

FILM
CULTURE

IN TRANSITION

HOLLYWOOD

is
Everywhere

GLOBAL DIRECTORS IN THE
BLOCKBUSTER ERA

MELIS BEHLIL

Amsterdam
University
Press

Hollywood Is Everywhere

Global Directors in the Blockbuster Era

Melis Behlil

Amsterdam University Press

Illustration back cover: Scene from Robert Altman's *THE PLAYER* (1992).

Cover design: Kok Korpershoek, Amsterdam

Lay-out: Crius Group, Hulshout

Amsterdam University Press English-language titles are distributed in the US and Canada by the University of Chicago Press.

ISBN 978 90 8964 739 9

e-ISBN 978 90 4852 497 6

DOI 10.5117/9789089647399

NUR 670

© M. Behlil / Amsterdam University Press B.V., Amsterdam 2016

All rights reserved. Without limiting the rights under copyright reserved above, no part of this book may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise) without the written permission of both the copyright owner and the author of the book.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	9
Introduction: Hello Hollywood	11
Some Basic Questions	14
Documenting “Foreigners”	20
Structure of the Book	23
1. Defining Hollywood	27
“New” Hollywood	27
The Transnationalization of Hollywood	31
Is Hollywood American?	33
Hollywood as a Brand	35
Denationalization and Deterritorialization	38
2. Cultural Work in a Globalizing World	41
Definitions, Debates, Dimensions	41
Global System Theory and the Transnational Capitalist Class	43
Hollywood and Labor	46
Networking: Representation and Reputation	48
3. Histories and Geographies of Global Directors	55
A Brief History of Foreign Talent in Hollywood	56
Talent Flows in “New” Hollywood	62
The Ubiquity of Hollywood	66
Runaway Destinations	68
New Waves and Rising Stars	71
Outsiders and Competitors	74
Creating Connections	77
4. A View to a Franchise: James Bond	81
Why Bond?	82
From the Novels to the Films	83
A Bondian History	87
Other Franchises	93

5. “Once More with the Volume Up”: Auto-remakes ¹	97
Why Remakes?	98
European Auto-remakes	100
The “Asian Invasion”	104
Remaking Continues	108
6. I Want My MTV: Advertising and Music Videos	111
Why Advertising? Why Music Videos?	112
The New Aesthetics of Advertising and Music Videos	115
The Scott “Empire” ²⁹	117
Convergence and Connectivity	121
7. Conclusion: “Everywhere is Hollywood”	125
“Leaving” Hollywood	126
New Rules of the Game	129
Notes	131
Bibliography	163
List of Directors	183
Index of Film Titles	187
Index of Names	191
Index of Subjects	199

Acknowledgments

This book started out as a dissertation at the University of Amsterdam, and eventually became a “proper” publication. Its creation spanned a decade and a half, during which I had many occasions to be thankful to many people and institutions. So many, in fact, that I’m sure I will overlook a number of them, and I offer them my sincere apologies in advance.

As I started working on my dissertation, Istanbul Bilgi University gave me funding for the first year of my studies. It also provided me with employment, something that I likewise later obtained from the Media and Culture Department at the University of Amsterdam and the Film and TV Department at Yeditepe University. Eloë Kingma and Jantine van Gogh from the Amsterdam School for Cultural Analysis helped me with various bureaucratic matters. Members of the Cinema Europe group and others at the University of Amsterdam (Malte Hagener, Jaap Kooijman, Tarja Laine, Floris Paalman, Ward Rennen, Wanda Strauven, Ria Thanouli, and especially Marijke de Valck) provided a wonderful intellectual environment. Winfried Fluck, Rob Kroes, Patricia Pisters, Kevin Robins and Jan Simons generously agreed to sit on my thesis committee. My Amsterdam friends Armağan and Çimen Ekici, Begüm Firat, and Nazlı Karabenli made my frequent visits enjoyable and memorable. Other friends and colleagues – Savaş Arslan, Yeşim Burul, İdil Elveriş, Wendy Shaw, Louise Spence, and Ayşe Ünal – were kind enough to read and discuss my work on many occasions. Anıl Bilge and the late (and not forgotten) Emre Yerlikhan helped me with finalizing the print version.

