, this is a very difficult task to achieve. Therefore, the possibility arises as the remake of an already successful film. In the early sound era, a number of directors remake their own films in sound, at times in a different language and context. Some filmmakers made their films into different genres during the studio era. One of the most successful examples came from a British director, where the film changed locations, but not its language: Alfred Hitchcock’s THE MAN WHO KNEW TOO MUCH (1934/1956). Since the 1980’s, however, very few directors attempted remaking their own films for Hollywood audiences, and until recently, all faced critical and commercial failure: Francis Veber’s LES FUGITIFS (1986) / THREE FUGITIVES (1989), George Sluizer’s SPIRITLOOS (1988) / VANISHING (1991), Ole Bornedal’s NATTEVAGTEN (1994) / NIGHTWATCH (1998), and Jean-Marie Poire’s Le VISITEURS (1993) / JUST VISITING (2001). But in the last few years, Japanese directors Hideo Nakata and Takeshi Shimizu successful remade their own horror films. Nakata directed the sequel to the Hollywood version of his RINGU (1998), THE RING TWO (2005), and Shimizu remade two of his films, JU-ON: THE GRUDGE (2003) / THE GRUDGE (2004), and their sequels JU-ON: THE GRUDGE 2 (2003) / THE GRUDGE 2 (2006). Chapter four will examine these sets of remakes and their function in bridging different film cultures.

A new way of achieving worldwide recognition since the mid-1970s has been by directing advertisements and music videos. The ‘British invasion’ at the beginning of the blockbuster era came from advertising. Ridley Scott still keeps his close ties with the advertising industry via his company Ridley Scott Associates (RSA), which was founded in 1965\textsuperscript{180}. Lately, some European and Asian music video directors such as Michel Gondry, Tarsem Singh and Jonas Åkerlund have been attempting to break into Hollywood, not all with great success. Nevertheless, since the UK is considered to be a world leader in directing music videos\textsuperscript{180}, one can expect this field to be a continuing source of talent for the film industry. The last case study will be about directors with these backgrounds, focusing on RSA and the talent it has fostered\textsuperscript{181}. The case studies will be focusing on how these networks of media and talent have been structured and how they function. The focus on British and European examples reflects the distribution of global directors in Hollywood, as analyzed in chapter one.

In a study encompassing over 200 individuals and their films, there could have been a variety of case studies. To focus on individual filmmakers would have been insufficient in a project that covers so many directors with such different backgrounds. Moreover, I wanted to focus on patterns and decision-making figures and institutions. EON Productions, Roy Lee and Ridley and Tony Scott are such figures and institutions that will be discussed in the case studies. I believe that on a larger scale, they are more influential in the shaping of talent flows than the individual filmmakers themselves. I have deliberately chosen not to base my case studies on specific nations. In a book that focuses on the mobility and denationalization of filmmakers and the films they produce, a classification based on nationality would have been contradictory. Nonetheless, certain patterns that reflect the state of specific national cinemas do arise in the following chapters. The reason I chose these particular cases was twofold. On the one hand, the patterns illustrated by the case studies appear among a noticeable number of directors, and provide an informative look at how talent transfers function. On the other hand, they also represent some of the major current trends in Hollywood like franchises and remakes, irrespective of the filmmakers’ nationalities, I believe we can get a clearer understanding of these talent flows and the state of Hollywood after analyses of these cases.
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3. A View to a Franchise: James Bond Films, Co-Productions and Franchises

In the latest James Bond film, *Casino Royale* (Martin Campbell, 2006), there is a peculiar series of events early in the film; a chase sequence where Bond (Daniel Craig) follows a suspected terrorist...
the ultimate blockbuster franchise, James Bond came into being much earlier than JAWS or any of the other well-known harbingers of New Hollywood. From the early 1960s on, Bond films became a truly global phenomenon. The films initially appealed to viewers familiar with the novels, later becoming events in their own right. Commercial brands, which existed in the novels to characterize Bond, became product placements in the films, spurring the sales of a wide variety of products.

On another level, Bond films have always been multinational in terms of financing, locations, cast and crew. As Tino Balio noted in his historical account of United Artists, “the James Bond films are quintessential examples of products tailored for the international market. Financed by an American major partly with British film subsidy funds, produced by two expatriates who had incorporated in Switzerland, and based on a popular series of espionage novels that played off Cold War tensions, the James Bond films were shot in exotic locales featuring a cast of mixed nationalities that was headed by a star of universal appeal”.

While Bond films have always been multinational in terms of financing, locations, cast and crew, the subject of this case study, the James Bond franchise, has been a US/UK co-production with input from countless other nations, making the films significantly transnational. As with other co-productions, the question of films’ nationality arises within the Bond franchise as well. Bond films have been identified as ‘British’ or as ‘Hollywood’, depending on the standpoints and agendas of the identifiers. This chapter will examine the history of the Bond franchise, as well as its directors, and raise questions about the role of co-productions and the nationality of films.

Meeting Mr. Bond

Compared to Bond’s popularity among the audiences, the scholarly world has been comparatively less interested in the series. While studies on the novels had already been published in the 1960s, the first volume on Bond films did not appear until 1987. Only around the fortieth anniversary of the series, several scholarly books and volumes were published. James Chapman explains this neglect of the Bond series in films scholarship with the nature of the “orthodox film criticism [...] in Britain, with its emphasis on ‘realism’ [...] and notions of ‘quality’.” But even after the 1980s, when film scholars started showing interest in films outside the traditional British canon, Bond series failed to gain attention. Chapman argues that this is in part due to the big-budget values of the films, but mostly because of their “sexist, heterosexist, jingoistic, xenophobic and racist” nature, as well as their apparent endorsement of these qualities.

Studies published since Chapman’s book not only acknowledge these characteristics of the films, but often focus on issues of representation in terms of gender, ethnicity, etc.

James Bond is one of the most recognized film characters of all times. The character, created by Ian Fleming, reached a wide popularity first through the novels, then through their filmic adaptations, which in turn made the books even more popular. Of nearly 28 million James Bond paperback sales in Britain between 1955-1977, almost 20 million copies were sold between 1963-1966, when the first Bond films were released. Over the course of forty years between 1962 and 2006, twenty of Bond films reached a ticket sales of over 1.5 billion. It has been estimated that between 25-50% of the world’s population has seen at least one Bond film. This popularity is clearly visible in the hundreds of fan books, web sites and discussion groups devoted to everything about James Bond.

Being “highly visual films” may be a great part of James Bond films’ popularity. But another factor in its success is the transnational nature of the franchise. In their discussion of co-productions as a business strategy, Hoskins et al. identify nine major benefits of co-produced film and television productions. While some of these benefits like “pooling of financial resources”, “cultural goals” or “learning from partner” are more relevant for co-productions among smaller filmmaking countries, there are clear advantages for Hollywood companies as well. Two of these, “access to foreign government’s incentives and subsidies” and “cheaper inputs in partner’s country”, are the most significant reasons behind economic runways; while “desired foreign locations” is the motive that drives creative runaway productions. Another benefit that co-productions provide to all parties involved is access to partners’ markets. In terms of Hollywood companies, this ensures higher profits in overseas markets, but more importantly, for other parties, this can be seen as a possible way to overcome the barriers of entry to the US market. This has been the case not only for directors like Paul Verhoeven and Roger Donaldson, cited in the previous chapter, but also for producers like Dino De Laurentiis. The subject of this case study, the James Bond franchise, has been a US/UK co-production with input from countless other nations, making the films significantly transnational. As with other co-productions, the question of films’ nationality arises within the Bond franchise as well. Bond films have been identified as ‘British’ or as ‘Hollywood’, depending on the standpoints and agendas of the identifiers. This chapter will examine the history of the Bond franchise, as well as its directors, and raise questions about the role of co-productions and the nationality of films.
British performers. Location shooting, an integral part of a Bond film, frequently spans the entire world, and on occasion, outer space. The films’ directors come from different geographies, mainly Britain, but also Canada and New Zealand. Earlier directors, who were all British, have retained their close ties with the studios, directing Hollywood action films.

As a result, although James Bond films are on occasion quoted as “the great last gasp of British film-making” or “some of the best-known British successes”, and the limited academic discussion of the films can be found in works on British cinema, they are not truly “British”, a problematic term in itself as discussed by scholars of national cinema in the last two decades. It should also be noted that one of the main reasons behind the decision to have a British production base was not loyalty to the novels’ pedigree, but that the films qualified for the Eady Levy. The Eady Levy was established in 1958 to assist the British film industry. In order to avoid criticism from the American companies, it was set up as an indirect levy. A proportion of the ticket price was to be pooled; half to be retained by exhibitors and half to be divided among qualifying ‘British’ films in proportion to the UK box office revenue, with no obligation to invest in further production. The films needed to be “registered as British, regardless of their source of finance”. The levy was terminated in 1985, but until then, it attracted many Hollywood (as well as European) productions to the UK.

Defining any country’s films is a difficult task; however, defining a British film is particularly problematical. The colossal presence of Hollywood capital invested in the British film industry is the primary cause of this difficulty. Prevalence of co-productions with various other European countries is another factor. Britain’s Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) 1997 that all films which have spent 75% of their budget in the country and employ mostly British, E.U. or Commonwealth citizens as crew qualify as British. This definition is a rather wide one, but at least it is more concrete than some other suggested definitions. In an editorial published in the June 2003 issue, Sight & Sound discussed what should be considered a British film. Despite contrary arguments, Sight & Sound’s designation of British films is limited to “the national location of the production companies involved.” By this definition, the Britishness of the James Bond series is questionable, due to the presence of MGM/UA behind it. In her discussion of British cinema’s emulation of Hollywood, Sally Hibbin suggests that Bond films are the opposite of what British cinema is. Even in terms of the official definition, Bond series are in danger of no longer being British. Despite the location shootings around the world, sets at Pinewood Studios in England had been used for all Bond films. Some time before the shooting for CASINO ROYALE began in early 2006, trade papers announced that the production could be transferred from Pinewood to Barrandov Studios in the Czech Republic. The British Culture Secretary Tessa Jowell commented that “everything possible is being done” to keep Bond in the UK, but most of the production was ultimately moved to Prague. Nonetheless, CASINO ROYALE’s release as a British / Czech / German / US co-production did not prevent it from becoming one of the most nominated films at the British Film Academy Awards (BAFTA).

While it may be difficult to qualify the James Bond series as British, it is not possible to define these films as American products either. After all, they come from a British literary tradition; they have a British protagonist and usually British directors and lead actors, and are shot at a variety of locations, including sets in England. The impossibility of assigning a specific nationality to these films brings into question the nationality of films as an essentialist category, as discussed briefly in chapter one. The labeling carried out by critics and scholars is often either arbitrary or aims to serve specific agendas. Initially, the identification of Bond films as ‘British’ has been partly for financial reasons, due to the Eady Levy. Cultural branding was also an issue, as evinced by the producers’ insistence on hiring a non-American actor for the lead role. Even though the franchise has always been multinational, the ‘face’ of Bond has consistently been from the Commonwealth. Currently, especially with a sizeable portion of the shooting done in the Czech Barrandov Studios, there is little Britishness left in the Bond franchise, save for the title character and the lead actor. The transnationality of Bond not only reflects that of Hollywood, but it is also what makes the franchise so popular around the globe. The films are concoctions that can no longer be tied to any specific nationality, but thrive on their own traditions and conventions.

In terms of story structure and narration, the films are close to the Classical Hollywood narration, although by now, with twenty films and countless spawns, they nearly have their own filmic language. The narrative structure has unchangeable elements such as the thrilling opening sequence, the climax at the villain’s hide-out and the ending in the arms of a Bond-girl. Iconographic details like the Walther PPK gun, the gadgets and the women are ever present, as well as the fixed characters, reappearing like M or Q, the two Bond girls, the power-hungry villain, his principal henchman, etc. The score, not only in terms of the famous theme, but also where and how the theme is employed, are all a part of a Bond picture. In the last analysis, these films are more ‘Bondian’ than anything else, to employ a term used by Broccoli and other members of the production team. This is a space that is neither British nor American, but encompasses both, as well as nearly everywhere else around the world, geographically. The persistence of this ‘comforting’ consistency is what makes Bond films so popular. The hero and the lines between Good and Evil have always been easily identifiable, prompting John Brosnan to approach Bond films as “fairy tales” and “twentieth-century folk epics”.

James Chapman suggests that the Bond films need to “find the right balance between repetition and variation, [...] so that they can simultaneously provide the sort of entertainment pattern which audiences expect while at the same time providing new thrills”. By this definition, the Bond films need to “find the right balance between repetition and variation, [...] so that they can simultaneously provide the sort of entertainment pattern which audiences expect while at the same time providing new thrills”. By this definition, the Bond films need to “find the right balance between repetition and variation, [...] so that they can simultaneously provide the sort of entertainment pattern which audiences expect while at the same time providing new thrills”. By this definition, the Bond films need to “find the right balance between repetition and variation, [...] so that they can simultaneously provide the sort of entertainment pattern which audiences expect while at the same time providing new thrills”.

