

To Recycle is to Author is to Create is to Recycle:
Transitory Film Authorship,
from Popular European Cinema to Post-New Hollywood Cinema

Anna McLeish

A Thesis in
the Mel Hoppenheim School of Cinema

Presented in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts in Film Studies at
Concordia University
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

September 2003

© Anna McLeish, 2003

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

ISBN: 0-612-83944-3

Our file Notre référence

ISBN: 0-612-83944-3

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

Canada

Abstract

To Recycle is to Author is to Create is to Recycle: Transitory Film Authorship, from Popular European Cinema to Post-New Hollywood Cinema

Anna McLeish

This study explores the notion of film authorship as a transitory, fluid concept, one that is capable of acquiring new meaning and connotations as it shifts between different national, cultural, and cinematic contexts. It offers as its theoretical point of contextualisation the transnational practice of cross-cultural cinematic recycling, specifically popular European cinema into post-New Hollywood cinema. This study argues for the viability of the remake as a topic of research through which to consider the (re)positioning of concepts of authorship and the (trans)national, at the interface of postmodern, global/local concerns in film production, reception and interpretation. In particular, this study calls for the recognition of contemporary film authorship, specifically auteurism, as two-tiered (“traditional” and “popular” auteurism as necessarily separate yet interconnected concepts). Following this socio-cultural theoretical discussion, presented in its first two chapters, this study then applies the notion of authorship as a shifting, transitory concept to a case study of Alejandro Amenábar’s *Abre los ojos* (1997) and its recycled version, Cameron Crowe’s *Vanilla Sky* (2001). This particular instance of cross-cultural cinematic recycling provides a pertinent illustration of the way in which contemporary authorial modes are both aligned and demarcated by their distinct cultural, cinematic contexts.

Acknowledgements

A project this size does not come to fruition without assistance, and there are several people I would like to thank for enabling its completion. I am grateful to Rosanna Maule for offering her expertise on theories of film authorship and national cinema(s), she both challenged and guided my scholarly thinking. I am also indebted to those people who contributed to the evolution of this project, whether on a conversational or critical level, by providing welcome advice and suggestions along the way. In particular Chris Meir, whose intelligent, thoughtful comments were greatly appreciated and absorbed. My thanks to Stuart Irving, for the generously long loan of his DVD player. Friends and family, as always, have played an invaluable role before, during and after the writing of this thesis, despite the distance that has kept me from them throughout this time. I would especially like to thank my parents, Andy and Jocelyn McLeish, who remain a source of great inspiration, as well as Indi Richardson for continually offering encouragement, friendship and care from her side of the world to mine during this period. Having made Montreal my home while writing this thesis, I would like to acknowledge the generosity and kindness of my friends here. In particular Hanna Laakso, with whom I have had the great pleasure of sharing my passion for film, cultures, places and people. Lastly, I would like to thank James Griffin, whose presence in my life keeps me sane, amused and impassioned. I would like to dedicate this work to him, and also to the memory of my grandmother Hilda Victoria Crapp, 24/5/1910 – 11/9/2002.

A film is, in some ways, a rebus, a crossword puzzle. Better still: it is a language which inaugurates a discussion, which doesn't end with the viewing of the film, but incites a genuine research.

Fereydoun Hoveyda (*Cahiers du Cinéma*, no. 126, 1961)

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
1. The (Trans)National and Cross-Cultural Cinematic Recycling	16
2. Transitory Film Authorship: from Popular European Cinema to Post-New Hollywood Cinema	50
3. Case Study: Alejandro Amenábar's <i>Abre los ojos</i> (1997) recycled into Cameron Crowe's <i>Vanilla Sky</i> (2001)	76
Conclusion	103
Works Cited	109
Appendix A	119

Introduction

The concept of authorship has proven its resilience as a critical and theoretical approach in film studies, vigorously conceptualized, challenged and re-conceptualized since its emergence some fifty years ago.¹ This study is concerned with the concept of auteurism, as well as the notion of authorship as a discursive function, existing within a specific socio-historical context.² Auteurism, which emerged from subjective interpretations of filmic authorship offered by *la politique des auteurs* in France during the nineteen-fifties, shall be discussed as separate from, yet interconnected with, authorship as a discursive function, which itself reveals a distinctly postmodern agenda. These two notions of film authorship provide a conceptual framework for this study, from which several other concerns emerge.