It took me a while to recover from finishing my doctorate, but I eventually decided that it was time to revisit my work. I was lucky enough to be invited to the Salzburg Global Seminar as a fellow, which gave me a chance to reassess my research. I want to thank Jaap Kooijman (again), Marty Gecek, and Ronald Clifton for giving me this opportunity. I was convinced that my arguments still held, and in 2014-15 I was able to take time to revise my work. I want to thank everyone at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology’s Comparative Media Studies department for providing me with a peaceful haven in which to focus on my book. William Uricchio was instrumental in arranging my Visiting Scholar position at MIT, where I spent what was undoubtedly some of the best time of my entire life. My stay was funded by a grant from the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TÜBİTAK). And it was made absolutely unforgettable by the contributions of many people – most importantly, Lauren O’Neal (and her home), Güven Güzeldere, Caroline Reeves, and Mine Nişancı.

As I struggled to find my post-doctoral voice, comments from Alejandro Pardo, İrem İnceoğlu, Efe Sevin, and Güven Güzeldere (again) were most helpful. I must emphasize the assistance of Peter Krämer, who read and commented on the manuscript at various stages. Special thanks must also go to Kadir Has University, which has been my academic home for almost a decade. I received warm support from my institution at every stage of writing this book. I want to thank Deniz Bayrakdar and Levent Soysal for their patronage while I was still a stressed-out graduate student, Mustafa Aydın and Sevda Alankuş for allowing me to take a very precious time-out, and Defne Tüzün, in particular, for making sure that everything ran smoothly in my absence. Jeroen Sondervan of Amsterdam University Press has been a wonderful commissioning editor, patiently taking me through all the necessary steps. Thomas Elsaesser has been a source of inspiration and support since our very first email exchange; not only during the writing of my dissertation, but also in the publication of this book, and every point in between (and beyond). My father saw only the initial stages of my study, but without his support, I would not have dared enter academia. My mother has stood by me every step of the way, giving me boundless moral support, and often acting as my copy editor.

Writing a book is hard work, but it is not a matter of life or death. Conversely, the last few years have not been easy for the people of my country; we have found ourselves wallowing in an incessant news flow of oppression, corruption, war, and misery. The one glimmer of hope for millions has been a resistance movement, sparked by protests that aimed to protect a little park where I played as a child. The impact of that movement penetrated nearly every part of our lives, and found its way into the conclusion and title of this book. I thus feel that it deserves a dedication as well, with hope for a brighter future.

Introduction: Hello 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 screens in Istanbul eleven months after its US release. It was a different era; films were not released simultaneously across the world, we had no notion of pirate copies, and, of course, there was no Internet to download or stream any movies. For many of the urban filmgoers of my generation in Turkey, *SUPERMAN* is the first film they remember seeing in a movie theater.¹ This was partly due to the limited choice available at the time. In November 1979, *SUPERMAN* was released in Turkey along with 24 other films. While this may seem like a large number to choose from, many of these films were popular sex comedies (a euphemism for soft-core porn), or “arabesk” melodramas, low-budget musicals that served as star vehicles for local singers, aimed mainly at recent internal migrants from rural areas into the cities. With the advent of network television and the decline of Turkish cinema in the late 1970s, audiences shrank, and the “family audiences” that remained seemed to prefer Hollywood films. The foreign fare released in November 1979 included one Italian-West German co-produced erotic thriller and several Hollywood productions from previous years.² 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 the hero really seemed to be flying. Superman may have traditionally stood for “truth, justice, and the American way,” and to many, it must have represented American imperialism through Hollywood dominance. To my five-year-old self, though, what made the film irresistible were the exciting adventures and the smile of Christopher Reeve; or what I would later identify as Hollywood’s high production values and star appeal.

At that point, of course, I was unaware of the place that *SUPERMAN* would come to hold in film history. The first of many major big-budget superhero films to come over the following decades, *SUPERMAN* is considered one of the leading films of Hollywood’s blockbuster era. Both the original film and the first of its sequels were the second-highest domestic box-office earners of their respective years (1978, 1981).³ As a popular comic book character, with animations, film serials, TV series and a Broadway musical already produced,⁴ *SUPERMAN* was a pre-sold commodity that practically had a guaranteed audience. Heralded by its producers Alexander and Ilya Salkind as one of the most expensive movies ever made, *SUPERMAN*’s estimated budget of \$55 million promised its audiences lavish spectacle

with state-of-the-art special effects. But perhaps even more importantly, and something that would be typical of later Hollywood blockbusters, the film was produced and released by Warner Bros., the owner of which, Warner Communications Inc. (WCI), had purchased DC Comics, publisher of the Superman adventures, ten years previously. Not only did this deal facilitate the development of the project, but it also created other merchandising opportunities within the conglomerate. The Licensing Corporation of America, a WCI subsidiary, allocated merchandising rights to major companies such as Bristol Meyers, General Foods, PepsiCo, Lever Bros. and Gillette.⁵ Warner Books issued eight Superman-related titles, Warner Records released a soundtrack album and two singles, while another Warner subsidiary, Atari, brought out a Superman pinball machine.⁶ This was one of the first instances of synergy at work, something that would only increase in subsequent years as all Hollywood studios became part of larger media conglomerates. *SUPERMAN* was a big hit domestically as well as globally, and paved the way for similar endeavors.