Bond History

An evaluation of Bond films’ history reveals three major periods. These periods...
adaptation of James Bond came in the form of an hour-long television film based on *Casino Royale*, directed by William H. Brown Jr. This version, wherein James Bond became Jimmy Bond, an American agent played by Barry Nelson, aired on CBS in October 1954. Dr. No, the first film of the Bond franchise, was inspired by an unrealized film project called *James Gunn-Secret Agent*, again with an American title character. Although this was later changed, details about Doctor No’s character and the Caribbean location remained largely the same. The two men behind the project were the producers Albert ‘Cubby’ Broccoli and Harry Saltzman. Broccoli was born in New York to an Italian-American family. Having started out as a tea-boy at Twentieth Century-Fox, he eventually moved up to the position of assistant director. After a stint at the Famous Artists Agency following the war, he founded the British production company Warwick Films with Irving Allen in the 1950s. Harry Saltzman was born in Canada, but eventually moved to New York. After various jobs in the show business, he co-founded the Woodfall production company. Saltzman was the one to first meet with Fleming in 1960, although Broccoli had been entertaining the idea of Bond adaptations for several years at that point. The two producers met in May 1961 and formed the Danjaq production company in Switzerland, as well as its subsidiary, EON Productions, for their operations in Britain. To secure financing, they first spoke to Columbia, but it was United Artists that accepted their project. The director, Terence Young, had already worked with Broccoli, as had one of the three scriptwriters, Richard Maibaum. After the selection of a Scottish actor to play Bond (Sean Connery) and a Swiss actress to be the original Bond girl (Ursula Andress), location shooting began in Jamaica. Thus from the outset, the franchise was a rather multinational formation. The first period in Bond film series starts thus with *Dr. No*, which was initially released in the UK, and did not open in the US until May 1963. Although not favored by the critics, it made a profit large enough to ensure the second film. Setting the standards for the franchise, *From Russia With Love* (Young, 1963) included a pre-credits sequence and credits accompanied by the title song. Made by the same producer-director-scriptwriter team and the same lead actor, the film was set largely in Istanbul, with Italian and German actresses playing Russian spies and a Mexican actor playing a major Turkish character. This trend, with similar crew members, some of the same actors and international locations, continued throughout the rest of the films. Guy Hamilton and Lewis Gilbert took over direction from Young for several films each, and later, Peter Hunt, an editor on Bond films, directed *On Her Majesty’s Secret Service* (1969). In the meantime, earlier directors such as Young and Hamilton had started working in Hollywood, as would Hunt later in his career. Young directed, among others, the well-received thriller *Wait Until Dark* (1967). Hamilton, although chosen to direct the original *Superman* (1978), had to back out due to tax reasons when production moved from Italy to England; nonetheless, he worked in other, less successful Hollywood films. All of these directors continued working in British, Hollywood, and co-produced projects. Their experiences as directors of a popular film series surely must have helped them get Hollywood jobs, but having worked in projects that are largely controlled by producers, as was the case with the Bond franchise, may have given them extra credibility in the eyes of Hollywood producers. In this regard, EON Productions is at least partially responsible for the transnational careers of these directors. The initial period of the franchise ended in 1975 when Saltzman sold his 50%
share in Danjaq to United Artists. The second period, from THE SPY WHO LOVED ME (1977) to LICENSE TO KILL, (1989) covers seven films. The first four of these were produced by Broccoli alone and starred Roger Moore, who had replaced Sean Connery in 1973. The last three, two of them starring Timothy Dalton, were produced by Broccoli as well as Michael Wilson. Wilson was originally a lawyer specialized in international business, but had come on board the Bond franchise in 1974, when Broccoli’s troubles with Saltzman were ongoing. He became a co-scriptrunner with Maibaum for YOUR EYES ONLY (Glen, 1981), and co-scripted the following four films, until the end of what I have called the second period. The directors in this period were Lewis Gilbert, who had already directed one Bond film, and John Glen, who had edited and acted as second unit director on three Bond films. This was a problematic era, since James Bond had become an icon and subsequently turned into a cliché. Roger Moore played up the comedy element in the films, and the presence of Jaws (Richard Kiel), a gigantic villain with steel teeth, was blamed for steering the films towards a juvenile audience: “Jaws [seems to be] created to appeal to anyone under the age of ten.” Despite the criticisms of older fans, the films did well at the box-office, each bringing in over US$150 million. When Roger Moore was replaced by Timothy Dalton in THE LIVING DAYLIGHTS (Glen, 1987), the films took on a more serious note in an attempt to return to their earlier style, but were faced with the collapse of the Soviets. Dalton starred only in two Bond films, and after LICENSE TO KILL (Glen, 1989), the series went into a hiatus for six years, marking the end of the second period. The two directors of this period helmed several Hollywood pictures after, and between, their Bond films, but were unable to become major players. This is not too surprising, considering this period was the one with lowest popularity in the franchise history, as can be seen in Figure 1.

The New Bond and the Newer Bond

In 1995, GOLDENEYE ushered in a new era. Not only was this the first Bond film after the end of the Cold War and the first outing for Pierce Brosnan in the title role, but it was also the first time Albert Broccoli delegated production to his daughter Barbara Broccoli and step-son Michael Wilson, and the first film after the death of Maibaum, who had scripted thirteen of the sixteen previous films. GOLDENEYE came six years after LICENSE TO KILL (Glen, 1989), a gap much wider than the usual 2-year cycle. Although this is an era of new blood, there are essentially no major changes in the Bondian universe. The pattern has been set, and the franchise stays within the family. One noteworthy change is in terms of the selection of directors. Until GOLDENEYE, the sixteen Bond films had been directed by four directors only, two of whom had already been on the crew as editors. Martin Campbell of New Zealand became the first director of the new Bond era, and this was to be his first experience with the Bond franchise. Although he was not originally from the UK, a solid career in British TV series and experience with US action films (NO ESCAPE, 1994) were the primary reasons Campbell was given the job. The success of the films, however, is not solely due to the capabilities of the director or the producers. GOLDENEYE opened with a massive ad campaign, positioning the film not as the forefather of the 1980s’ and the 1990s’ action blockbuster, which it arguably was, but as a contemporary, thrilling action-adventure. At this point, it was clear that the Bond franchise had become truly Hollywood, and the campaign pushed the film as an update on the franchise everyone knew and loved, without any specific references to Bond’s nationality.

After the major success of GOLDENEYE, the next Bond was produced very quickly, this time under the direction of British-raised Canadian Roger Spottiswoode, who had started out as an editor first in the UK, and continued in Hollywood working on films of Sam Peckinpah. His career as a director largely included action films such as UNDER FIRE (1983), AIR AMERICA (1990) and the universally reviled STOP OR MY MOTHER WILL SHOOT (1992). Although TOMORROW NEVER DIES (1997) did well at the box-office, and even surpassed GOLDENEYE, much friction was reported between the director and the producers, as had been the case on the set of GOLDENEYE with Campbell. Broccoli and Wilson had complete control over the films. As Wilson noted in an interview when asked if there is a line they don’t cross in terms of MPAA ratings, “You can ask [Martin Campbell] how many times we asked him to get some cover on that and do it another way.”

These frictions between the production company and the director have led to new directors for every following film. The choice for THE WORLD IS NOT ENOUGH (1999) was Michael Apted, who fit the criteria: a British director with several Hollywood thrillers under his belt (BLINK, 1994; EXTREME MEASURES, 1996). Curiously though, Apted was also known for his documentary work in the UK (7 UP series) and more “dramatic” films (COAL MINER’S DAUGHTER, 1980; GORILLAS IN THE MIST, 1988). THE WORLD IS NOT ENOUGH is considered to be one of the darker Bond films, so much so that the review in Sight & Sound found the film to be almost non-Bondian: “The makers of THE WORLD IS NOT ENOUGH, of whom director Michael Apted should be singled out for blame, have attempted to dispel all-too fleshy characters who desire, lack and feel. It’s what is valued in a Ken Loach film, but it acts as an explosive and unsettling expulsion from the fantasies Bond films invite us to.” This resulted in yet another change of directors. DIE ANOTHER DAY (2002) was directed by Lee Tamahori, half Maori, half British, born and raised in New Zealand. Tamahori made his international breakthrough with a drama about the Maori, ONCE WERE WARRIORS (1994), and quickly transferred to Hollywood to direct a series of thrillers (MULHOLLAND FALLS, 1996; THE EDGE, 1997; ALONG CAME A SPIDER, 2001). The Guardian called Tamahori, probably one of the most famed directors in the franchise, an “expert, solid, faintly anonymous director, [he is] tailor-made for the next Bond movie”. The director himself is also aware of the limitations, saying “... they have a very loyal fan base and after 19 pictures, I’m not the guy to come in here and say that my idea is right and theirs is wrong”, even though he argues that the limitations are imposed by the genre itself, not by the producers or the studio. It’s, however, the producers and the studio that have created the genre. For CASINO ROYALE, Martin Campbell was chosen to direct, despite Quentin Tarantino’s apparent interest. GOLDENEYE’s enormous popularity was clearly the leading motive, but Campbell’s success after GOLDENEYE, with two Zorro films has proven that he is an ideal Bond director – skillful, action-oriented, yet consistently ‘invisible’.

CASINO ROYALE did breathe new life into the franchise, bringing audience numbers back up to the early Bond era. Initially, Daniel Craig’s selection as the new Bond sparked heated debates on the web and in the press. His blandness and his rough features, especially when compared to Pierce Brosnan, the previous Bond,
drew a lot of criticism. Nonetheless, the film opened to rave reviews and proved to be a great critical and commercial success. CASINO ROYALE took the series back to its beginnings, when Bond first received his ‘license to kill’. The opening sequence, shot in black and white with sharp camera angles and intercut with shots of an unusually bloody fistfight, signaled to the audiences that this was a different Bond. While the rest of the film is closer to what is expected of a Bond film, James Bond’s awkwardness around classical features like his tuxedo and his drinks, as well as the romantic plotline set CASINO ROYALE apart. While James Bond was born in the Cold War era, this Bond is fighting ‘the War on Terrorism’. The villain is not a madman trying to take over the world, but a banker who holds global terrorists’ fortunes. The film even suggests that the events of September 11, 2001 were not ideologically motivated, but instead was a part of a stock market scheme to deprecate the values of airline companies. Slavoj Žižek has compared Osama Bin Laden to Ernst Stavro Blofeld, the villain of numerous Bond films, and asked whether single hero movies like Bond can survive after September 11. CASINO ROYALE answered this question by setting Bond up against not an individual terrorist villain, but against the very source that sustains terrorism. Concerning global stock markets and an international poker game, with villains from multiple regions, the film’s plot is a reflection of the age of transnational corporations, and Bond is renewed for a new generation.

Other Franchises

Although widely used, the term ‘franchise’ is rarely properly defined. It is often used for all films with multiple sequels; however, serials from Hollywood’s studio era are often kept out of discussion. Janet Wasko and Eileen Meehan define the film franchise as a concept that is copied and recycled, that generates different products. While these have always existed, they were not called franchises until the last few decades. To better comprehend the impact of franchises on film industry, it is enough to take a quick look at the top ten films in the all time box-office list for worldwide grosses. Except for one film, all are parts of franchises. Furthermore, studios earn even higher revenues from merchandising, tie-ins and DVD sales. Franchises offer a great variety of these products, becoming gold mines for their studios.

Similar to James Bond, most of the successful franchises are transnational in terms of their production. HARRY POTTER and THE LORD OF THE RINGS, both from an English literary tradition, were runaway productions with multinational casts and crew. The first two HARRY POTTER films were directed by the American director Chris Columbus, the third by a Mexican, Alfonso Cuarón, and the fourth by an Englishman, Mike Newell. All were shot at Leavesden Studios outside London, where GOLDENEYE and DIE ANOTHER DAY were also filmed, as well as the first two episodes of STAR WARS. THE LORD OF THE RINGS series were written, filmed and completed in New Zealand, by a local director. With the global popularity of the series, ‘Wellywood’ was put on the map of international filmmaking. Nonetheless, the three films were produced and distributed by Hollywood companies and are perceived, not incorrectly, to be Hollywood films.

Even the most ‘American’ superhero, Superman, had his farmhouse, including its surrounding corn fields, built from scratch in Australia for SUPERMAN RETURNS (Bryan Singer, 2006). Warner Bros. produced the first four BATMAN films with PolyGram Filmed Entertainment, a London-based subsidiary of the Dutch music company PolyGram. While BATMAN (Tim Burton, 1989) and BATMAN RETURNS (Burton, 1992) were shot partially at British studios, BATMAN FOREVER (Joel Schumacher, 1995) and BATMAN & ROBIN (Joel Schumacher, 1997) were produced in-house, at Warner Bros.’ Burbank Studios. With BATMAN BEGINS (Christopher Nolan, 2005), however, the franchise took another step away from the US, where the fictional Gotham City is located. BATMAN BEGINS had an English director, a Welshman (Christopher Bale) in the title role, and an assortment of international acting talent in supporting roles. A cartoon published prior to the release shows Batman in his classic pose: perched atop a building, high over the city. Albeit, the building is Big Ben, and Batman is sipping tea from a floral cup. The film eventually grossed over US$ 370 million, 55% of which came from the US market, which did not seem to mind Batman’s new English heritage.

Conclusion

Successful franchises continue to provide audiences with familiar delights, and studios with guaranteed revenues. While the content of these films may be homogenous and standardized, their productions are certainly not. Bond films are among the earliest examples of franchises, but they have now been joined by many others. The space that Bond films belong to is that of co-productions, aiming for the largest common denominator for audiences, and the largest possible profit. Through “access to foreign governments’ incentives and subsidies”, access to each other’s markets, “foreign locations” and “cheaper inputs” across countries involved in the co-production, worldwide profits are maximized. This is a transnational space, encompassing more than one ‘nation’. In these ways, this realm is much closer to Hollywood, which does not necessarily need to be located in Southern California, than to an invented construct of ‘British’ cinema.

The significance of Bond franchise for this project is twofold. The first is that this transnational space had been created as early as the 1960s by Bond, which acted as a blueprint for many blockbuster action films in the decades to come. The second involves the position of directors within this space. The name, nationality, and style of a Bond director are of little importance compared to the franchise, its producers and its studio. While the émigré auteur narrative still prevails for some of the famous global directors like Paul Verhoeven or John Woo, many others have been ignored largely in their capacity as any other industry filmmaker. In this light, it is not surprising that Bond directors continued their careers in other Hollywood films. Instead of émigré auteurs who wanted to leave their marks on the films they made, they were highly skilled craftsmen who were capable of providing the studios with the thrills that could lure audiences to cinemas, and for the studios, that has always been more important than a director’s nationality.

Several months after its release, CASINO ROYALE had its China premier, becoming the first Bond film ever to be officially released there. This was the biggest launch ever for a foreign film in China on 1000 screens, and yet Sony did not expect to make a significant profit, since China’s state-owned distributor retains the bulk of the box-office returns. Nonetheless, the film’s stars Daniel Craig and Eva Green, as well as Martin Campbell, Barbara Broccoli and Michael G. Wilson were present. This premier highlighted two of the key issues in contemporary
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4. Let Me Rephrase That: Autoremakes across the World

Jean Renoir famously said that great directors make the same film over and over again throughout their careers. While he may have meant this to refer to auteurs who dwell on particular themes and employ a consistent style within their oeuvre, it is the literal truth for certain filmmakers who have remade their own works. Sven Lützschenn points out that this practice dates back as early as the Lumière Brothers; and that the “mythical first film,” WORKERS LEAVING THE FACTORY, was shot three times: once on paper in 1894 and twice during 1895. This practice, labeled ‘autoremake’ by Daniel Protopopoff and Michel Cerceau, has constituted a sporadic but steady subdivision of remakes in general.

Robert Eberwein has suggested a thorough classification of remakes by dividing them into fifteen categories, taking into account the films’ origins, cultural settings, genres, as well as other factors that may be changed between the original and the remake.

Autoremakes can fall into the first two of Eberwein’s categories. The first category is “a silent film remade by the same director as a sound film.” The second category is “the original version in a different country in a different language.” I will return to examples of each of these categories shortly.

In this chapter, then, I will look at directors who remade their own films in Hollywood; translating their native cinematic language into that of Hollywood. The reason I have chosen to study auto-remakes is that they provide global directors with a comfortable move into the Hollywood system, reworking their own previous material. Having a film that has proven well in one country is already a great asset, having a film that can be remade into a Hollywood picture is an even greater one. These remakes give their directors a possibility to distribute their films in countries that would otherwise be out of their reach. Hollywood’s vast distribution infrastructure guarantees this reach; at the same time, it secures financing for production, allowing for the larger budgets. Furthermore, comparing ‘original’ and Hollywood versions of films, particularly by the same directors, can provide an insight into the content and the style of the film, and how these are translated when transposed from a national into a global context.