To begin and end with auteurism, for instance, means the exclusion of historical, socio-cultural and commercial notions of authorship in film, the last two notions being particularly relevant to this study. John Caughie's discussion of concepts of authorship beyond solely auteurism, for instance, calls for an ongoing exchange between conceptualizations and *re*-conceptualizations of what is clearly an indomitable theoretical and critical approach within the discipline of film studies (1981: 2-3). It would appear

¹ With regards to this concept's polemic existence, which informs this study's theoretical backbone, see John Caughie, ed. *Theories of Authorship* (London: Routledge, 1981); Stephen Crofts, "Authorship and Hollywood," *The Oxford Guide to Film Studies*, eds. John Hill and Pamela Church Gibson (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998); and David A. Gerstner and Janet Staiger, eds. *Authorship and Film* (New York: Routledge, 2003).

² For a detailed account of the concept of auteurism, see Caughie *Theories*, specifically "Part.1: Auteurism" (7-120); and John Hillier, ed. *Cahiers du Cinéma: The 1950s: Neo-Realism, Hollywood, New Wave* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1985). For more on the author as discursive function, see Michel Foucault, "What is an Author?" *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice*, ed. Donald F. Bouchard (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1977).

that this exchange is gaining prominence; the concept of authorship has recently been the subject of much academic interest, debate and re-evaluation.³ As James Naremore notes,

[...] writing about directors hasn't disappeared, and discussion of authorship isn't incompatible with theory. In fact, given the current situation, which is also characterised by a renewed interest in history and the sociology of culture, a space has been opened for us to reconsider the contributions of the original auteurs. (14)

Thus, while auteurism as it was originally conceived as *la politique des auteurs* in France during the 1950s remains pertinent to this study, of even greater relevance are recent re-assessments of authorship as a commercial and cultural strategy of intersubjective agency.⁴

At this point it's worth addressing what has curiously remained a rather unclear distinction in film studies: the terms "authorship" and "auteurism." Too seldom is the latter recognised as a critical and theoretical concept derived from, but not necessarily the same as, the former; both should be defined according to changing socio-historical contexts that align and distinguish their strategic positions within film studies. Rather

³ For instance, see Dudley Andrew, "The Unauthorised Auteur Today," *Film Theory Goes to the Movies*, eds. Jim Collins, Hilary Radner, and Ava Preacher Collins (New York: Routledge, 1993); Timothy Corrigan, *A Cinema Without Walls: Movies and Culture after Vietnam* (New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1991); Crofts "Authorship" (1998); Gerstner and Staiger *Authorship*; Catherine Grant, "www.auteur.com?" *Screen* 41.1 (2000); Rosanna Maule, "De-Authorizing the Auteur: Postmodern Politics of Interpellation in Contemporary European Cinema," *Postmodernism in the Cinema*, ed. Cristina Degli-Esposti (New York: Berghahn Books, 1998); and Dana Polan, "Auteur Desire," *Screening the Past* 12 (2001), www.latrobe.edu.au/screeningthepast/firstrelease/fr0301/dpfr12a.html.

⁴ See Andrew "The Unauthorised"; Corrigan *A Cinema*; Gerstner and Staiger *Authorship*; Grant "www.auteur.com?"; and Maule "De-Authorizing."

intriguingly, Caughie appears to be the lone theorist in acknowledging the importance of such a distinction, associating “auteurism” with “those critical practices which have gone under the banner of either ‘*la politique des auteurs*’ or the ‘*auteur* theory’,” while referencing the term “authorship” in “as neutral a sense as possible, without involving it in the critical practices of *auteurism*” (1975: 3).⁵ This distinction is subsequently put into practice by Caughie in Theories of Authorship (1981), qualified by the reminder that “*auteurism* is more clearly a critical practice than a theory” (4).