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 Americans (both supporters and critics of Hollywood) “do not perceive these products as part of a specifically national culture.”⁷ Andrew Higson contends 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.”⁸ Globalization and national cinemas have been subjects of much debate in recent decades, not only within academia and specifically film studies, but also within film criticism, and even in daily conversation. “We are all experts about Hollywood,”⁹ suggests Toby Miller, but the expertise that comes out of familiarity often tends to rely on unquestioned assumptions. Hollywood is forever changing and evolving, and the era of globalization has been one of major transformation.

This study on Hollywood in the age of globalization grew out of two core interests, which proved to be related. These are my interest in Hollywood, dating back to my *SUPERMAN* days, and in globalization, a process that I have observed in my own lifetime. Hollywood is perhaps the clearest showcase for this process, in terms of its production, distribution, exhibition, and reception practices. Hollywood is in a continuous dialogue with globalization, both shaping it and, in return, being shaped by it. Thomas

Elsaesser and Warren Buckland point out that “Hollywood cinema is a world industry, just as much as it is a world language, a powerful, stable, perfected system of visual communication.”¹⁰ As such, this world industry recruits its workers from around the world, including its directors. This book therefore uses an examination of the career paths of foreign directors as a way to gain a better understanding of Hollywood as a whole.

Hollywood has exerted a centripetal force on foreign filmmakers since its earliest days. The studios hired these directors to make films of all types and genres, ranging from frivolous comedies to “problem pictures,” from “weepies” to action-adventure films. The films that have become embedded in the public imagination, however, are largely those of the émigré generation, those who migrated to the US from Europe just before World War II. It is easier to categorize these directors, as they had clear narratives of emigration, with romantic undertones of escaping an oppressive regime and looming war as refugees. They have also been largely credited with creating the film-noir style. Films such as *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) cemented the image of the dark Hollywood films directed by Europeans in exile.

Starting from the mid-to-late 1970s, a new generation of foreign filmmakers emerged in Hollywood, including 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) and *FACE/OFF* (John Woo, 1997) were directed by non-American directors, even though the directors’ nationalities were not highlighted in the marketing of the films (with the exception of the campaigns in the directors’ respective home countries). It would be very unlikely, however, for anyone in the audience to be aware that the following films were their 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), the Oscar-nominated racial conflict drama *MONSTER’S BALL* (Marc Forster, 2001), and the comedy hit *LEGALLY BLONDE* (Robert Luketic, 2001) (with directors from the UK, Hong Kong, Switzerland, and Australia, respectively). Even *SUPERMAN*, which was made by an American, came very close to having a British director. The film was initially to be shot in Italy by Guy Hamilton, renowned for his James Bond films. However, when production was moved to the UK – the

director's native country – Hamilton had to step down for tax reasons. Globally dispersed shooting locations, James Bond, and tax are all themes that re-emerge in this book.

In the following chapters, I examine Hollywood as a transnational industry that has attracted talent from around the world throughout its history. I discuss Hollywood's relationship with other regional and national filmmaking centers, and throughout the case studies, I consider the various strategies employed by Hollywood (and foreign directors) to make transnational cooperation possible. I argue that rather than being a specific geographic location, Hollywood functions as a network of production, distribution and exhibition across the world, spreading through local involvement. This shift from a centralized base to a global network is immensely significant, and has even changed the political economy of the film industry (Elmer and Gasher 2005). I analyze some of the notions taken for granted in discussions of Hollywood, and thereby provide a clearer understanding of the workings of this globally dominant cinema at the end of the twentieth century.

Some Basic Questions

This study started out as an attempt to position the global filmmakers of more recent decades within a wider historical context of “émigré” directors in Hollywood. Then, however, I took the inquiry a step further: what does this flow of international talent tell us about cinema in a globalized world, particularly *vis-à-vis* the positions of Hollywood and other cinemas, as well as about the role played by the transnational corporations that now own and manage Hollywood? This is the “what” that the book is aiming to cover. In order to define the boundaries of the research more clearly, let us continue with some other basic questions, and consider the who, the where, and the when.