Remakes have become a common occurrence in filmmaking starting in the late 1920s, with the advent of sound. Since silent films lacked recorded dialogue, they were easily screened in different countries. With the coming of sound, this convenience disappeared. In addition to remakes of silent films into sound films, early days of sound saw many films shot as multilanguage productions, as briefly discussed in chapter 2. The same sets were utilized to shoot different language versions of the same story with different casts. Ewald André Dupont, hired in 1929 by British International Pictures to direct the English and German versions of ATLANTIC, was one of the first directors to shoot multilanguage films, Dupont had already worked in Hollywood, and he was a German national; hence he was an ideal candidate. The practice of multilanguage versions was abandoned when cheaper methods such as dubbing and subtitling started to be deployed. During the first decades of sound era, several autoremakes were made that fall into Eberwein’s first category.
required to produce and to market blockbusters could only be afforded by large studios, and the magnitude of these investments required that the films be as little ‘risky’ as possible. The popularity of remakes in this era is related to the studios’ desire to use sources that are ‘presold’ in other media, that have already proven their popularity in other markets, to provide pictures that are more likely to succeed at the box office. The blockbuster era saw an increase in these ‘safe’ productions. This is also the case for remakes, where films already successful with audiences are chosen to be remade. This trend is supported by the limited (or at times non-existent) distribution of foreign films in the American market. As Eberwein notes, every remade film is bound to encounter new audiences, and since the foreign originals can reach only a small portion of the world market, the remakes are certain to broaden their audiences.

Not all remakes have proven to be financially successful, but those that have combined the allure of blockbusters and the narratives of the originals have done very well at the box office. Among the most notable ones are TRUE LIES (James Cameron, 1994) with Arnold Schwarzenegger, THE BIRDCAGE (Mike Nichols, 1996) with Robin Williams, and VANILLA SKY (Cameron Crowe, 2001) with Tom Cruise - Remakes of LATOTALE! (Claude Zidi, 1991), LACAGE AUX FOLLES (Edouard Molinaro, 1978), and ABRELSOJOS (Alejandro Amenábar, 1997), respectively. Asian remakes have been added to this list, after the phenomenal success of THE RINGS (Gore Verbinski, 2002) with Naomi Watts. This film, remake of the Japanese horror film RINGU (Hideo Nakata, 1998) will be discussed in the following pages. This pattern is a partial answer to an essential question: why are films remade and not...
pages. Ultimately, a Hollywood remake is likely to draw larger audiences, because it carries the brand of Hollywood. For most audiences around the world, this brand signifies a high level of technical standards and promises an entertaining experience. I will return to discussing Hollywood as a global brand in the conclusion chapter.

**European Autoremakes**

As I have indicated in my introduction, the history of autoremakes is somewhat limited. Hitchcock’s *The Man Who Knew Too Much*, as a 1934 British and a 1956 Hollywood film, is possibly the best-known example. It is also an interesting case, since the language of the original and the remake are the same. Anatole Litvak and Julien Duvivier made their Hollywood debuts with auto-remakes: Roger Vadim, who alternated between France and Hollywood throughout the 1970s and the 1980s, remade his classic*Et Dieu Créa la Femme* (1956) in 1987 as *And God Created Woman* in Hollywood. Since the 1980s, Hollywood studios have produced several more sets of autoremakes. Interestingly, these are rather easily classified by region and genre: two French comedies, two North European thrillers and three Japanese horror films. The trend started with Francis Veber’s *Les Fugitifs* (1986) / *Three Fugitives* (1989) and Jean-Marie Poiré’s (*Gaubert Les Visiteurs* (1993) / *Just Visiting* (2001)). Comedy is a genre that does not tend to travel well, and both films received scathing reviews. Disney tried to avoid the negative comparisons with the original for *Three Fugitives* by not distributing the original *Les Fugitifs* in the US market, but to no avail. The Washington Post proclaimed: “*Three Fugitives*, a Disney remake of a French farce, recalls *Men and a Baby*, a Disney remake of a French farce, which recalled *Down and Out in Beverly Hills*, a Disney remake of a French farce. Aside from a lack of Yankee ingenuity, what we have here is an advanced case of déjà view.” Despite the negative reviews, the film did exceptionally well at the box office, providing Veber with another chance to direct a Hollywood studio film, *called Out on a Limb* (1992). This was to be his last studio project, proving the old Hollywood adage “you’re only as good as your last movie”. *Just Visiting*, Poiré’s Hollywood debut also received negative reviews, exacerbated by the fact that *Les Visiteurs* had indeed been released in the US by Miramax in 1996. “*Just Visiting* not only microwaves what is already four-day-old fish in Paris, but lets the original director, screenwriters, and stars do the reheating.” Unlike *Three Fugitives*, *Just Visiting* failed to earn enough money at the box office, and brought a quick end to Poiré’s Hollywood career.

Another set of Hollywood-debut auto-remakes are two thrillers, one by a Dutch director and the other by a Danish director: George Sluizer’s *SPOOLLOOS* (1988) / *The Vanishing* (1993) and Ole Bornedal’s *NATTEVAGEN* (1994) / *Nightwatch* (1998). Both *SPOOLLOOS* and *NATTEVAGEN* were extremely successful in their native countries, and received several awards at international festivals. *SPOOLLOOS* was also distributed in the US, and in addition to receiving positive reviews, did well at the box office. Shortly thereafter, Twentieth Century Fox, which had purchased the rights of *SPOOLLOOS*, hired Sluizer to remake his own film, this time set in the US, with American actors and with a budget of US$33 million; as opposed to the merely NLG1.5 million spent on *SPOOLLOOS*. One of the most striking elements of *SPOOLLOOS*, adapted from Tim Krabbé’s novel *The Golden Egg*, was its final scene, where the protagonist lies inside a coffin, buried alive. It was this ending that was picked up by many critics to be the most striking part of the movie despite its claustrophobic and decidedly gloomy nature, but predictably, was changed in the remake. The reviewer in *Variety* remarked, “Should Sluizer decide to issue a dubbed version of the film, it might find a large audience in the US. It has all the ingredients of the best American suspense film and could do well. Its ending, while a little bleak and not for all tastes, is a sensible choice that is almost a signature for the film.” Producers of *The Vanishing* wanted to make sure that audiences would not be alienated by seeing the protagonist die and made a safe choice by requesting Sluizer to change the ending. In the Hollywood version, the protagonist’s new girlfriend, a role significantly expanded for the remake, kills the villain and rescues the protagonist from the coffin in which he was to be buried alive. Sluizer started the project knowing full well that he would have to change his film quite drastically. In an interview given prior to the shooting of *The Vanishing*, the director said that in order to make a film in Hollywood, one had to play the game by their rules, and that otherwise one could end up sharing the fate of *Fatal Attraction* (Adrian Lyne, 1987). Sluizer also argued that his main reason for accepting the project was not to tell the same story differently, but to direct different actors in similar roles. The author of the novel and the initial original script, Tim Krabbé connects Sluizer’s choice to a desire to work in Hollywood: “It was, at 61, his one chance to work in Hollywood, so I can understand that he yielded to the pressure that made him spoil his own masterpiece.”

*NATTEVAGEN* / *Nightwatch* remakes are also of the thriller/suspense genre. Unlike *The Vanishing*, there are barely any differences between *Nightwatch* and its original in terms of narrative. There was, however, a major difference in distribution. When *NATTEVAGEN* became a hit in Denmark and received awards at several European festivals, Dimension Films, the genre division of Miramax, purchased the distribution rights and promptly put the original film on the shelf. *NATTEVAGEN* was never released in the US, thus the audiences and most of the critics did not have the chance to compare *Nightwatch* to the original. Interestingly, some critics mentioned the failure of *The Vanishing* as a factor in Dimension Films’ decision not to show the original film. Roger Ebert wrote: “[Dimension] kept *NATTEVAGEN* off the market here while producing the retread, no doubt to forestall the kinds of unfavorable comparisons that came up when the Danish [sic] director George Sluizer remade his brilliant *The Vanishing* (1988) into a sloppy, spineless 1993 American film.” Despite this strategy, *Nightwatch* did not garner critical or financial success.

Surely, critics have the tendency to dismiss remakes as inferior to the original, just by virtue of not being the original. But in these cases, the public also failed to show an interest in the films. Although there have been attempts to theorize a model for predicting the success of a motion picture, there is still no clear formula as to which films become profitable at the box office (Litman, Sochay, Chung and Ki). In the case of *The Vanishing*, the main reason seems to be the drastic change in the ending. The new ending gave the audiences a safe familiarity, but failed to provide them with the originality of the first version. Beyond the content of the film, a lot hinges also on the release pattern and the marketing efforts. In the case of *Nightwatch*, Dimension Films did not release the film until 1998, although shooting had wrapped in late 1996. While there has been no official explanation,
this delay was reported to be due to some last-minute changes and “fixes” with the script, as well as to avoiding going up against the film’s lead actor, Ewan McGregor’s other 1997 releases (Peter Greenaway’s The Pillow Book and Danny Boyle’s A Life Less Ordinary) at the box office. Whatever the reasons, this lag in release had a negative effect on the film’s box-office success. In addition, although both films featured well-known actors, neither of them had bankable major stars, or special effects, which have become stars of their own accord in the age of the blockbuster. Like Yeber and Poire, these films were Shuitar and Bonedall’s Hollywood debuts. Both directors returned to their respective home countries after these films.

Steven Jay Schneider concludes that these remakes “prioritize spectacle and action at the expense of character development and plot subtlety,” are “less psychological and less philosophical,” “more conventional and more predictable,” and lack the sense of humor found in the original. One can see these autoremakes as an extension of the close relationship Hollywood has had with Europe throughout its history. As a source of inspiration and talent from the 1920s on, Hollywood has followed Europe; even as European auteurs themselves, like the filmmakers of the New Wave era, admired and appropriated works of Classical Hollywood. The dualities between Hollywood and Europe that uphold the European films as “unique works of art” versus Hollywood’s “standardized commodities”’ reappear in much of the discourses surrounding these remakes, despite the fact that the European originals are popular genre films. Looking toward Europe in search of new ideas had been standard practice for Hollywood until the late 1990s. The large Asian market and the rising popularity of Asian films on festival circuits as well as cult video distribution networks has added Asia as an alternative, as I will discuss in the next section.

‘Asian Invasion’

The final sets of remakes are a rarity in the sense that they seem to have found a good balance between familiarity and originality. They are part of a trend that has been called the ‘Asian Invasion’ in Hollywood. These films are The Ring Two (Nakata, 2005), the sequel to the remake of Hideo Nakata’s Ring; The Ring; and two films by Takashi Shimizu: The Grudge (2004) and The Grudge 2 (2006), the remakes to Shimizu’s Jun-On: The Grudge (2003) and Jun-On: The Grudge 2 (2003), which are remakes of his straight-to-video J-U-On films. The fact that the ‘original’ films themselves are adaptations and remakes opens up a new set of questions. Unlike in Europe or the US, the question of ‘originality’ is not central to cultural debate in these cases. In fact, there is no Japanese word for ‘originality’, since the concept is “generally alien to Japanese Aesthetics”. Thus, in Japan, the remakes are not necessarily labeled ‘inferior’ from the onset. This may be one of the reasons why The Ring surpassed Ringu in terms of box office success in Japan. The other and likely greater reason is that Japan has become the largest foreign market for Hollywood films in the last decades. This position, along with the recent surge in popularity of Japanese horror films, can also explain the closer relationship between Hollywood and Japan.

Koji Suzuki’s popular novel Ringu (first published in 1989), about a video tape that kills anyone who sees it within a week, was first adapted to television in 1995 by Chisui Takigawa. It became a great hit with international audiences when Nakata adapted it to the screen in 1998. Rasen (Joji Iida), a sequel based on the novel’s sequel, was produced and released simultaneously to Ringu, but failed to receive the same popularity. Since he was the director of the more popular version, Nakata was asked again to make a sequel independently of the novels, which became Ringu 2 (1999), with an original storyline. Ringu 2 had several of the same characters as the original film, and tried to shed more light on the character of Sadako, the dead little girl who kills people through the mysterious video tape. This was followed by Ringu 0 (Norio Tsuruta, 2000), a prequel, as well as a Korean-Japanese co-production remake, Ring (Dong-Bin Kim, 1999), and two television series, based on Ringu and Rasen.

The enormous success of Ringu around the world attracted the attention of a young studio executive, Roy Lee. Lee, a Korean-American who served as the intermediary in selling the remake rights of the Japanese film to DreamWorks, is billed as one of the executive producers in The Ring. Vertigo Entertainment, the company he co-founded with Doug Davison, continues to be the gatekeeper of the Asian remake market in Hollywood. Having already released The Grudge, Lee and Davison are behind remakes of many famous Asian films of the last decade. These include Nakata’s Hongourei Mizu No Soroi Kara (2002), remade by the Brazilian Walter Salles as Dark Water, the Hong Kong crime picture Infernal Affairs (2002), remade by Martin Scorses as The Departed (2006), as well as a number of South Korean films like Siwora (Hyun-Seung Lee, 2000), remake for the lake House (Alejandro Agresti, 2006). The fact that a leading Hollywood director like Martin Scorses has remade an Asian film shows that the stature of these films has risen quickly. Lee argues that the most important factors in the popularity of Asian films are the directors like Park Chan-wook, Kim Ji-woon and Bong Joon-ho, as well as the story. It is noteworthy that while the stories are retold, the Korean directors Lee mentions have not yet worked for Hollywood. This may be due to the quota system, which allows them to reach large audiences in South Korea. However, with the changes in the system as discussed in chapter two, Korean directors may become more active in Hollywood in the next few years.

With all his involvement, Roy Lee is now seen as “the go-to guy for Asia” in Hollywood. Although he does not speak any Korean, nor Japanese or Chinese, he has discovered that his Asian appearance gives him an advantage both in the US and in Asia. His role in this new wave of Asian remakes is fundamental and is an excellent example for the importance of individual producers, agents and managers in cinematic trends. Vertigo Entertainment is based at Universal Pictures, but also has close ties with Warner Bros. The company is the key node in the remakes network spread across the globe. This network has dense ties between Hollywood and various Asian filmmaking centers like Tokyo and Seoul, as well as festivals. When asked about his working methods, Lee responds: “I don’t really have a game plan, I just sort of bumble around, meet people”. He notes that he was shown Ringu by the director of Puchon Fantastic Film Festival, and that he goes to the festival to meet the filmmakers, even though he has seen all the films. Lee’s strategy of going to festivals and meeting people is a node that interconnects the global festival network and the executives’ network, I have already stressed the importance of international festivals as alternative distribution networks where deals are made in chapter two. Lee’s regular attendance of Asian film festivals highlights this
network once again. His frequent travels also remind us that Hollywood is not a fixed location, and that the producers today are an essential part of this global presence.

The RING, the Hollywood adaptation/remake (opening credits acknowledge both the novel and the Nakata film) was released in 2002 and opened the floodgates of Asian films’ remakes. The remake had moved the location to the Pacific Northwest, which shared the rainy atmosphere of RING’s Japan. The story included elements from both RING and RING 2, as well as added components, to make it less ambiguous and less ‘spiritual’

The greatest change was possibly the budget; compared to RING’s US$1.2 million, THE RING cost US$45 million to make. A sizeable portion of this budget was spent on computer generated effects. THE RING’s success, both critical and commercial, led to the way for a number of remakes of Asian films, most facilitated by Roy Lee, many still in production. It also led to a sequel, this time shot by the director of the original, Nakata. Admittedly, it is somewhat difficult to call THE RING TWO a true remake, since the story line differs completely from that of RING 2. This was necessary, since elements from RING 2 had already been used in THE RING, and also because unlike the Japanese version where the first film’s lead character is killed off in the sequel, producers wanted to keep Naomi Watts, who played a large part in THE RING’s popularity, in the sequel. Nakata’s first Hollywood film thus became a variation on a theme he was already thoroughly familiar with. While the budget for the film was not disclosed, THE RING TWO earned over US$160 million, more than half of which came from overseas markets. Although this was less than the US$250 million made by THE RING, it was still considered a financial success.