Although the term “authorship” has certainly moved toward a closer involvement with the “critical practices of *auteurism*” since its recent re-assessment within postmodern discourse (as shall be discussed further below), it still operates less critically and more conceptually in film studies than does the term “auteurism.” It is important to recognise, therefore, that these two terms, given their inherently complex manifestation, remain distinct yet interdependent. Naremore suggests that, “the discourse on authorship, of which *auteurism per se* is only a small part, is full of contradictions” (21). This point will prove an important and relevant one to bear in mind in relation to this study’s approach, in that the concept of authorship, of which *auteurism* is an integral component yet not its defining characteristic, shall be conceptually linked to other, equally aligned yet separate, notions: modernism and postmodernism; art and commerce; European films and Hollywood films; the national and global.

As with the concept of authorship, keen attention has been paid in film studies to notions of national cinema. The need to re-assess previous interpretations of national

⁵ Caughie goes on to comment: “I make this point since it seems to me that much of the confusion of *auteurism* derives from critics who have made fundamental adjustments to the approach without allowing these adjustments to appear, in the terminology. The result may be a misleading impression of inconsistency” (3). Almost thirty years after Caughie’s observation, it appears the result has been just that.

cinema has occurred primarily in response to the previously unchallenged treatment of this topic since its emergence in film studies. For instance, Mette Hjort and Scott MacKenzie note that

In the early days of the institutionalisation of film as an academic discipline, the study of national cinemas – in conjunction with *auteur* theory – was widely and unproblematically accepted, and these two critical approaches provided the categorical framework for the first film courses in North American universities in the late 1960s. National cinema at that point was understood both as a descriptive category and as a means of systematising an emerging university curriculum. (2)

Among the various concerns since raised regarding the concept of national cinema, those of particular relevance to this study pertain to cultural specificity, national identity and nationalist discourses within the socio-historical and socio-cultural contexts of industry and reception.⁶

Despite both authorship and national cinema having undergone recent scrutiny and re-consideration in film studies, they appear to have received little if any joint attention. I aim to explore this juncture, which shall prove fundamental to the theoretical framework of this study, and in turn offer the argument that authorship exists as a

⁶ For more on this subject, see Crofts, “Concepts of National Cinema,” *The Oxford Guide to Film Studies*, eds. John Hill and Pamela Church Gibson (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998); “Reconceptualizing National Cinema/s,” *Quarterly Review of Film and Video* 14.3 (1993); Andrew Higson, “The Concept of National Cinema,” *Screen* 30.4 (1989); and Paul Willemen, “The National,” *Look and Frictions: Essays in Cultural Studies and Film Theory* (London: BFI Publishing, 1994). A common preoccupation and point of reference in these texts is Benedict Anderson’s notion of the nation as an “imagined community,” which shall be addressed in the first chapter of this study.

shifting, malleable concept,⁷ a textual and intertextual strategy capable of both valorizing artistic expression and strengthening industrial reception. I propose to contextualise and frame this approach by examining the “recycling” of “popular European” cinema into “post-New Hollywood” cinema.

I use the term “recycling” in accordance with its inherently cyclical meaning alongside the transitive verb “recycle,” defined in The Oxford English Dictionary as a way to “reuse (a material) in an industrial process; to return to a previous stage of a cyclic process” (388). My usage of this term connotes the renewal of a (once) new source, specifically the (re)appearance of a product or concept following its original creation; a fluid, postmodern process which, as shall be demonstrated, resonates appropriately with this study’s theoretical framework. In this respect it is more closely aligned with the context and aims of this study than the commonly used terms “remaking” or “remake,”⁸ in that it effectively connotes the movement of authorship from one cultural, cinematic context to another, by the remaking of one filmic text into another.⁹

⁷ My use of the terms “shifting” and “malleable,” and later “fluid” and “transitory,” is intended to convey the movement of film authorship, as a concept, through and between different national cultural contexts, acquiring distinct meanings and connotations as it does.

⁸ See Carolyn A. Durham, Double Takes: Culture and Gender in French Film and Their American Remakes, (Hanover: New England UP, 1998); Jennifer Forrest and Leonard R. Koos, eds. Dead Ringers: The Remake in Theory and Practice (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002); Andrew Horton and Stuart Y. McDougal, eds. Play It Again, Sam: Retakes on Remakes (Berkeley: California UP, 1998); and Lucy Mazdon, Encore Hollywood: Remaking French Cinema (London: BFI Publishing, 2000).