The answer to the “who” question provides us with our primary subjects of research: a rather large group of filmmakers who are not American-born and who work in Hollywood. My use of the words “global” or “international” directors instead of “émigré” is deliberate.¹¹ The term “émigré director” has come to be firmly associated with the earlier generation of filmmakers who emigrated to the US in the 1930s and the early 1940s, mostly for political reasons. Emigration connotes an act of relocating for good, leaving the old country behind, but many of the directors in the post-1975 era have been more flexible in terms of working across and moving between countries. To

some extent, this was also the case with the earlier generations, especially in the 1920s, something that is often not mentioned.

The categorization here is one that essentially hinges on the question of nationality and citizenship. The directors in question hold the nationality of a country other than the US; only some of them have become US citizens or hold dual citizenship.¹² “Alien of extraordinary ability” is the official term used by the US Immigration Services for an individual “who possesses extraordinary ability in the sciences, arts, education, business, or athletics, or who has a demonstrated record of extraordinary achievement in the motion picture or television industry and has been recognized nationally or internationally for those achievements.”¹³ However, whether these directors really are “aliens” in terms of being foreign to the Hollywood style of filmmaking is an entirely different issue. They are initially identified by their nationality as “foreign,” but this foreignness does not go beyond a basic preliminary identification. “Native” and “foreign” are no longer clear categorizations when it comes to studying Hollywood, meaning that “global” is the key adjective in my discussion. Hollywood is no longer a national cinema – it is debatable whether it ever was – and notions of emigration no longer apply to “foreign” talent in Hollywood. If Hollywood is indeed a global and transnational cinema, speaking of “foreign” talent becomes inconsequential, since Hollywood cannot be construed as the total other, and since “so much of any nation’s film culture is implicitly ‘Hollywood,’”¹⁴ as Higson proposed.

The use of the term “foreign” in this book is strictly limited to citizenship, but even then, this classification is problematic. Recent debates in citizenship have centered on alternative notions of belonging. The internationalization of capital has led to a process of denationalization, 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 concerns.¹⁵ Aihwa Ong suggests the term “flexible citizenship” as a way to theorize contemporary practices amongst the migrating Chinese diaspora of various classes. 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.”¹⁶ 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.”¹⁷

In this sense, the dual citizenship of someone like the former president of the Directors Guild of America (DGA), Michael Apted (British/American), is less a statement on where a person's loyalties lie and more a matter of convenience. To return to issues of classification for the purposes of this book, what should one then make of Christopher Nolan, for instance, who was born in England but is half American? Or James Cameron, who arrived in the US from Canada with his parents at the age of 17? I have opted to include the former and leave out the latter: Nolan's formative years were spent in the UK, and Cameron was still a minor when he moved. Some cases are very straightforward, such as those where the filmmaker gains experience and fame in his home country, then transfers to Hollywood. The well-known examples cited above, such as Paul Verhoeven, John Woo and Roland Emmerich, belong to this category. But not every director that I have included had an established pre-Hollywood film career. Some, like Alan Parker or Adrian Lyne, were known in the industry as advertising (and not film) directors before directing their first features for a major studio.¹⁸ Sam Mendes first made his name as a theater director and then made his film debut with *AMERICAN BEAUTY*, a Dreamworks SKG release and an Academy Award winner. I have thus had to evaluate each case individually, and I have strived to keep my selection consistent. I hope I have done justice to all parties, considering the substantial scope of the study.

Although people from all parts of the film industry have worked for Hollywood, I focus on directors alone. In the early days of Hollywood, directors, apart from a few exceptions, tended to be seen as technicians who would fulfill the vision of the studio and the producer. With the collapse of the classical studio system, producers had to become more involved in deal-making and retreat from the actual production process, while directors filled the void. Although the director is now largely regarded as the leading creative force behind a project, his or her control over production is fragile. In a Hollywood studio project, there are so many steps leading up to an actual production that many, if not most, of the creative choices have already been made before the director comes on board and the production process begins.¹⁹