Another film that Roy Lee helped sell the remake rights to, THE GRUDGE, was released between THE RING and THE RING TWO. Takeshi Shimizu first wrote and shot JU-ON and its sequel for television and the video market, in 2000. The films, about a haunted house and ghosts who kill, had minuscule budgets and were shot within a matter of days. They were later remade, again by Shimizu, for the big screen in 2002. THE GRUDGE was also a relatively low-budget production, costing US$10 million. The story remained in Japan in this case, but the protagonists were Americans living in Tokyo, played by Sarah Michelle Gellar and Jason Behr. Director Shimizu said in interviews that he was changing the story only a little bit for his own sake, since “if the American producers didn’t think the original version was scary then they wouldn’t have wanted to do the remake.” In addition to the horror sequences that remained identical, the same location was employed as the haunted house, and the family that started the curse was played by the same three actors. Changes served to simplify the story and make it less ambiguous. Shimizu had the advantage of releasing the film after the success of THE RING and amid the buzz surrounding Japanese horror films and their remakes. His use of Tokyo as the location again points at the fragile balance between the familiar and the original: a foreign location, where familiar faces confront an unexplainable horror. This formula proved to quench the thirst of international audiences for a genuine horror movie, earning nearly US$40 million on its opening weekend alone.

A remake film, especially by the same director, is easier to sell in its native country. The DVD cover of NIGHTWATCH for the Danish market reminds the viewers in bold letters that this is “Ole Bornedal’s Hollywood-version of NATTEVAGTEN”. The blurbs printed are from a Danish (Jyllands-Posten) and an American (The Washington Post) newspaper, and they both feature Bornedal’s name prominently. Nonetheless, Denmark is a small market as world markets go, unlike Japan. Hence, it should not come as a surprise that the Japanese poster for THE GRUDGE uses the original name of the films, with only a hint of Hollywoodization; the new version is called THE JU-ON. In Japan, this strategy of highlighting the local component in the remakes is in fact similar to localization policies adopted by TNCs like McDonald’s, a global corporation with specific advertising campaigns, and even specific products for individual markets. Additionally, a remake often increases the interest in the original film in terms of DVD sales and rentals worldwide. Two years after the first film, Shimizu remade its sequel; THE GRUDGE 2 was released in 2006. Again, he shot the film in Tokyo with American actors, but this time, the story line was different from the Japanese version. Nonetheless, with a relatively low budget of US$20 million, the film was profitable; the second sequel, THE GRUDGE 3 is announced to be released in 2008, directed again by Shimizu.

But what was it about these films that made them so much more successful than the European thriller remakes? Obviously, there is no clear formula as to which films succeed at the box office. As Barry Litman says, “it takes the right thing at the right moment to catch the public fancy”, in addition to the marketing efforts. The remakes of Japanese horror films appear to be the right thing at the right time. Their success at the box office is a result of a combination of factors. The first is the authenticity of the original story, which is often lost in Hollywood remakes, making the film so successful. The second is the development of the Japanese horror film industry, which has a dedicated audience and a strong presence in the global market. The third is the influence of Japanese films on the Hollywood horror genre, which has become more prevalent in recent years. These films have helped to establish the genre in Hollywood, and have also helped to increase the interest in Japanese horror films. The fourth is the success of the film itself, which has helped to increase the interest in Japanese horror films. The fifth is the influence of Japanese films on the Hollywood horror genre, which has become more prevalent in recent years. These films have helped to establish the genre in Hollywood, and have also helped to increase the interest in Japanese horror films. The sixth is the influence of Japanese films on the Hollywood horror genre, which has become more prevalent in recent years. These films have helped to establish the genre in Hollywood, and have also helped to increase the interest in Japanese horror films. The seventh is the influence of Japanese films on the Hollywood horror genre, which has become more prevalent in recent years. These films have helped to establish the genre in Hollywood, and have also helped to increase the interest in Japanese horror films. The eighth is the influence of Japanese films on the Hollywood horror genre, which has become more prevalent in recent years. These films have helped to establish the genre in Hollywood, and have also helped to increase the interest in Japanese horror films. The ninth is the influence of Japanese films on the Hollywood horror genre, which has become more prevalent in recent years. These films have helped to establish the genre in Hollywood, and have also helped to increase the interest in Japanese horror films. The tenth is the influence of Japanese films on the Hollywood horror genre, which has become more prevalent in recent years. These films have helped to establish the genre in Hollywood, and have also helped to increase the interest in Japanese horror films.
directors’ Hollywood debuts. After the successes of the two films, both directors received offers to direct other Hollywood pictures. When asked in an interview whether he thought about permanently moving to Hollywood, Nakata gave an answer that reflects the attitudes of many other global directors: “Ideally, I would love to work in both countries, because although Japanese film production is really limited in terms of budget and schedule, I can have creative control during the shoot. But I’d love to be able to enjoy the good things about both countries.” Indeed, unlike their European ‘émigré’ predecessors who moved permanently, directors today can enjoy a much larger flexibility. Considered alongside Shimizu’s practice of directing Hollywood films from one’s own home country, this statement takes on a new meaning regarding how films are made; one can see that Hollywood can be freed from the ‘tyranny of place’, to revisit Tyler Cowen.

Conclusion

While some directors remake their own works as discussed in the previous pages, it is worth noting that many of the Hollywood remakes of Asian films have been directed by other international filmmakers. These include Dark Water by Walter Salles of Brazil, The Lake House by Alejandro Agresti of Argentina, and the 2007 releases My Sassy Girl, directed by the Frenchman Yann Samuell and The Eye, by French directors David Moreau and Xavier Palud, among others. Not all of these films are in the horror genre, My Sassy Girl is a romantic comedy/drama, while The Lake House is defined as a fantasy romance. Another upcoming Asian remake is from the Philippines; Yarn Laranas is remaking his horror film Sigaw (2004) as The Echo, to be released in 2008. Despite its recent problems, the Philippine film industry has been a locally popular one throughout the 1990s and is keen to re-establish its popularity. For all of these directors, these remakes are also their Hollywood debuts, reconfirming the practice of establishing oneself with a presold product that is likely to succeed both in the US and global markets. Another point worth observing is that every one of these films involves Roy Lee in the capacity of producer or executive producer, and has been brought into consideration as possible remakes via Lee’s Vertigo Entertainment, once again confirming the importance of such key figures as facilitators.

The autoremakes discussed in this article point to several trends and highlight some recent patterns in Hollywood and world cinema. Most significant of these is the growing importance of Asia in terms of film trade. Until recently, Europe, including Britain, was the most important international market for Hollywood studios. In fact, Tom O’Regan argues that ‘Hollywood’ is “culturally specific to a general ‘European’ or ‘Western’ cultural frame.” However, while Europe (calculated with Middle East and Africa) is still the largest foreign regional market for Hollywood, Asia has been growing fast. In 2004, the Asia-Pacific region made up 21.6% of world-wide box office revenues of Hollywood films; but it constituted 63.4% of the worldwide admissions, as can be seen in Figures 4.1 and 4.2 below. These numbers show that there is great potential in this region, and that it could easily become the largest market if the ticket prices went up.
In terms of mutual influences, Hollywood and Asian cinemas have been increasingly intertwined in the last decade. Asian martial arts have become a staple of Hollywood action films and the polished Hollywood-style has become prevalent in larger-budget Asian pictures. Compared to the aging population of Europe, Asia presents much larger potential, as well as challenges. This potential / challenge is embodied by the greatest anticipation, or dread, of recent times: China. People’s Republic of China joined the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 2001, but accession implementations still continue. Once China completes the changes it has started, the large Asian market will get much larger. Turning to Asia for new ideas results in closer ties with the continent, and possibly an eventual break into the Chinese market, as argued by the Hong Kong directors Andy Lau and Alan Mak.

The other pattern demonstrated here, largely interdependent with the one discussed above, is the globalization of the film world and the transnationality of Hollywood. As discussed in the previous chapters, the conglomerization in the media industry and the increase in runaway productions, as well as in the mobility of the creative class have contributed to these trends. At the same time, the international talent working in Hollywood has become increasingly varied; instead of only Europeans, filmmaking talent from all parts of the world, Asia, Australia, as well as South America are now working in Hollywood, as I have demonstrated in chapter one.

The Asian remakes are illustrations of the trends discussed, and Takashi Shimizu’s THE GRUDGE series is their epitome. Shimizu worked in his homeland for a transnational conglomerator, Columbia Pictures (owned by Sony Pictures Entertainment, part of Sony). The project had a Japanese source, an international cast and crew, transnational financial backing, and was a runaway production. With a larger Asian market, and a globalized China, there is no doubt that more Asian directors will be making their way to Hollywood. Some of them might take advantage of the wave of remakes, since it has been proven to be an effective way to break into the US market, and subsequently, the world markets. As the career paths of the six directors discussed here prove, whether the Hollywood careers of any global director can then continue depends entirely on the financial success of their films.

1 Sven Lütticken: “Planet of the Remakes.” In New Left Review, no. 25, 01-01.2004: 103-119, here 104. One should note, however, that the reason for this was very different; it was not yet possible to make physical copies of films, and the original wore out because of the repeated viewings.
4 For a thorough analysis of Hollywood’s global distribution networks, see Miller et al.: 294-311.
7 Unlike remakes of Hollywood films in other countries, autoremakes are unique to Hollywood, as no director has ever remade his/her own Hollywood production in a different country.
9 Eberwein: 18.
10 Mazdon: 24.
12 Higson (1989): 42. While Higson made this observation for British audiences, it can be extended to others as well. At the time Higson wrote this essay, Britain was the largest overseas market for Hollywood, that position now belongs to Japan.
13 Litvak remade L’ Équipage (1935) as The Woman I Love (1937) and Duvivier remade Un Carnet de Bal (1937) as Lydia (1941)
14 Williams and Mork quoted in Grindstaff: 142.
16 OUT ON A LIMB grossed about $2 million in the US, a ghastly box office figure by any standard, and much lower than the $40 million THREE FOOTPRINTS had brought in.
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I Want My MTV and My MP3: Advertising, Music and Film Industries

One of the most famous advertising commercials of all times is a 60-second spot for Macintosh called ‘1984’, shot by Ridley Scott for Chiat/Day advertising agency. Within a dystopian setting as suggested by the George Orwell novel of the same name, a young woman in vivid color is seen running towards a giant TV screen amidst hollow-eyed workers dressed in gray. She throws a sledgehammer she is carrying, crashing the screen. A voice-over is heard saying: “On January 24th, Apple Computer will introduce Macintosh. And you will see why 1984 won’t be like ‘1984’.” Although it ran only once, on January 22, 1984, during the Super Bowl game in the US, it received four major advertising awards that year, and went on to be declared the best advertising commercial of the last 50 years in 1995. Its US$400,000 budget allowed for high production values, reminding audiences of R. Scott’s Blade Runner, which had just been released in 1982. In the late 1990s, Macintosh released a Quicktime version of 1984, and the commercial is currently available on all video streaming web sites.

‘1984’ is significant on various levels. Firstly, it is one of the earlier examples of media convergence; it is beyond just an advertising commercial or just a movie, it is an event. It is an instance of an already famous feature film director working on a commercial, which has now become commonplace. In terms of its production company Ridley Scott Associates (RSA), which will be further discussed in this chapter, ‘1984’ is an example of a transnational production. And what happened to the advertising agency responsible for the commercial in the following years is a classical example of the conglomerization process that media and advertising companies have been going through since the 1980s. The agency was Chiat/Day, based in Los Angeles, called “the hottest shop” in the 1980s’ US advertising. In addition to working with the London-based RSA, the agency was the first one in the US to adopt the British strategy of account planning. Nonetheless, Chiat/Day was still largely a national agency. Even though it had purchased the Australian advertising agency Mojo to become Chiat/Day/Mojo in 1990, it stood only at number 18 on the list of the largest US agencies based on worldwide income. This was largely due to its limited international involvement; Chiat/Day/Mojo’s non-US gross income was only 33% of its overall income, much below the average 60% among the leading agencies. In 1993, after it sold Mojo, the agency was dropped by one of its largest clients, Reebok, because it did not have “the global resources the company needed”. Soon after this incident, Chiat/Day was acquired by the Omnicom Group, and merged with TBWA, becoming a part of one of the largest global marketing groups. The necessity to build international networks is as inevitable for advertising corporations as it is for media conglomerates. These networks, in turn, show parallels with the global film industry, as Hollywood studios extend their presence in world markets via local production and distribution, much like the strategies adopted by advertising corporations in recent decades.
branding, and even healthcare. Like the media conglomerates that own the studios, these corporations are globally flexible and aim to profit from synergy.

Along with the conglomerization of these companies in the 1980s, the transnational brands they serviced started launching international advertising campaigns. Through market segmentation independent of nationality, advertising companies created a global space. Like Hollywood’s role in global filmmaking, New York plays a central role in terms of global advertising, albeit with further emphasis on localized versions of global campaigns. As suggested by the slogan adopted from ecological campaigns, ‘think global, act local’, global companies offer and sell their products in as many countries as possible, but always bear in mind differences between individual markets, with the help of similarly globalized advertising corporations. This practice, also termed glocalization, has been the leading factor in creating this global space, while maintaining the uniqueness of each local market. The advertising world is also brought together by professional networks. The International Advertising Association (IAA) has representation in 76 countries, whereas World Federation of Advertisers (WFA) is represented in 55. These associations facilitate the globalization of advertising.

Patterns followed by the music industry within the last decades have been similar to those in film and advertising industries. Conglomerations built through mergers and acquisitions started dominating the industry starting from the 1980s onward. By 1994, “more than 90 per cent of the gross sales of recorded music worldwide came from albums, singles, and music videos owned or distributed by one of six multinational corporations: Time Warner, Sony, Philips, Bertelsmann, Thorn-EMI and Matsushita”. Due to the constantly shifting nature of media industries, there have been changes in this data. For example, Time Warner sold Warner Music Group in 2003, and Matsushita rid itself of most of its foreign stock by the late 1990s. Further mergers, like that of the recorded music divisions of Sony and BMG in 2004, continued the consolidation process. Film and music industries are both dominated by the few major media conglomerates, and often, they are the very same ones like Sony or until recently, Vivendi and Time Warner. The greatest challenge faced by the music industry over the past years has been online piracy. The proliferation of online music file sharing started in 1999 with Napster, and although Napster was shut down in 2001, other peer-to-peer file sharing programs like Kazaa allow millions of users to access files for free, and has contributed largely to the decrease in recorded music sales. Legal measures taken to curb the practice of downloading free music, such as suing “individual computer users who are illegally offering large amounts of copyrighted music over peer-to-peer networks”, coupled with the success of Apple’s iTunes, which allows users to download individual songs legally for US$0.99, have helped the recovery of sales. With the increase in broadband Internet access, film industry is facing the same problems, some of which it may avoid by adopting practices developed by the music industry. Aida Hozic, whom I briefly mentioned in chapter two, argues that since the end of the studio era, the power has shifted from the manufacturers (producers) to the merchants (distributors). While the main transnational distributors are still largely a part of the media conglomerates, pirate distribution, whether online or on the streets, has become an alternative network that in some markets threatens the legitimate distribution and exhibition channels. This is particularly evident in China, a new market that Hollywood studios want to reach.