⁹ My use of the term “filmic text” in this thesis is intended to express the remaking of a film by basing it upon the original’s screenplay, or narrative framework. In turn, the use of “filmic text” when used in relation to a remake and its original is intended to assert, rather than deny, the formal differences apparent between the two films, such as language, mise-en-scène and camerawork. It should be noted, however, that the primary focus in this thesis, in terms of differences that reveal themselves between an original and its remake, is not so much aesthetic aspects, as notions of cultural and national identities, as well as authorial approaches.

Within the context and aim of this study, I refer to “popular European” cinema from a somewhat polemical perspective, offered in large part to challenge and displace “sterile, exclusive and ultimately misleading binaries such as art/popular, political/commercial, European/American, national/global” (Eleftheriotis xii). Such an approach problematises the term “popular,” particularly from within a national film context. As Nataša Ćurovićová points out, in relation to a usage of “popular” in film studies that looks beyond traditional genre frameworks toward socio-cultural ones that are recognised as shaping and informing such categorizations:

But why not accept a heuristic use of the category of the popular as a tool for bringing to light new and otherwise invisible sections of cultural terrains? [...] In sum, to the extent that the ‘popular’ remains set up so as to be shadowed by ‘art’ as the charged ‘bad’ complementary (and thus necessary) Other, just as art that is ‘low’ inevitably calls forth its ‘high’ counterbalance, we are distorting at least the European (and possibly some other) national film cultures into the image of the U.S. situation. (7)¹⁰

I employ the expression “popular European” cinema, therefore, in order to acknowledge the emergence during the past decade of scholarly texts that call for a recognition of popular cinema within Europe,¹¹ in opposition to an essentialist tendency in film studies

¹⁰ See also Sue Harper, “Studying Popular Taste: British Historical Films in the 1930s,” Popular European Cinema, eds. Richard Dyer and Ginette Vincendeau (London: Routledge, 1992).

¹¹ For instance, see Dyer and Vincendeau Popular; Dimitris Eleftheriotis, Popular Cinemas of Europe: Studies of Texts, Contexts and Frameworks (New York: Continuum, 2001); and Ginette Vincendeau, “Issues in European Cinema,” The Oxford.

to define European cinema as solely “art cinema.”¹² As these studies make evident, “popular European” cinema exists in its own right as an important component of Europe’s film culture.

Lastly, the term “post-New Hollywood,” which I borrow from John Hill (101), offers a necessary periodic distinction from the still commonly used “New Hollywood” (Neale 1976; Schatz 1993), indicating its further re-conceptualization, both aesthetically and as part of an evolving industrial, inherently studio driven, system.¹³ While “New Hollywood,” most commonly aligned with the breakdown in the 60s and 70s of the “classical” Hollywood studio system (following the advent of television), is a relevant term when framed within an “awareness of the interaction between film and other media and the proliferation of cultural commodities” (Tasker 226-7), “post-New Hollywood” signals the arrival and consolidation of such an awareness, both industrially and aesthetically.

Examining the juncture of film authorship and the national in relation to transnational, cross-cultural cinematic recycling has, to my knowledge, not yet been explored in film studies. Typically, as recent texts have demonstrated,¹⁴ remakes have

¹² This has particularly been the case post-David Bordwell’s “Art Cinema as a Mode of Film Practice,” Film Criticism 4.1 (1979) 56-64, and Steve Neale’s “Art Cinema as Institution,” Screen 22.1 (1981) 11-39; the latter is discussed within this context in the first chapter of this study.

¹³ It’s worth noting that, in relation to the same aesthetic and industrial shift occurring in Hollywood cinema, Thomas Elsaesser offers the term “New New Hollywood,” essentially defining it as a “package deal” production process of “world-wide distribution and marketing strategies, blockbuster exhibition practice, merchandizing, video-release, pay-television,” in “The New New Hollywood: Cinema Beyond Distance and Proximity,” Moving Images, Culture and the Mind, ed. Ib Bondebjerg (Luton: Luton UP, 2000) 188. While such a definition is relevant to, and reflective of, this study’s conceptual framework, Hill’s term is preferable as it effectively illustrates a distinct move beyond, while still retaining a necessary link to, New Hollywood.