The directors who are imported by Hollywood studios are often unfamiliar faces to audiences outside their own countries and regions. Most directors' nationalities are never brought into the spotlight, especially in cases of directors from other English-speaking countries. The more fame a director accrues, the likelier it becomes that his national background is addressed, as can be seen in the cases of Ridley Scott or Christopher Nolan. The obvious exception is when the films are marketed in their director's

native country (see chapter five for a discussion of how Hollywood remakes are marketed in their original countries). The handful of directors who were famous before they started working for Hollywood, like Woo, Emmerich, or Verhoeven, are the names everyone remembers, overshadowing dozens of other, lesser-known directors. Using directors as case studies provides historical consistency and a framework. At the same time, examining the personal networks of the directors draws attention to the importance of other players, such as producers, executives and agents. One needs to acknowledge the director as the person responsible for a film's creative vision, without losing sight of all the other factors that go into a Hollywood production. These other factors, primarily the studios' demands, are often seen as limiting the director's artistic freedom,²⁰ but as Janet Wasko also points out, the primary driving force and guiding principle of the industry is profit, not art (2011).

The next question, the "where?" is no less problematic. The one-word answer is "Hollywood," but the seemingly simple follow-up question, "where is Hollywood?," is one that demands further attention. The next chapter is dedicated to what Hollywood entails and how it functions, and even where it is. Tom O'Regan pointed out that 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."²¹ One should start by making a distinction between Hollywood as a location and Hollywood as an industry. While I frequently refer to "arriving in Hollywood," in this context this is more of a figure of speech, as the ubiquitous presence of "Hollywood the industry" makes a physical arrival in the actual location gratuitous. For now, let me clarify what is meant by "working in Hollywood" in this book.

When the American motion picture industry moved from the East Coast to the West Coast in the 1910s, several film studios were constructed in this neighborhood of Los Angeles. By the mid-1920s, "Hollywood" and the "American film industry" had become synonymous. "Studios" or "majors" are also terms that are frequently used in the same sense as Hollywood, as we have seen in previous pages. "Studio" in its most simple sense means a place where motion pictures are made; and while there is a large number of sound studios in and around Hollywood (and the Greater Los Angeles area), this term has been closely associated with the major companies that have been producing the films with the high production values that have come to be expected of Hollywood. As Ben Goldsmith and Tom O'Regan argue 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 Hollywood majors.”²² These major studios form the Motion Pictures Association of America (MPAA), the leading trade organization established in 1922.²³ While mergers and acquisitions frequently reshape the proprietary landscape, throughout the period of research the members were the Walt Disney Company, Sony Pictures Entertainment, Inc., Paramount Pictures Corporation, 20th Century Fox Film Corp., Universal Studios, Inc., Warner Bros. (WB) and Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Inc. (MGM).²⁴ These corporations form the first tier of Hollywood, followed by indie subsidiaries and independents. What I refer to as “working in Hollywood” means making a film that is being produced by a company from any of these three tiers. While most global directors work for the majors or their subsidiaries, there have been cases of smaller independent films being directed by a global filmmaker. Nonetheless, even these smaller films are distributed worldwide by the distribution arms of Hollywood studios, making the reach of the majors inescapable.

The answer to “when?” emerged out of the initial phases of my research on the directors. In order to gain a more precise understanding of exactly who global filmmakers are, my initial step was to compile an inventory of all non-American directors working for Hollywood studios, as well as of the films they had made. This was followed by quantitative analyses on these inventories in terms of the directors’ national and professional backgrounds and the year of their first Hollywood features. My aim was to find out how many global directors had made their Hollywood debuts and how many films they made in any given year, analyzed further by filmmakers’ origins.

This analysis revealed that a divide had opened up in the second half of the 1970s. Several British directors had already started working for Hollywood studios in the second half of the 1960s (e.g. Tony Richardson, John Boorman and John Schlesinger), along with Czech directors like Miloš Forman and Ivan Passer, who released their first Hollywood pictures in 1971. But the numbers show a significant increase towards the end of the 1970s, and climb even higher in the 1980s.²⁵ This book therefore concentrates on the period starting in the mid-1970s, which overlaps with the increasing globalization of the world economy, and with what scholars such as Thomas Schatz (1983, 1993, 2008, 2012) have termed the “New Hollywood.” In *New Hollywood Cinema: An Introduction*, Geoff King (2002) defines what is new in this era at various levels. Within the industrial context, this is the post-Fordist Hollywood of giant media conglomerates; and in terms of style, it is the post-classical Hollywood of the MTV generation.