Globalization of Advertising and Media

The development of the advertising industry throughout the 20th century shows many parallels with that of the film industry. The history of moving image advertising is nearly as old as cinema itself. The first cinema advertisement is widely considered to belong to Dewar’s Scotch, dated 1898. These advertisements continued in cinemas and later transformed into the new media of television. The first TV advertisement was for a Bulova watch, shown during a baseball game in 1941 in the US. With the spread of network telecommunications, commercials became a staple in the homes of viewers across the world. The internationalization process in service industries such as advertising that started in the 1970s gave rise to a number of multinational agencies. These changes not only mirrored, but also facilitated the internationalization of capital, including the transnationalization of media conglomerates that purchased the Hollywood studios. As of 2005, the top advertising holdings of the world by revenue were transnational conglomerates like Omnicom Group, WPP Group, Interpublic Group, Publicis Groupe, and Havas. Each of these holdings owns numerous individually transnational advertising agencies. Omnicom and Interpublic are headquartered in New York, WPP in London, and Publicis and Havas in Paris. All of these groups earn their revenues largely from advertising services, but also offer services such as public relations,
While Hollywood films are being shown in China, and the viewers are indeed accessed, the limited number of non-Chinese films released, along with the low price of available pirate copies shows that this access is achieved by illegitimate networks rather than the studios themselves. I will return to these topics and the developments in film distribution in chapter six, nonetheless I would like to look at some of the new industry practices that are currently gaining momentum.

While I have discussed the transnationalization of Hollywood largely from a production point of view so far, the borderless distribution network that the Internet has become is surely a part of this process. Selling legal downloads of entire films is a practice that has yet to catch on, primarily because of limited bandwidth, and the limited variety of available films. iTunes started offering films in September 2006, but only from the subsidiaries of The Walt Disney Company. Another drawback to downloaded “near-DVD quality” films is that unlike DVDs, they do not offer extra features or multi-channel audio. Without a drastic change in pricing policies, films that are readily available on DVD are not likely to be popular downloads. Nonetheless, for films that are harder to find, downloads may prove to be a valuable distribution strategy. An alternative is to release portions of films, as done by India’s Rajshi Productions. Aimed primarily at the large non-residential Indian (NRI) market based largely in the UK and North America, rajshi.com provides free streaming videos, which can be purchased and downloaded. The structure of Bollywood films is ideal for such a fragmented viewing experience, since song-and-dance sequences are often also broadcast on television as music videos independent of the films they are in. This may be an alternative distribution method for Hollywood as well, whereby audiences can download specific scenes. While this may seem unreasonable at first, for a generation of Cinephiles raised on DVDs, it is not uncustomary to watch individual scenes repeatedly, or to view only the extra features like the making-of documentaries. That the fact this strategy was first developed by Indian distributors reflects Tyler Cowen’s approach that the exchange of ideas across cultures operates in various directions.

Music videos are conceptually rather similar to commercials; they are indeed promotional films made to market songs. As acknowledged by Peter Wollen: “In origin and, from the point of view of the music industry, in function, music videos are an advertising vehicle, promoting the sale of records.” Forrunners of music videos date back to Oskar von Fischinger’s animated films synchronized to jazz and classical music. These were followed by the American ‘Soundies’ in 1940s and the French ‘Scopitone’ in 1960s. In 1975, Jon Roseman and Bruce Gowers produced BOHEMIAN RHAPSODY for Queen, often credited as the first video clip. Music videos entered an entirely new age with the launch of MTV in 1981. Incidentally, the very first video to be broadcast by MTV was The Buggles’ VIDEO KILLED THE RADIO STAR, directed by Australia’s Russell Mulcahy, who then went on to helm feature films, including Highlander (1986) and RoboCop (1991), both fairly high-profile Hollywood pictures. MTV Networks was acquired by Viacom in 1986, of which it is still a division today. This puts MTV under the same umbrella with Paramount and DreamWorks. Consequently, MTV Films was founded in 1995. This is the motion picture production arm of MTV, which produces youth-oriented, relatively small-budget films. The European MTV started its broadcast in 1987, and as of September 2006, broadcasts on 51 channels in 25 countries. MTV Asia has local versions in 11 countries, MTV Latin America includes Mexican and Brazilian channels, as well as MTV Central and MTV South. These attempts at localizing within a global framework mirror the developments in advertising, and film companies utilize localization strategies that are not dissimilar. Warner Bros.’ Chinese joint-venture released its first film, the low budget PENGHUANG DE SHITOU (Crazy Stone, Hao Ning) on June 30, 2006. Only 12 days later, it followed with the film’s DVD, sold for as little as 10 yuan (US$ 1.25). This kind of a short release window is still not the norm in other markets, but in China, where piracy rates are the highest in the world with 90%, it may work as a solution to curb the sales of illegal DVD copies.

To see how these conglomerates function as networks facilitating the flow of filmmakers, it is useful to look at Stefan Krätke’s analysis of ‘global media cities’. Krätke includes in his study a variety of entertainment and media industries, namely “theatres and orchestras, music production, film production, television and radio productions, the printing and publishing trade, as well as design agencies, advertising design and the advertising industry”. The main criterion is that they are global, meaning that they have a presence “in at least three different national economic areas and at least two continents or ‘world regions’.” His inclusion of advertising agencies alongside entertainment companies demonstrates the interconnectedness of these industries. Cities function as the ‘nodal points’ of these networks, as they do in other industries. Companies in question are locally anchored to specific centers of cultural production and are networked within their local business area, but at the same time, they are integrated into the supra-regional and transnational networks of the global media companies. This two-directionality allows local talent to form global alliances and be mobile within this network. It is not surprising then, that talent can move around more quickly and freely than it has ever before.

Advertising and Music Videos: A New Aesthetics

The pervasiveness of music videos, along with the launch of home video systems, has ushered in a new era for the film industries. Dubbed ‘the video decade’ by Billboard magazine, the 1980s brought about major changes in filmmaking style, often associated with ‘music video aesthetic’. The style is also influenced by global advertising; it has been argued that to gain an international appeal, advertisements “with a strong visual or musical component” have been emphasized. Some have also drawn attention to British filmmakers who have started their careers as advertising directors, also the subject of this chapter. This new style was characterized by very rapid editing and flashy visuals, frequently at the expense of credible storylines. Embodied in blockbusters of the period, especially those made by the producing duo Jerry Bruckheimer-Dan Simpson, this style proved to be immensely successful. These films also had ambitious soundtracks, and videos to the songs from the films were played on MTV, promoting not only the song, but also the film, doubling the commodification process. One of the earliest and most quoted examples of this is Tony Scott’s Top Gun (1986), which combines songs specifically written for the film with classics like ‘You’ve Lost That Loving Feeling’. As John Mundy argues, even more important than the mutual “commercial exploitation” clearly manifest, “... is the impact the music exerts on film style. With a rather bare storyline, what the film
screenplay that focused on dialogues rather than characters is what saved him from being labeled as yet another style-over-substance director. His next project, *Birth* (2004) was produced by Fine Line Features, the specialty division of Time Warner. The Directors Label series and the directors they feature have provided music videos with artistic legitimacy, and allowed these films to be screened publicly at international film and digital arts festivals.

**The Scott Empire**

In this web of advertising, music videos and feature films, and among Hollywood’s global directors, Ridley Scott and Tony Scott hold a unique position. Both former advertising directors, their path to Hollywood is rather typical. What sets them apart however is their status as not only directors, but also as producers, entrepreneurs and innovators. Within this capacity, they have on various occasions been involved with other global directors’ entrance into the US film industry. Their backgrounds as advertising directors and their capacity as owners of an advertising agency (Ridley Scott Associates, including Black Dog Films, a music video production house), a production company (Scott Free), a state-of-the-art post-production company (The Mill) and major shares in Britain’s leading film studios (Pinewood Studios Group). Pinewood Studios Group, which consists of Pinewood, Shepperton and Teddington Studios, is a significant node in the links between Hollywood and the British film industry. Traditionally home to James Bond films, other major Hollywood films shot at these studios include *The Chronicles of Riddick* (David Twohy, 2003), *Charlie and the Chocolate Factory* (Tim Burton, 2005) and *The Da Vinci Code* (Ron Howard, 2006).

Ridley Scott, born in 1937, received his formal training at the Royal College of Art (RCA) as a set designer. During his college years, he became interested in the cinema and consequently started working on to directing. After directing several series for the BBC, he founded his own commercial production company, RSA, in 1965. He directed over 2000 commercials, including the famed 1984 spot for Macintosh. His earlier work, most notably his commercials for Hovis bread and Maxwell House coffee paved the way for his feature film career. In 1976, he was the top-prize winner at Cannes for a commercial he directed for the French *Elle* magazine. His feature debut, *The Duellists* (1977) was produced by David Puttnam's Enigma Pictures. Made in the UK, the film received an award for ‘Best First Work’ at Cannes.

David Puttnam played another important role at this point, by recommending Scott to a Paramount executive. The executive was impressed by Alan Parker’s * Bugsy Malone* (1976) at Cannes and asked Puttnam if there were other British filmmakers like Parker. While the Paramount project of a *Tristan and Isolde* adaptation never materialized, Scott relocated to a Los-Angeles production office, and was ready for a chance to work in Hollywood; he has admitted to having been very envious of Alan Parker, who had been invited to Hollywood earlier. Scott was then offered to direct *Alien* (1979) by Twentieth Century Fox, his first Hollywood film. Throughout his long Hollywood career, some of R. Scott’s films have reconfigured entire genres, like *Alien*, *Bladerunner* and *Gladiator* (2000). As many other directors with backgrounds in advertising, his style is characterized by...
stunning visuals. For some, these come at the expense of story or character depth. Among those who criticize his work, David Thompson complains that R. Scott is "[best by] disastrous 'stylishness.'" However, the negative criticism Ridley Scott has faced is considerably little compared to the disparagement Tony Scott often receives. Tony Scott, seven years younger than Ridley Scott, followed in his older brother's footsteps. He went to Royal College of Art, studying painting. With his brother's encouragement, he started directing commercials for RSA soon after his graduation. Over the next decade, he directed commercials, an episode of a French TV series, and he realized his first feature film project, The Hunger (1983) for MGM. Despite the critical and commercial failure of the film, Scott continued with Top Gun, already mentioned for its music video aesthetics. By the mid-1990s, the combined worldwide revenue of Tony Scott's films at the box office had surpassed the billion-dollar mark, a feat not achieved by many directors. He is often seen as the more profitable but less celebrated of the two brothers and reviews of his films frequently make allusions to his past as a commercials director. His latest films, Man on Fire (2004) and Domino (2005) push the limits of the music video aesthetics, and reflect the work he did on his longer commercials. Indeed, Tony Scott has also stated that he uses his commercials as testing grounds for what he can do in feature films, like the GM commercials about surveillance, which were then translated into the surveillance shots dominating Enemy of the State.

Since its foundation, RSA has been a major player among the commercial production companies. It expanded in 1986, opened its New York branch and established RSA USA, Inc. A few years later, RSA moved its US headquarters to LA to become the central center of production campaigns for Philip Morris, Ericsson, Coca-Cola, Visa, Kodak, Nokia, Nike, American Express, BMW and many others. Black Dog, already mentioned above as a music video production company, is not the only firm functioning under the umbrella of RSA. Little Mirkza/ RSA is a semi-independent commercial/music video production house. It was founded by Rhea Rupert in 1990 and worked with RSA in 2002. Joy/6/RSA UK emerged when director Mehdi Norowzian's Joy Films, London, merged with RSA Films, London, in 2003. There is also 'La Division' geared for the Latin American market, and a 'Special Division', formerly called 'Top Dog', specialized solely in sourcing film directors such as Sam Mendes and the Polish Brothers.

Over the years RSA has demonstrated through acquisitions of smaller, more specific firms reflects to a smaller degree the expansion larger media companies have shown since the late 1970s. By having separate, yet related units in different media capitals, RSA enables itself to utilize a wider network of businesses. Ridley and Tony Scott are still closely involved with the company, and "work closely with" RSA. ... RSA has been a nucleus for new ideas and directing talent over the last two decades. As Ridley Scott states, "Now, and essentially for the last ten years, everyone has been looking into the advertising game and the music video game for directing talent." and Tony Scott agrees that "movie studios routinely steal from the spot world; they just haven't figured out how to avoid some of the pitfalls that come along with it". Anna Notaro points out that after various incarnations, the author was transformed into "the figure of the technically savvy director", befittingly epitomizing the filmmakers who come from advertising and music videos; who are obliged to be not only familiar with, but have full command of cutting edge technologies. Many directors who worked, or still work for RSA have moved on to feature film directing. The early generation,Scott brothers, Hugh Hudson and Alan Parker are frequently mentioned as the forerunners of directors with a background in commercials. There are also those who have made shorts, and / or independent British films, like Jake Scott, who directed Plunkett & Macleane (1999). However, for the purposes of this book, one would need to look at only the non-American directors who followed their careers at RSA with Hollywood filmmaking: Marek Kaniewska, Marco Brambilla and Marcus Nispel.

Marek Kaniewska is a British director, well-known for his work on TV and in commercials. In 1984, he directed his feature debut, Another Country, which was quite well received. His first US film came in 1987 as an adaptation of the Bret Easton Ellis novel, Less Than Zero. Alongside his feature film career, Kaniewska continued directing commercials and worked largely for RSA London. His return to features in 2000, Where the Money Is, was produced by the Scott brothers' production company, Scott Free. This fact, along with Kaniewska's background in advertising, is highlighted in one of the many negative reviews: "Trading in coherence for flash, underlining each event with portentous music, remaining content with half-drawn characters and never missing an opportunity to pander, director Marek Kaniewska works in the tradition of the film's producers, Ridley and Tony Scott." Marco Brambilla, originally from Italy, moved to Canada to study film, where he started his career as an advertising director. He transferred to the US in 1990, where he worked for RSA USA. His first feature film, Warner Brothers' Demolition Man (1993), is the subject of a chapter on cultural globalization in Thomas Friedman's The Lexus and the Olive Tree. Again, Brambilla's origins in advertising surfaced in various reviews: "... [a] director who made his name in commercials, which shows"; "... Brambilla betrays his origins in TV commercials. Demolition Man is sleek and empty as well as brutal and pointless. It feels computer engineered, untouched by human hands." Following the failure of his next feature film, Excess Baggage (1997), Brambilla returned to commercials, however, no longer with RSA. Brambilla also directed a miniseries called Domino (2002) for Hallmark Entertainment, broadcast on ABC. He shot Domino at Pinewood Studios, which is owned in part by the Scott brothers. Brambilla is also involved with projects as a video artist and has been hired to create video game titles for PlayStation, Xbox and Gamecube.

German-born Marcus Nispel started his career as an art-director in Germany, then moved to the US and became a director of music videos. In New York, he founded his own company, Portfolio Artists Network, which then merged with RSA USA. In 2000, his ties with RSA were severed due to a controversial print advertisement protesting the SAG (Screen Actors Guild) strike. Nispel then moved onto MIZ Production Company. He directed his first feature film in the form of a remake: The Texas Chainsaw Massacre (2003), produced by Michael Bay, himself one of the prominent directors with a background in advertising. Again, Nispel's credentials as a music video and commercials directors are brought up frequently: "The slick and witless remake [is] the feature debut of music-video veteran Marcus Nispel." It should be noted that references to these directors' professional backgrounds are much easier to come by than references to their
These parallels between various media and technologies have also been closely observed by Henry Jenkins, who discusses different forms of media convergence in his work. Some of these convergences have been taken up in this book, albeit under different names. For instance, Jenkins calls attention to ‘economic convergence’, the horizontal integration resulting from the conglomerations of giant media corporations, controlling interests in various media such as film, music, books, games, etc. This integration has been the determining factor in the structure of New Hollywood. Similarly, what Jenkins terms ‘global convergence’ is the cultural hybridity this book has been concerned with throughout. The explosion of “creativity at the intersections of various media technologies, industries and consumers” is what shapes the transformation of Hollywood at this juncture, bringing globalization and digitalization together.

As Stefan Krätke and Peter J. Taylor point out, global firms are “connecting the internationally distributed urban clusters of media and cultural production with one another”, enabling “the large media groups to tap the globally distributed creative potential of cultural production”. RSA, with its subsidiaries in different media, allows a space where directors can transition between advertising commercials, music videos and feature films. Ridley Scott emphasizes the importance of working on different forms: “We are always looking for ways to help our directors develop their careers, challenge their talents and evolve their style”. This flexibility offered to the global talent not only in terms of product or style, but also in terms of geographies. RSA itself is located on both sides of the continent, and production shoots are done across the globe. Within the last decade, one of the most attractive locales for commercial production has been South Africa, due to its strong infrastructure, trained professionals, production values and varied geographies. In terms of talent, RSA signed, among others, Stockholm-based music video director Jonas Åkerlund in 2003 and Hong Kong-based postproduction specialist Kofai in January 2007, expanding its international roster.

The small-scale conglomeration Scott Brothers built, encompassing RSA, Black Dog Films, The Mill and Scott Free, along with their share in Pinewood Studios, demonstrate the connectivity of media and advertising industries between themselves and across the globe. As globally networked institutions, firms such as these provide global talent with high-quality work regardless of their location. In the case of RSA, these networks are connected to Hollywood via Scott Free film production company and Pinewood Studios Group. On an individual level, as decision-makers within Hollywood, Ridley and Tony Scott hold a position not granted to many other global directors. Among the filmmakers discussed in this book, Ridley Scott has directed the largest number of films, followed closely by Tony Scott. One can see the same pattern for other directors who have strong presences in Hollywood; Renny Harlin, Fred Schepisi, James Cameron, Roland Emmerich and Peter Jackson all produce their own films, in addition to other projects. In my concluding chapter, I will return to discussions of Hollywood, both in terms of a location and a mode of production. I believe that these case studies provided me with tools to clarify some of the debates on Hollywood’s stance vis-à-vis globalization, and to reformulate the position global filmmakers hold within these discussions.
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6. Conclusion: Where Do We Go From Here?

I started this book by asking a number of questions. The initial question was how to position the blockbuster-era foreign talent within a wider historical context of ‘émigré’ directors in Hollywood. This question, it soon transpired, could not be answered without another, regarding what the flow of this talent tells us about cinema in the globalized world. Is Hollywood global, and if so, how does this globality function? These are ongoing discussions and are subject to significant changes within short stretches of time. Even during the time I wrote this book, there have been considerable developments in filmmaking and communication technologies that transformed distribution practices around the globe. In the light of the case studies I have already presented, I would like to pinpoint some of the emerging trends that might be helpful in shedding light on these questions.

Chapter three, on the James Bond franchise, has demonstrated the complexities of a film’s nationality, or its multiple nationalities. While the Bond films’ stories, as well as a portion of cast and settings, are “quintessential examples of products tailored for the international market”, in Tino Balio’s words.

The everlasting popularity of Bond films and their recent turn towards more action-filled sequences also show a trend in Hollywood’s strategy for the global markets. While this strategy for the global markets had been adopted by the studios since the advent of sound, it has become even more significant during the blockbuster era.

The chapter on remakes has shown Hollywood’s dependence on stories from across the world, and the significance of global advertising and media networks and their relationship with Hollywood. The new aesthetics and distribution practices that were developed within these networks inadverently altered Hollywood and furthered its globalization, and continue to do so. Furthermore, the positions held by Ridley and Tony Scott within these networks demonstrated the importance of being nested in...
one of the nodal points of global networks, as the only truly powerful directors in Hollywood are the ones who take on decision-making duties and become producers.

These case studies are based on career patterns that have stood out in the recent decades. At the same time, they reflect the importance of middlemen such as agents and especially producers. Hollywood studios are a part of larger conglomerate networks, and middlemen function as facilitators of talent moves along certain paths within these networks. Taking transnationality and global mobility as my framework, I have avoided case studies based on specific nations. Had I decided to follow the path of nation-based case studies, a chapter could have been devoted to directors from Australia and New Zealand, demonstrating the intricate relationship between Hollywood and the festival and arthouse circuits. Indeed, these circuits were where the ‘New Australian Cinema’ directors such as Peter Weir, Fred Schepisi and Bruce Beresford, as well as filmmakers from New Zealand, like Jane Campion, Lee Tamahori and Niki Caro first made a name for themselves, before moving on to larger projects. Or I could have focused on a group of directors from Europe, the names most famously associated with Hollywood blockbusters: Wolfgang Petersen and Roland Emmerich from Germany, Paul Verhoeven and Jan de Bont from the Netherlands. These directors are among the most visibly ‘foreign’ in Hollywood, yet their style has been called “more American than Americans”. Petersen himself has admitted liking to work in Hollywood, not only because of the facilities and the large audiences, but also because it gives him the opportunity to “make political-patriotic films of a kind he could never make in Germany”.

Similarly, the directors from Spanish-speaking countries deserve a chapter of their own. The networks between Spain, Mexico and other Latin American countries allow Spanish-speaking directors like Guillermo del Toro, Alfonso Cuarón and Alejandro González Iñárritu to work across these and larger geographic areas. Their rising popularity in Hollywood is the recognition of their recent success at international festivals, as well as of the rapidly increasing Hispanic market within the US. But since I chose to highlight the transnational network structures, a nationally based classification would have defied my purposes. I would now like to revisit some concepts that I have presented in the earlier chapters, in the light of these case studies.

**Globalizing Hollywood**

In *Global Hollywood*, Toby Miller et al. set forth that Hollywood’s dispersion of various stages of production and post-production throughout the world is how Hollywood is structured, and this system is also the foundation of its continuing domination across the world. Similarly, Aksoy and Robins point out that the synergy provided by the global media conglomerates bestows Hollywood with the power it possesses. These arguments have been raised opposite those of California-based economic geographers like Michael Storper, Susan Christopherson and Alan J. Scott, who stress the agglomerated nature of Hollywood.

In the earlier chapters, I have discussed Hollywood as a network with nodes across the world, the most significant of which is in Los Angeles. But other nodes like London, Vancouver, New York or any major festival site – Berlin, Cannes, Toronto – are not to be easily dismissed. Hollywood, or Los Angeles County, is home to studios, which are now “basically distributors, banks, and owners of intellectual copyrights, contracting out creative and production activities to others”, as observed by Richard Fox, executive vice president international at Warner Bros. While many production studios are indeed located around Hollywood, other studio agglomerations like the runaway destinations around Vancouver, the Pinewood Studio Group near London, or more recently, Wellington in New Zealand hold significant positions within the Hollywood network. Goldsmith and O’Regan point out that “Hollywood majors are not so clearly synonymous with or connected to their affiliated studio complex”, and argue that their real ‘strength’ lies in their “command and control functions”, which allow them to assemble different groups of employees to collaborate on complex projects. The arrangement of these collaborations is primarily through producers and agents, the importance of whom I have maintained throughout this book.

The shift towards a network of deals is characteristic of the post-Fordist flexible production system, as described by Susan Christopherson and Michael Storper. But while Christopherson and Storper, and more significantly, Allen J. Scott emphasize the importance of the clustering around Hollywood, they underestimate the importance of other studio complexes around the world. Hollywood’s production, in terms of location, stories, as well as talent, has become more deterritorialized over the last decades. Goldsmith and O’Regan argue that agglomeration is still “a feature of this ‘deterritorialized’ system”, as production requirements demand a level of concentration of services. Nonetheless, they note that “functional proximity - how well plugged-in a location is” in terms of data and transport connections now carry more weight than geographical proximity alone, both for production and post-production facilities. Post-production companies from far-flung countries such as Israel, Japan, Hong Kong, UK, and Canada have collaborated on digital special effects with studios over Internet connections. According to Miller et al., this deterritorialization is what makes Hollywood global, and lies behind its supremacy as a leading factor. Ultimately, Hollywood functions as more than a conglomerate of film production companies. It is a global network, a network that is connected through specific nodes across the globe, which can also play a significant role in decision making, as I have demonstrated in my discussion of media and advertising capitals in chapter five.

The nature of the products of this command and control network has also been debated in terms of globality and nationality. Jonathan Rosenbaum contends that Hollywood no longer produces any films that are specifically American. Charlie Keil has argued that the reduced trade barriers championed by the US contribute “to the elimination of any sense of national cinema at all”, and that in the meantime, what constituted American cinema has undergone a similar de-nationalizing process. Globalization creates a suitable environment for cross-cultural exchange, which, as Tyler Cowen argues: “creates a plethora of innovative and high-quality creations in many different genres, styles, and media”, and allows the availability of a much wider range of cultural products. Richard Pells for example, has argued that America has been ‘Europeanized, as much as Europe has been Americanized’. Hollywood’s international nature has been reflected in the films made by the earlier generations of emigrés, as well as by the American directors of the 1970s who were influenced by foreign filmmakers. A.O. Scott sees the contemporary cinematic environment in Hollywood, with its “remakes, homages and rip-offs” as “a hybrid of influences from elsewhere, to an extent not seen since
the great wave of émigré talent” of the 1930s and the 1940s. While these approaches may be seen as overly optimistic, carrying assumptions of equality between different film industries, they do nonetheless reflect trends in world cinema, from earlier and current practices.

This hybridization in Hollywood’s products reflects the transnationalization of its production and distribution. While Hollywood becomes less ‘American’, films from other parts of the world become more ‘Hollywood’, as demonstrated by the discussions of Asian remakes and by Elsaesser’s emulation model. Recent scholarship on national cinema within a global context has yielded approaches that reflect a change in the very definition of the term, not only for Hollywood, as American national cinema, but also for the world’s other national cinemas. Tim Bergfelder stresses the transnational nature of current European cinema, calling for a reconceptualization of European film studies, taking into account migration as an “integral element in the discursive construction of national cinemas in Europe itself”, as it has been in discussions of Hollywood’s Global Directors of New Hollywood.

Globalization has not only facilitated Hollywood’s reach over the entire globe, but it has also made it easier for directors to reach Hollywood. The new information and communication technologies, along with the Internet and the festivals, both of which can be seen as manifestations of cultural heterogeneity, fuel the studios’ search for new and fresh talent throughout the world. The Internet in itself is not an alternative to Hollywood; but its function as a channel of distribution as discussed in chapter five, establish it as a principal shaping force in the current cinematic environment.
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born in Madras and attended business school in Calcutta. Her appointment came shortly after Pepsi and Coke were banned from distributing their products in several Indian states due to concerns over pesticide levels found in these beverages. PepsiCo’s effort is seen by many as a strategic one, aiming to recapture the Indian market. This move has also been considered to be an outsourcing of the CEO, and it has been suggested that PepsiCo understands that the only market that matters is the global marketplace. PepsiCo’s move to appoint an Indian-born CEO cannot be seen as entirely different from what the studios have been doing in terms of directors. Nooyi’s appointment, while on a different plane, reflects the same strategy.

One should remember however, that transnational corporations (TNCs) are not alone in acting globally. Ironically, the campaign that led to the protests and the bans on PepsiCo and Coca Cola Co.’s products were organized by a non-governmental organization (NGO) called Global Resistance, based in Northern California, which coordinated the activities of protesters in India and communicated their cause to the outside world via the Internet. Although they have been accused by Coca Cola Asia of “making false environmental allegations against us to further an antiglobalization agenda”, NGOs such as Global Resistance are a part of the globalization process, albeit on a non-corporate level. They communicate, coordinate and plan their actions online on a global scale. In the global film scene, this can be compared to independent online distribution networks like YouTube and Ifilm, as well as the global film festivals network as discussed in chapter two.

In the case studies, I have repeatedly stressed the transnational nature of Hollywood productions. Globalization entails more than interaction between Hollywood and its others, however, and its reflections can be seen among different parts of the world. Bollywood producers have also been shooting films internationally. One of the main locations has been Switzerland, first used in the 1960s, then again since the mid-1980s, with over twenty Bollywood films a year shot in this European country. More recently, the UK has been a main destination of location shooting for Bollywood producers, in an attempt to lure the large Indian population there. The growing middle class in India cannot be ignored by local tourism industries worldwide, and tourism boards of Australia, Singapore, Malaysia and others have been competing to attract Bollywood producers. Similarly, numerous Japanese and Korean commercials are produced in Australia, where post-production houses also complete work on Taiwanese feature films. Co-productions within the European Union and between the EU and Eastern European countries are also very common occurrences.

**Hollywood the Brand**

Within globalization debates, one of the most renowned anti-globalization stances has been articulated by Naomi Klein in her book *No Logo*. Klein argues that globalization is interconnected with the proliferation of the brand culture worldwide, created by the corporate hegemony. Antiglobalists’ position against the transnational corporations is often symbolized by protests of these brands. Hollywood’s relationship with brands has been the subject of some research in terms of product placements. Product placement, defined as a “paid product message aimed at influencing movie (or television) audiences via the planned and unobtrusive entry of a branded product into a movie (or a television program)” has already been touched upon in chapter three, regarding the many deals made with different brands for James Bond films. However, there are many more levels to this relationship between brands and Hollywood.

The content of the term ‘brand’ has evolved greatly within the last three decades. While brands used to be confined to consumer goods and services, they now encompass various business sectors, non-governmental organizations, countries, cities, sports teams, political parties and celebrities. Within Hollywood, stars and directors have become brands of their own. Their association with a project gives the prospective audiences a sense of familiarity with the film, which itself can become a brand. In fact, even if a brand-name filmmaker is not associated with the production of the film, his or her stamp of approval can play a vital part in the release. Films like *Ying Xiong* (*Hero*, Zhang Yimou, 2002) that would most likely go unnoticed otherwise are heavily promoted under the banner: ‘Quentin Tarantino presents’.