Immediately after World War II, the seemingly invincible oligopoly of the Hollywood studios that had existed since the 1920s faced a number of

challenges. The labor strike of 1945, decline in the box-office from overseas markets, and even more crucially, the “Paramount decision” by the US Supreme Court in 1948, which demanded that the vertical control exercised by the studios over rights of production, distribution and exhibition be dismantled, were all responsible for the studios’ declining profits. To deal with declining profits, studios geared themselves towards fewer productions, which led to a bigger change in the system. Filmmaking personnel were no longer on a payroll; individual projects were put together by producers and brokered through agents, which led to gradual change in the industry’s power structures. “New” waves in European cinema, led by Neorealism in Italy, and technical advancements facilitating location shoots added momentum to these changes. In the 1950s, blacklisting practices caused by the House Committee on Un-American Activities (HUAC) 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 the economic to the political and the cultural, 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, due not only to the lucrative blockbusters they released, but also to acquisition activities by large media conglomerates. Although there had been “blockbusters” – namely, high-budget spectacles with great box-office ambitions – in earlier decades as well, “the blockbuster syndrome went into high-gear in the mid-1970s.”²⁶ Similarly, while the takeover of individual studios by corporations had already begun in the mid-1960s, this practice became even more pronounced and globalized in the following decades.²⁷ And although major changes occurred in the industry in the 2000s, primarily as a result of digitization, the dominance of blockbusters and conglomerates is ongoing. Nonetheless, the present analysis covers the three decades between 1975 and 2005. These decades represent a period of change, during which the studios regained their lost power and the effects of globalization were inextricably inscribed upon Hollywood. Symbolically, 2005 was the year in which YouTube was launched, almost single-handedly changing the viewing habits of the world. The period that followed was thus an era of digital conversion, and soon afterwards, of economic meltdown. Thomas Schatz argues that the balance in Hollywood between the three tiers of “major Hollywood studios, conglomerate-owned indie subsidiaries, and genuine independents operating in relative harmony”²⁸ started to shift right around the middle of the first decade of 21st century, resulting in the collapse of the independent sector. Jordan Levin, in turn, claims that this is “the largest, most fundamental transformation in the history of the media

since the advent of typeface, the moving image, and terrestrial broadcast transmission.”²⁹ The post-2005 era has indeed been a very interesting period for Hollywood and foreign directors, but it is a subject that deserves to be addressed in another book.

The answers to these three questions define the boundaries of my study. But let me address the one remaining question, namely: “why?” Why is the phenomenon of foreign directors such an inextricable part of Hollywood’s own narrative? The global flow of talent towards Hollywood has always had rather clear motives. Hollywood offers more opportunities, financially and technologically. This means not only higher fees, but also larger production and marketing budgets.³⁰ 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.³¹ In addition, Hollywood studios can provide filmmakers with more advanced technologies, bankable stars, and the opportunity to reach much larger audiences through their globally supplied and locally established distribution networks. In return, the directors are expected to play the game by the rules and to make films that make a profit. Correspondingly, Hollywood wants and needs global talent for a number of reasons. Clearly, skilled creative labor, of whatever nationality, is desirable for producing high-quality output in entertainment industries. Hollywood has had another incentive to import talent, and that has been to weaken the various local film industries that might pose a threat, a practice dating back to the 1920s with the German and Swedish industries. An added advantage of employing global directors is to service the local markets of the filmmakers’ native countries. In the late 1920s, this was achieved through employing directors such as William Dieterle and Günther von Fritsch to film German-language versions of Hollywood pictures, aimed at the German market. In more recent decades, studios’ interest in East Asian source materials and filmmaking personnel (to be explored in chapter five) can be explained in terms of the substantial Japanese market and potentially enormous Chinese market.

Documenting “Foreigners”

In terms of research into foreign filmmakers in Hollywood, the 1940s émigré generation dominates the field. Most of the literature on foreign directors in Hollywood focuses on the intense emigration during the Nazi regime and World War II, starting with John Baxter’s *The Hollywood Exiles* (1976) and ending with Gerd Gemünden’s *Continental Strangers: German Exile*

Cinema, 1933-1951 (2014).³² A few scholars have looked at earlier periods, when economics was a more influential factor than politics, or considered later decades.³³ This tendency has also determined the Eurocentric territorial scope of the literature, as until the 1980s, Europe was the sole region seen as a source for foreign talent. Only after 2000 did studies on filmmakers from Asia (Chung 2000, Tesson et al. 2001, Tezuka 2012) begin to appear.³⁴ Research focusing on more recent flows from individual countries is exemplified by Peter Krämer's (2002a, 2002b) and Christine Haase's (2007) work on German directors, Ian Scott's history of lesser-known British émigrés (2010), Christian Viviani's edited volume on French connections in Hollywood (2007), Michaela Boland and Michael Bodey's survey of Australian talent (2004), or Kenneth Chan's account of the Chinese presence in transnational cinemas (2009).³⁵