On a larger and more traditional level, the corporations are also brands. Charlie Keil has pointed out that studio logos, while interchangeable amongst themselves, signify quality. In the studio era, studios were strongly branded and each identified with specific genres. For instance, MGM was known for its lavish musicals, Warner Bros. for gangster films, and Universal Pictures for horror pictures. Among the current Hollywood brands, Disney is a leading global brand, and its name is immediately associated with family-oriented entertainment. Miramax Films, a subsidiary of The Walt Disney Company, has become synonymous with foreign arthouse films and ‘independent’ productions. Dimension Films, founded within Miramax and now a part of The Weinstein Company, specializes in horror pictures, particularly the *Scary Movie* or *Spy Kids* series. The Weinstein Company was founded in 2005, when Harvey and Bob Weinstein left Miramax Pictures, which they had founded in 1979. As much as Miramax had become a significant brand within film world, the Weinstein name itself was sufficiently attractive to investors and became the name of the company.

But above all, Hollywood itself can be seen as a brand name. In chapter one, I have quoted Jonathan Rosenbaum, who argues that ‘American cinema’ is the brand name which sells best in global markets, even though what is inside the ‘American’ package is multinational, not national. Regardless of its nationality, the package that Hollywood presents to the world is a hugely popular and clearly branded one. In this sense, it is Hollywood’s identity as a ‘name for globally popular English-language cinema’ as well as a certain style which is emphasized. This is not a conscious or intentional branding in the same vein as the branding of individuals or companies; nonetheless it functions as a brand.

Chuck Brymer presents five traits of successful brands: The first is their consistency in delivering on their promise. Much of Hollywood’s success relies on its ability to provide its audiences with reliable and familiar products, whether through franchises or through remakes, as I have discussed in chapters three and four. The second trait is the brands’ superior products and processes. While their content is up for debate, there is rarely any objection to the technical superiority of Hollywood films, achieved through increasingly huge budgets that are mostly unsustainable for other national film industries. This consistency and quality is ensured through a lengthy process of greenlighting - formal approval of production
finance, followed by the efficient Hollywood mode of production, with a clear division of labor and close control of studio management and producers over all expenses. While DeVany and Walls argue that the uncertainty of the market deems all executive control imaginary in terms of a guaranteed box office success, it is nonetheless this control that ensures the level of technical and narrative quality in Hollywood films. However, it is also this very process of constant controlling and playing safe that leads to Hollywood’s homogenization, contributing to the widespread criticism of its cinematic products.

The third trait of successful brands is their distinctive positioning and customer experience. Hollywood offers its audiences films featuring stars and special effects other cinemas cannot afford. While other cinemas often emulate Hollywood, the level of box office attained is rare at the same level, as one can see in the releases of Bernd Eichinger or Luc Besson. For audiences around the world, the Hollywood brand signifies a certain level of technical competence, engrossing narrative and an emotional catharsis. Despite the challenges to the Hollywood / European binary models where the former signifies high budgets, attractive locales and extravagant action, and the latter, low budgets, local settings and quotidian daily life stories, Philippe Meers’ study of young Flemish audiences demonstrates that these separations still exist in the minds of the audiences, reaffirming the strength of Hollywood as a brand.

On a more complex level, the fourth trait that a successful brand needs to possess is the alignment of internal and external commitment to the brand. Since Hollywood as a brand consists of multiple corporations, internal commitment is not provided as intentionally as in other examples such as Harley-Davidson or Google. Nonetheless, since the early studio days, Hollywood has cultivated its glamorous inhabitants, fostering the celebrity cult that is now promoted through media such as magazines and television shows that are owned by the same companies as the studios. Since stars began to matter in the 1910s, audiences have been encouraged to admire not only what they see on the screens, but also what they find out, or are lead to believe, happens behind the scenes in Hollywood.

Another strategy to create commitment to the brand which is employed by Hollywood studios and media conglomerates that own them, is the diversification of their products. Booz, Allen and Hamilton define diversification as “a means of spreading the base of a business to achieve improved growth and/or reduce overall risk that may take the form of investments that address new products, services, customer segments, or geographic markets.” Chan-Olmsted and Chang point out that this diversification can be studied from the ‘geographic’ or ‘product’ perspective. On a macro level, media conglomerates expand their presence across various regions, providing familiar, yet globalized products in a variety of geographies; and they branch into related products within media, aiming to create synergy among their businesses. More specifically for Hollywood studios, companies aim to diversify the films they release through their specialty divisions. While the clichéd image of a Hollywood picture by Disney or Twentieth Century Fox may be of a blockbuster aimed at the male teenage population, the same companies also foster subsidiaries like Miramax and Fox Searchlight Pictures, respectively, which cater to a different group of audiences. And the blockbusters that are prone to be dismissed by Hollywood’s critics are still manufactured at the highest levels of production quality; they reach millions of spectators from all nations at all education levels, as JAWS, STAR WARS, and THE MATRIX (The Wachowski Brothers, 1999) have done.

The last trait of a great brand is the ability to stay relevant. All the examples in this book, be it the changing nature of James Bond, new production venues, or alternating styles, point to the often articulated fact that Hollywood is nothing if not adaptable. By incorporating changing styles and creating new stars, Hollywood has always managed to remain relevant and continues to be so. In such a collaborative medium as film, where authorship is often open for debate, multiple brands often need to join forces, whether it is the studio, the director, or the stars, all within the Hollywood brand. The legal ‘owner’ of a film is also a matter of debate and the practices differ among countries. In the previous pages, studios have been called “owners of intellectual copyrights.” It is worth noting that in France, copyright of a film belongs to its director, as per the ‘droit d’auteur’ copyright law. In contrast, producers hold the copyrights in Hollywood, as evidenced earlier by the ‘official’ James Bond films, the rights of which belong to EON Productions. In the recent years, one of the most controversial court cases has been fought between New Line Cinema and Peter Jackson over the revenues of the LORD OF THE RINGS series. In February 2005, Jackson sued New Line, a subsidiary of Time Warner, claiming that he was owed money and demanded an independent financial audit of the company. In the following months, New Line declared that Jackson would no longer be considered to direct THE HOBBIT, the prequel to the famous trilogy, to be shot by 2009. New Line holds the rights to THE HOBBIT and the trilogy, of which the box office receipts alone surpassed US$ 2.9 billion. This court case caused some of the debates regarding accounting principles of large studios to reemerge, where profits are reduced in the books, in order to minimize the payment to directors and stars who have agreed to receive a portion of their pay as share of the profit.

Beyond ownership issues, another important problem facing the film industry as well as other international brands today is brand protection. In terms of other brands, this usually means registering the brand name and other features that represent the brand, such as logos, slogans, colors, sounds, shapes, etc. In case of Hollywood, this is possible for individual companies but not the overall Hollywood style, which is emulated across the world. Intellectual property rights, important to all brand identities, are more crucial than ever to film industries, which primarily create copyrighted works. Intellectual property rights have long presented a predicament for the studios. Unauthorized remarks of Hollywood films were and still are commonplace in various film industries, especially in India. These have not been legally pursued, however, since Hollywood involvement in India was relatively low until recently. In 2003, author Barbara Taylor Bradford sued Sahara TV in India, claiming that a series produced by the TV channel was a ‘rip-off’ of her bestselling novel A Woman of Substance. The Calcutta high court ruled that there had been no infringement on her copyrights. After this example, it is not very likely that other cases would go to court. In any event, all the remake films are ‘Indianized’ with the addition of song and dance sequences and often do not reach large audiences outside India.

Piracy, however, became a concern for the studios from the late 1970s on with the advent of the VCR, especially in Asia and the Middle East, where intellectual property laws were inadequate and ineffectively enforced. A proliferation of recording technologies, public demand for content, and the inability of small local
production industries to satisfy this demand exacerbated the situation. With newer
digital technologies, the costs of reproduction decrease and the volume and speed
increase, while quality remains unchanged with each generation of duplication. The World Trade Organization requires all of its member countries to conform to its
agreement on trade-related aspects of intellectual property rights (TRIPS) by 2006.
TRIPS includes “basic trade and international intellectual property principles,
protection, enforcement, dispute settlement, and transition arrangements”.
The free flow of data allowed by digital technologies permits consumers (and pirates) to
connect to creators more directly, diminishing the need for intermediaries such as
distributors. Considering the importance of their distribution networks to connect
with a global market, Hollywood studios are likely to explore new avenues for
reaching their audiences.

On November 5, 2003, The Matrix Revolutions (The Wachowski Brothers)
became the first film to be released simultaneously across the world, and this
practice has become the norm for many of the big-budget studio films. Similarly,
piracy problems have also prompted studios to shorten release windows. Steven
Soderbergh released his film Bubble on January 27, 2006, in theaters, on DVD and
on high-definition cable-TV simultaneously, arguing that different formats are
available on the day of the release anyway through piracy. While Bubble’s
commercial failure may have slowed the process of simultaneous release across
different formats, the window between theatrical and DVD release has indeed shortened from about six months to four months in recent years.

Hollywood the brand may be controlled largely from South California, but its
current mode of production is neither completely flexible and fleeting, nor squarely
established around Los Angeles alone. Clustering arguments that uphold
Hollywood’s position as the leader of global media production tend to undervalue
the spread of Hollywood in terms of production. Chris Lukinbeal’s study of
production centers in North America outside of Hollywood demonstrates that while
Los Angeles remains as the industrial core for production, “on location” shooting
has increasingly spread across other states and Canada as well. Sassen’s suggestion
that Manhattan as a financial hub “is a highly specialized functional or institutional
realm that has become denationalized” also holds true for Hollywood, in that it has
become a denationalized node within the deterritorialized network of media and
entertainment production. What does this tell us about the central issues of this
book? The globality of Hollywood lies in its transnational nature of finance,
production and distribution. And the foreign directors no longer need to remain in
Hollywood, even when they continue working with Hollywood studios. Their
presence can be delegated through the agents whose job it is to be situated wherever
deals are being made. The filmmakers’ membership in the Director’s Guild of
America is an attestation to their (virtual) presence.

After Hollywood

Whether a director actually resides in Hollywood, or makes Hollywood films
elsewhere, the relationship between a filmmaker and the studios is often not eternal.
The “ticket to Hollywood” is not a one-way ticket, as can be seen in my discussion
of directors who alternate between Hollywood and other film industries. The
strength of the “command and control” center and the Hollywood network attracts a
great number of international talent, diversifying the nature of the industry;
nonetheless, this talent has a considerably high turnover, with most of the directors
eventually going away. The Hollywood maxim “you’re only as good as your last
movie” is as true as it has ever been, and it is very much applicable to foreign
directors. In fact, looking at the number of Hollywood films made by foreign
directors gives us the clear picture seen below:

Figure 6.1: Number of films made in Hollywood per director, 1975-2005

Figure 6.1 shows the number of films made by any foreign director in
Hollywood. Those who directed only one film comprise the largest portion by far,
and directors with only one or two films comprise nearly half of the entire group.
This chart also included newer arrivals, who may continue making films in
Hollywood. However, another analysis, where only directors who started working
in Hollywood in or before 2003 are considered, does not give dramatically different
results. What this indicates is that after one or possibly two attempts in Hollywood,
those who do not succeed no longer try, or are not likely to be offered any other
major projects. The significance of these figures in terms of this thesis is that my
initial statement, positing that the émigré paradigm is no longer valid, is confirmed
once again.

Foreign directors are more flexible in the face of failure in Hollywood, since
they have a ‘homeland’ to fall back on, and are not purely dependent on
Hollywood’s studios for their careers. An analysis of directors who have made one
or two films in Hollywood and no longer work there, reveals that the largest portion
of the said filmmakers direct feature films in their home countries. This also holds
true for some of the directors discussed in previous chapters: later careers of some
of the earlier James Bond directors such as Terence Young and Guy Hamilton, or
directors whose auto-remakes failed, namely Francis Veber, Jean-Marie Poiré, and
Ole Bornedal. Even Paul Verhoeven, one of the most significant foreign directors in
Hollywood throughout the 1980s and the 1990s, returned to his native Netherlands.
to shoot ZWARTBOEK (BLACK BOOK, 2006). A Dutch / Belgian / British / German co-produced period piece set in WWII, ZWARTBOEK premiered at the Venice Film Festival, where it received the Young Cinema Award. Then it won Best Film, Director and Actress in a Leading Role awards at the Dutch Film Festival, it was nominated at the BAFTA Awards for Best Film not in the English Language and became Netherland’s entry into the Academy Awards, where it was shortlisted among nine films, but failed to make it to the final five nominations. The film remained at the top of the Dutch box-office lists for seven consecutive weeks, and its distribution rights were sold to numerous countries, including the US. As a major Hollywood director, Verhoeven’s name has become an internationally recognizable brand, facilitating the sale of his multinationaly produced and transnationally promoted European film. Hence, Verhoeven has left global Hollywood to work in a transnational Europe.

A very significant number of filmmakers retain their Hollywood contacts, working on Hollywood’s television productions. In a sense, these directors, such as Elory Elkayem, Peter Hunt, Mikael Solomon, Robert Dornhelm or Carl Schultz, still work in Hollywood, albeit in an adjacent sector. Another group of filmmakers that keep in close contact are those who return to their own country, but work on projects that have significant Hollywood financing. Jean-Pierre Jeunet’s controversial UN LONG DIMANCHE DE FIANÇAILLES discussed in chapter one is one of the most noted cases. The controversy surrounding Jeunet’s film shows just how relevant some of the debates within film studies can be. As I have argued, issues of nationality regarding individuals as well as cultural products have become more complex than ever.

Returning to the very first question set forth in this book, namely, how we can position this blockbuster-era foreign talent within a wider historical context of ‘émigré’ directors in Hollywood, I would like to recapitulate the points I have made in the preceding chapters. I have found it impossible to employ the émigré paradigm and believe that in order to comprehend the global flow of talent to Hollywood in the current era, one needs to take into consideration that Hollywood has become corporatized. Hence, taking a cue from Richard Florida’s work, these directors can be considered as part of the global creative class. Florida defines the creative class in two components: the ‘creative core’ who fully engage in the creative process, and the ‘creative professionals’, who work in knowledge-intensive industries including financial, legal and health services, as well as business management. In this sense, the creative class encompasses the transnational capitalist class, and its members are similarly mobile. Since the émigré paradigm is no longer valid, and global mobility of international talent has become the norm, there is no reason why the filmmakers in question should not be treated as any other member of a global, mobile, transnational creative class; or indeed, as CEO’s or other leading executives of multinational corporations. Unlike their émigré-era counterparts, global directors today need not be tied down to a single locality. They are denationalized both in terms of citizenship and in terms of workplace. If they are to work within the US, all they need is a valid visa and a membership to the DGA, which can both be temporary. In case of directors like Takashi Shimizu who take their production outside the US, even those formalities may not be necessary. In transnational Hollywood, questions of nationality no longer work as a paradigm, although they still matter, as they continue to be the point of entry to many debates, including this very book.