Several studies stand out in their approaches to theorize the flow towards Hollywood. Graham Petrie's *Hollywood Destinies* (2002) looks at the earliest period of emigration (1922-1931), focusing mostly on German and Scandinavian directors. In his discussion of the reception of foreign films in the US in the 1920s, Petrie demonstrates how the perception of "foreign" changed across the decade, colored by the anti-immigration movements, and how the popular mood turned against the qualities that made the European directors attractive for the studios. He argues that this was the decade that defined the "self-evident and universally valid" standards of American entertainment.³⁶ "American" films are expected to display "the truly 'American' qualities of wholesome, optimistic, popular entertainment instead of dabbling in the 'morbid,' 'depressing,' 'ugly' side of life favored by too many of the European imports."³⁷ Even with the later generations, he contends, the only directors to "survive" were those who discarded "the foreignness that made them interesting in the first place" and adapted "to the imperatives of the Hollywood machine."³⁸ Pitting the "artsy"³⁹ European style against the entertainment-minded mainstream American film, Petrie reasserts the binary oppositions that have traditionally separated these two cinemas and that have been often challenged since. In line with this classical discourse, Petrie also reiterates the idea that the only indication of "success" for a migrating filmmaker is to remain in Hollywood and continue work there. These strict binaries between American/Hollywood and European films are lampooned by Robert Altman's brilliant satire on Hollywood, *THE PLAYER* (1992). Studio executive Griffin Mill (Tim Robbins) finds himself in a situation where he has to listen to a pitch for an "important" film. The director (Richard E. Grant) gives the pitch, and ends it with: "If I'm perfectly honest, this isn't even an American film. ... There are no stars. No pat happy

endings, no Schwarzenegger, no stickups ... No terrorists. This is a tough story, a tragedy in which an innocent woman dies." The director, of course, is British. And the "important" film, of course, is turned into a star vehicle with a happy ending after it "tests badly with suburban audiences."

James Morrison approaches the contrast between European and American cinemas more cautiously in *Passport to Hollywood* (1998), in which he examines European directors in Hollywood (and a few American-born filmmakers in Europe) from the silent period until the 1970s. Morrison's approach is a textual analysis of a selection of films, problematizing the perceived binary relationship between modernism and mass culture, associated with Europe and the US, respectively. Reflecting Petrie's approach, the directors he has chosen "were imported to the Hollywood system with the preexistent 'passport' of a style, a reputation, a pedigree,"⁴⁰ which in many cases clashed with what they were expected to create for the studios. Consequently, Morrison argues that this set of films can be thought of as "manifestations of a particular style of subculture within the larger institutional system," where the subculture is the network of (mostly German) émigrés in Hollywood throughout the 1930s and the 1940s.⁴¹ According to Morrison, who uses the term "émigré" as well as "exile," Europeans in Hollywood found "themselves defined as 'alien' in Hollywood culture and in turn produce[d] representations often driven to define [...] American culture itself as 'other.'"⁴² In the New Hollywood era, however, it is no longer possible to distinctly categorize films by foreign directors as having a different style than that of Hollywood. Furthermore, hardly any of the filmmakers in this book are defined as a part of the "European art-cinema," either by themselves or by others. Morrison himself notes that the situation may have changed, especially with the influx of directors from areas other than Europe.⁴³

Thomas Elsaesser (1999) investigates why so many talented European filmmakers have ended up in Hollywood, starting from the very early days of cinema. Elsaesser brings trade and competition into the picture; a move that is essential for an analysis of migration flows in recent eras, as political motives have been practically non-existent since the time of the émigré Czech directors of the 1970s. Even countries where the state imposes limitations on filmmakers, such as China and Iran, have not been the source of "emigration" in a political sense. Elsaesser has also put forward an "emulation/emigration" model (2005), where he proposes that certain European (particularly German) directors such as Roland Emmerich and Wolfgang Petersen have adopted a Hollywood-like style, which enables them to be noticed by the 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.⁴⁴ Emmerich himself is clear about his inspiration: “For me German movies were boring and dull, and everything that came from the new Hollywood was cool.”⁴⁵ The tendency to mimic Hollywood’s style goes as far back as the early days of its dominance. Kristin Thompson points out that Lubitsch often declared that “he was strongly influenced by Hollywood films,”⁴⁶ and that the influence of these films in Germany during the first half of the 1920s is often underestimated, even disregarded. Similarly, taking advantage of the German tour that 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).⁴⁷ Charles Rosher recalled that Murnau would constantly ask questions about how things were done in Hollywood; as a result, Murnau was already familiar with the Hollywood style when he was offered a contract by William Fox in 1926.⁴⁸

Nearly everything that is written on these filmmakers continues to use the migration discourse, even though the notion of emigrating is one of “crushing, definitive finality,” connoting “leaving everything behind.”⁴⁹ In the globalized world and within global Hollywood, the “migration” to Hollywood is not a final one, nor does it even always require a physical relocation. Contemporary directors who have worked in Hollywood can and do return to their home countries to make other films. This has been the case for Alejandro Amenábar, Paul Verhoeven, and a number of Hong Kong directors such as Ringo Lam, Stanley Tong and Hark Tsui. Even John Woo, the most renowned of the Asian directors, returned to China.⁵⁰ In fact, many do not even have to move to the US, as Hollywood has gone global; movies are now shot all around the world. In the following chapters, I look at Hollywood as a global site of production as well as a magnet for foreign talent throughout its history.

Structure of the Book

This book consists of two parts, each with three chapters. In the first three chapters, various aspects of Hollywood are explored through analyses of theoretical approaches and historical background. Hollywood has been defined in different ways over the years. In the first chapter, I start by focusing on how we can understand Hollywood in the blockbuster era,

surveying accounts of the transnationalization of the industry and its branding strategies. This is followed by what is admittedly a partial overview of globalization theories in chapter two, relating in particular to the position of labor, and an analysis of how different levels of labor networks in Hollywood interact with the studios and with one another. Chapter three shifts the focus to directors, presenting a brief history of foreign directorial talent in Hollywood, and a categorization of regional and national filmmaking centers across the world with respect to their relationships *vis-à-vis* Hollywood.

The second part comprises three case studies, in which I examine the strategies employed by Hollywood and global directors to facilitate collaboration. The case studies are not of specific directors, but of groupings that consist of different styles and production conditions, representing significant networks visible in blockbuster-era Hollywood. For global directors, the path to Hollywood that we most commonly encounter seems to be to achieve box-office success or a significant reputation in one's own country or region or on the global festival circuit, possibly leading to an Oscar nomination, something that often translates into a contract with a major studio.⁵¹ But there are other ways, as can be seen in the case studies.

Many of the global directors have their first experience of Hollywood through co-productions; in particular, franchises such as the HARRY POTTER or BATMAN series are often shot outside the US and employ global directors. As pioneers of both co-production and franchise practices, the James Bond films serve as the first case study. "Financed by an American major partly with British film subsidy funds," the films are "quintessential examples of products tailored for the international market."⁵²

As demonstrated again and again, studios are in search of new, talented directors who have proven themselves to some extent, or who have potential that is deemed worthy of investment. One way of proving this potential is by already having a script, in order to "have a full hand" and "something to sell,"⁵³ or an already successful film that can be remade with Hollywood's budget and conventions. Japanese producer Takashige Ichise observes, "once I make it and once they see it they understand what I'm talking about."⁵⁴ Chapter five thus examines several sets of Hollywood remakes directed by the same filmmaker as the original.

Another avenue for directors since the mid-1970s has been making advertisements and music videos. In addition to being a career path in its own right, directing commercials and music videos has become a way of crossing over to feature filmmaking. The last case study explores directors with these backgrounds, focusing on the production company Ridley Scott

Associates (RSA) and the talent that it has fostered. RSA uses the various media it creates, such as commercials, music videos, and television series, to provide a “training ground”⁵⁵ for the young directors it employs, playing a significant role in global production networks.

This book is a study of Hollywood as a global phenomenon. The careers of foreign directors are examined in order to gain a better understanding of this ubiquitous and complex cinema on which we all seem to be experts. Using the filmmakers’ careers as a tool also allows us to (re)conceptualize the international flow of directors towards (and, on occasion, away from) Hollywood. The analyses in the following chapters expose the multifaceted 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.”⁵⁶ While this is a significant acknowledgment, what happens when we go beyond the exile and immigration discourses and explore this phenomenon at the very end of the twentieth century? “Global directors” in the corporate era can only be viewed through the lens of transnational networks, of which Hollywood studios have become a part. Hollywood has always been international in terms of its production, and certainly its reception. Nevertheless, its current transnationality extends to ownership and production, as well as to distribution, exhibition, and reception.