What are some of the possible scenarios for the future of global filmmaking? I have set the limits of this particular research between 1975 and 2005, for reasons explained at the outset. In the mid-1970s the last big shift occurred in Hollywood, ushered in by the introduction of VCRs and the blockbusters. This thirty-year era in Hollywood had been preceded by two other periods that lasted approximately thirty years each, as discussed in chapter one. The digital era, with the introduction of digital editing and recording equipment, DVDs, and digital projection, has already revolutionized production, distribution and exhibition processes. While studios continue investing in large budget projects that employ the latest digital technology for shooting and special effects, it is now easier than ever for individuals to shoot, edit, and distribute their own low-budget films. In 2003, Jonathan Caouette released TAMATION with an estimated budget of US$ 218 to great critical acclaim, and went on to earn nearly US$ 600,000 at the box office. While the ultra-low-budget home movies have not become the norm in theaters, they do constitute an alternative.

Throughout this book, I have focused on the production side of the film industry, and except for box-office figures, have not delved into audience research. This was for purposes of brevity, as well as relevance. However, some of the most significant changes influencing the film industries, and the media in general, are related to audiences. This is reflected in the Internet with the proliferation of the participatory sites, termed Web 2.0. This new generation of websites includes collaborative efforts like the wikis, blogs, forums, and so on. These websites provide audiences with new spaces to express their opinions, share information, and experience new media. YouTube’s success as a free video hosting website has reached phenomenal levels. Shopping sites like Amazon and eBay, and search engines like Google and Yahoo have created a huge database of the public’s tastes and preferences. Hollywood studios have spent millions of dollars on market research in the last thirty years, but with the data from the Internet, this research can become much more effective, both content- and cost-wise. Nearly ten years earlier than the designation of Web 2.0, James Daly published an article in Wired magazine, dubbing the transformation of Hollywood through digital technologies ‘Hollywood 2.0’. While the term never truly caught on, the article highlights certain tendencies that I have referred to above, such as the dispersal of production and post-production facilities, significance of online communities and online film screenings, and the distribution of home entertainment over the Internet, which I have briefly discussed in chapter five.

Summer of 2006 has been an interesting time to see the new interactions between web communities and Hollywood studios, thanks to the SNAKES ON A PLANE (SOAP) phenomenon. SOAP was a horror-thriller film released by New Line Cinema in August 2006. A throw-back to the older B-movies, the film was initially to be directed by the Hong Kong action director Ronny Yu. Samuel L. Jackson, who had worked with Yu before, signed on to the project because of its director, and allegedly, its title. Before shooting began, Yu was replaced by David Ellis. The online excitement began on several blogs in August 2006, snowballing into something much bigger. Although principal shooting ended in September 2005, the hype generated online lead to the re-shooting of portions of the film, in order to raise its MPAA rating from a PG-13 to an R to reach a specific segment of the
almost simultaneously across the world. It was not the first, nor the only superhero coming to the theaters; X-MEN: THE LAST STAND had opened a few weeks before, the Batman franchise had been revived successfully in 2005, and SPIDER-MAN 3 was to be released in 2007. Its director was also no stranger to superhero films; Bryan Singer was seen as the master of superheroes, due to his success in bringing the first two X-MEN films to the screen. The night before I watched SUPERMAN RETURNS, I visited a friend to watch the first two Superman films on DVD. We watched the extended director’s cut, increasing the fan-input to unprecedented levels. By the time SOAP opened on August 18, it had become one of the most hyped movies of film history. Before its release, New Line Cinema announced that it was expecting about US$ 30 million box office revenues for the first weekend. The film’s budget was estimated around US$ 33 million. Anticipation was high, since SOAP was seen as the film that might change the industry. However, the result was largely disappointing. The film only reached US$ 15 million in its first week, failing to live up to all the commotion. It turned out that although the Internet may eventually change some of the industry practices, the online communities are not yet as strong as they were made out to be. Nonetheless, the SOAP phenomenon provided the studios with new ways of producing and promoting their films.

In addition to the studios, filmmakers have become more and more aware of the direct relationship they can build with their audiences over the Internet. Peter Jackson announced on a fan website, theonering.net, that he would not be directing THE HOBBIT; debates and calls to protest New Line Pictures continued on that and many other websites. Similarly, Joss Whedon used his whedonesque.com to pronounce the end of the WONDER WOMAN project he had been involved in with Warner Bros. David Lynch has a store and a password protected members only division on davidlynch.com, where his various projects can reach the paying audience directly. This new availability of the directors does not only influence the way film and media are consumed, but also the way the idea of an “auteur” is maintained and perceived by the public.

For the directors examined in this book, there have been some changes in a more practical sense. Miller et al. point out that since the attacks of September 11, 2001, there has been increased scrutiny on all paperwork involving temporary workers admitted for special projects. Similarly, Florida calls attention to a possible flight of talent away from the US following the development of recent isolationist policies. He points to Peter Jackson as an example, and underscores his transforming of Wellington from a small town to a global cultural capital. Perhaps, as the flow towards the US diminishes, Hollywood’s globalization will continue, resulting in a flow among other nations, yet still as a part of transnational Hollywood. With the decline in box-office revenues in 2005, as well as the increase in piracy concerns, the styles and budgets of films are also likely to change. George Lucas has predicted that budgets will decrease significantly in the next few years, opening the path to more independent productions. But revenues started increasing again in 2006, giving the studios another break before having to make drastic changes.

In addition to the SOAP phenomenon, 2006 will be remembered for the return of Superman. When I went to see SUPERMAN RETURNS, nearly 27 years after my initial Superman experience, things were quite different. One of the biggest changes was that I did not have to wait for months to see the film in Turkey; it was released almost simultaneously across the world. It was not the first, nor the only superhero coming to the theaters; X-MEN: THE LAST STAND had opened a few weeks before, the Batman franchise had been revived successfully in 2005, and SPIDER-MAN 3 was to be released in 2007. Its director was also no stranger to superhero films; Bryan Singer was seen as the master of superheroes, due to his success in bringing the first two X-MEN films to the screen. The night before I watched SUPERMAN RETURNS, I visited a friend to watch the first two Superman films on DVD. We watched the extended director’s cut, with eight minutes worth of footage seamlessly integrated into the original. In terms of the film itself, Superman does not seem to have changed much; the producers have chosen Brandon Routh, whose looks are uncannily similar to those of Christopher Reeve. Nonetheless, this new Superman does not settle for saving only the inhabitants of Metropolis. Newscasts from as varied locations as the Philippines, Germany, Egypt, China, Australia and France are seen, informing the people of the world that Superman is back, and that he knows no boundaries. But there is one sentence in the film that shows how Superman and Hollywood have evolved over the last 30 years, becoming truly global, and I would like to conclude with that. In the old days, Superman stood for ‘truth, justice, and the American way’. In Superman 2006, Clark Kent’s boss, the Daily Planet editor Perry White gathers his team after Superman’s return. He demands his staff to find out everything about the hero and asks: “Does he still stand for truth, justice, … and all that stuff?”
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15 Bergfelder: 320. Similarly, Jerry White argues for a more nuanced definition of national cinemas in the global age. He contends that “not every film in a national cinema [...] will be an example of national cinema”, just like “some films may not be a part of a national cinema at all”. See Jerry White: “National Belonging. Renewing the concept of national cinema for a global culture”. In New Review of Film and Television Studies, vol. 2, no. 2, 11.2004: 212-232, here 228.
18 See for example Elsaesser, European Cinema: 317, 491-492. Ironically, quite a number of film critics, including Brian D’Aramo and David Rimanelli of Art Forum, Adrian Martin, and Jacques Rivette, himself a film director and a former critic for Cahiers du Cinema where the auteur concept was born, would firmly disagree with Barber’s stance on Verhoeven. See Adrian Martin: “The Offended Critic: Film Reviewing and Social Commentary” On Senses of Cinema, 07.2000. 
20 Barber: 45.
21 Barber: 45.
22 Barber: 45.
24 See for example Elsaesser, European Cinema: 317, 491-492. Ironically, quite a number of film critics, including Brian D’Aramo and David Rimanelli of Art Forum, Adrian Martin, and Jacques Rivette, himself a film director and a former critic for Cahiers du Cinema where the auteur concept was born, would firmly disagree with Barber’s stance on Verhoeven. See Adrian Martin: “The Offended Critic: Film Reviewing and Social Commentary” On Senses of Cinema, 07.2000. 
25 For a discussion of the ‘European’ nature of Hollywood, see O’Regan.
26 Barber: 45.
27 Barber: 45.
28 Barber: 45.
29 Barber: 45.
30 Barber: 45.
31 Barber: 45.
32 Barber: 45.
33 Barber: 45.
34 Barber: 45.
35 Barber: 45.
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For instance, the ‘stocks and stripes flag’ used at some demonstrations is a variation of the American flag, where the stars are replaced by corporate logos. The logos are those of Adidas (headquartered in Germany) and Royal Dutch Shell (based in the UK with headquarters in the Netherlands).


Not everything can be trademarked, however. Following the success of his reality TV show, THE APPRENTICE, Donald Trump attempted to patent his famous line, “You’re fired!” in 2004. The United States Patent and Trademark Office issued a rejection a few months later.


Among other simultaneous releases are LORD OF THE RINGS: THE RETURN OF THE KING (Peter Jackson, 2003), STAR WARS EPISODE II: THE REVENGE OF THE SITH (George Lucas, 2005), and THE DA VINCI CODE.


For instance, the ‘stocks and stripes flag’ used at some demonstrations is a variation of the American flag, where the stars are replaced by corporate logos. The logos are those of Adidas (headquartered in Germany) and Royal Dutch Shell (based in the UK with headquarters in the Netherlands).
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36 Goldsmith, O’Regan: 11.


38 For instance, the ‘stocks and stripes flag’ used at some demonstrations is a variation of the American flag, where the stars are replaced by corporate logos. The logos are those of Adidas (headquartered in Germany) and Royal Dutch Shell (based in the UK with headquarters in the Netherlands).


43 Keil: 56.

44 These investors include the investment bank Goldman Sachs and the luxury goods producer LVMH. See David Carr: “Placing Bets on Miramax the Sequel”. In New York Times, 31.10.2005.

45 Rosenbaum: 221.


47 Studios’ executives are as much a part of this process as individual producers. See Lee Berton, Roy Harris: “Red World Accounting”. In CFO Magazine, 03.1999.

48 DeVany, Walls: 314.


50 Harley-Davidson creates a loyal customer base by aligning its employee experience with the values the brand embodies, such as freedom, individualism, self-expression and

51 From the foundation of the studios until the end of vertical integration (the mid-1910s to the mid-1940s), and from then until the mid-1970s.
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73 Tim O'Reilly: “What is Web 2.0: Design Patterns and Business Models for the Next Generation of Software”. On O'Reilly, 30.09.2005
Accessed on 05.09.2006.
74 For a discussion of online communities’ relationship with cinephilia, see Melis Behlil:
"Ravenous Cinephiles: Cinephilia, Internet and Online Film Communities”. In Marijke de
Valck, Malte Hagener (eds) Cinephilia: Movies, Love and Memory. Amsterdam:
University of Amsterdam Press, 2005: 112-123.
76 For a more detailed analysis of the relationship between the artist, audiences and
technology within the context of the Internet, see Notaro.
77 For a history of the SOAP phenomenon, see Amanda Schupak: “SNAKES ON A PLANE’S
slithery slope: How one movie with a straightforward title became a phenomenon”. In
Forbes, Posted on 17.08.2006
78 One could argue that the Internet movie fans prefer to watch films at home. The DVD
sales of SNAKES ON A PLANE, while healthy, were not exceptional. The other option is that
these fans illegally downloaded the films, but that is an unmeasurable form of distribution.
79 Incidentally, the title of this chapter is a reference to a song written by Joss Whedon for
a musical episode of his hit TV series, BUFFY THE VAMPIRE SLAYER.
80 Miller et al.: 132.
82 Lloyd Grove: “Lucas: Big pics are doomed”. In New York Daily News, 06.03.2006.
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## Appendix - List of Directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Born</th>
<th>Died</th>
<th>First Feature Hollywood</th>
<th>First Hollywood Feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Petersen, Wolfgang</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaefer, George</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weir, Peter</td>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wincer, Simon</td>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaen, Corey</td>
<td>HK</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dornhelm, Robert</td>
<td>R / AUS</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson, Brian</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulya, Russell</td>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forsyth, Bill</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanievka, Marek</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietz, Nigel</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogutts, Yurek</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima, Luis</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, George</td>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schroeder, Barbet</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell, John</td>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feurs, Stephen</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlin, Renny</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland, Agneszka</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Connor, Pat</td>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schultz, Carl</td>
<td>H / AUS</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barron, Ziska</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avis, Meiert</td>
<td>IRL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell, Martin</td>
<td>NZ / UK</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eski, Ulu</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorfi, Roland</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novace, Phillip</td>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schenkel, Carl</td>
<td>CH</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple, Julien</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veber, Francis</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amiel, Jon</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amarr, Francisco</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cason-Jones, Michael</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figgis, Mike</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Born</td>
<td>Died</td>
<td>First Feature</td>
<td>First Hollywood Feature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen, John</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green, David</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandoki, Luis</td>
<td>MEX</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy, Geoff</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schindler, Volker</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branagh, Kenneth</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faiman, Peter</td>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallstrom, Lasse</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris, Damian</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes, Terry</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nair, Mira</td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tani, Nadia</td>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell, Martin</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donovan, Martin</td>
<td>UK / RA</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidron, Beeban</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menges, Chris</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose, Bernard</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmerich, Roland</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong, Vic</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August, Billie</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bratillia, Marco</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacDenn, John</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mih殖lla, Anthony</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salomon, Mikael</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woo, John</td>
<td>HK</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Bort, Jan</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morahan, Andrew</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson, David</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simonneau, Yves</td>
<td>CDN</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pryvet, Alex</td>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsoen, Peter</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker, Oliver</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soffley, Iain</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arau, Alfonso</td>
<td>MEX</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Born</th>
<th>Died</th>
<th>First Feature</th>
<th>First Hollywood Feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bard, Stuart</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett, Bill</td>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campion, John</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hymer, Nicholas</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, Peter</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lars, Ringo</td>
<td>HK</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamahori, Lee</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tnabha, Fernando</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyle, Danny</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West, Simon</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waller, Anthony</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Toro, Guillermo</td>
<td>MEX</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogan, PJ</td>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annuad, Jean-Jacques</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niccol, Andrew</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tong, Stanley</td>
<td>HK</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsai, Hark</td>
<td>HK</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yu, Reny</td>
<td>HK</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bornedal, Ole</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radford, Michael</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wong, Kirk</td>
<td>HK</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butterworth, Jez</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinyor, Gary</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hicks, Scott</td>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendes, Sam</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michell, Roger</td>
<td>SA / UK</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruinak, Josef</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rymer, Michael</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamiński, Janusz</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berliner, Alain</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Global Directors of New Hollywood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Born</th>
<th>Died</th>
<th>First Feature</th>
<th>First Hollywood Feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gondry, Michel</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keu, Chen</td>
<td>PRC</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan, Kevin</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haggis, Paul</td>
<td>CDN</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamm, Nick</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw, Takashi</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwemle, Robert</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haftomer, Mikael</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naess, Peter</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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