¹⁴ See Durham Double Takes; Forrest and Koos Dead Ringers; Horton and McDougal Play It Again; Mazdon Encore Hollywood; and Vincendeau, “Hijacked,” Sight and Sound 3.7 (1993).

received a pejorative treatment in film studies and remain a widely neglected topic in this field, despite offering a privileged point of access for various critical and theoretical crossovers, such as those of authorship and the national. Although the practice of recycling cinema is generally dismissed as “the issue – the ‘scandal’ – of Hollywood remakes of European films” (Vincendeau 1993: 23), which in turn is commonly referenced as part of the wider Hollywood vs. Art cinema debate, it is in fact almost as old as cinema itself, occurring *within* the Hollywood system just as much if not more than beyond it (as an instance of transnational, cross-cultural exchange).¹⁵

This study is concerned with the recycling of cinema in its cross-cultural context, which has recently experienced a resurgence in critical interest given Hollywood’s prolific reproduction of European films since the 1980s.¹⁶ It has gradually been garnering attention as a practice that cannot be reduced exclusively to one of commercial gain at the expense of artistic loss. Ginette Vincendeau argues,

Reviewers usually note that these films [...] are based on European (most often French) titles, and then content themselves with pointing out that they are inferior to the originals. But remakes are interesting beyond this well-rehearsed dichotomy of Hollywood commerce versus European art [...] Remakes also throw into relief the notion of national identity in

¹⁵ See Horton and McDougal Play It Again; and Forrest and Koos Dead Ringers, for analyses of the remake process as it occurs within and outside of the Hollywood system. Worth particular note in the former is Andrew Horton’s “Cinematic Makeovers and Cultural Border Crossings: Kusturica’s *Time of the Gypsies* and Coppola’s *Godfather* and *Godfather II*,” which considers this process from the unusual perspective of a Hollywood film being remade in a “non-English-speaking, third world country” (172).

¹⁶ Again, see Durham Double Takes; Forrest and Koos Dead Ringers; Horton and McDougal Play It Again; Mazdon Encore Hollywood; and Vincendeau “Hijacked.”

cinema. What constitutes a story, how stars are framed and how gender is constructed all undergo considerable change as they cross the Atlantic — despite a seeming similarity of plot. (1993: 23)

I would add that remakes also “throw into relief” the notion of authorship in cinema, and it is this premise that shall remain central to this study’s purpose. Lucy Mazdon, offering a similar perspective as Vincendeau to the practice of cross-cultural cinematic recycling, as one of the “potentially fascinating areas of research [...] invariably ignored” (1), presents a combined textual and socio-cultural, historical conceptualization of this practice, specifically with regards to French cinema being remade by Hollywood. Positing the “wider process of cross-cultural interaction and exchange” (2) made possible with the analysis of an original text and its duplicate, Mazdon’s approach will prove an important and relevant sounding board for this study.

The first two chapters of this study shall establish a socio-cultural theoretical framework from which its core concerns will emerge, while the third and final chapter shall incorporate this framework into the analysis of a specific case study. In the first chapter, I will consider notions of the national vis-à-vis the emergence of transnational (re)conceptualizations at the global/local interface,¹⁷ specifically those relating to the concept of (trans)national cinema. Placing my discussion within the context of popular European and post-New Hollywood cinemas, I shall argue that these two cinemas reveal

¹⁷ I use the term “global/local interface” as it is defined in Rob Wilson and Wimal Dissanayake, eds. Global/Local: Cultural Production and the Transnational Imaginary (Durham: Duke UP, 1996), with regards to “a new world-space of cultural production and national representation which is simultaneously becoming more *globalized* (unified around dynamics of capital logic moving across borders) and more *localized* (fragmented into contestatory enclaves of difference, coalition, and resistance) in everyday texture and composition” (1). See also Dick Hebdige, “Subjects in Space,” New Formations 11 (1990) v-x. For a

local (national, cultural) specificities that are foregrounded by transcultural processes of hybridization and difference when recycled from one into another. The terms “cultural specificity,” “cultural difference” and “transcultural hybridization” will be defined and addressed in this chapter, offering a necessary segue into the theoretical framework presented in the second chapter.

The concept of authorship, in particular its postmodern (re)emergence at the global/local interface, shall be explored in the second chapter. For instance, I will investigate how the auteur, in undergoing a conceptual re-birth, has been placed alongside postmodern assessments of what is essentially non-individualist, authorless authorship. I shall present the notion of postmodern auteurism as a two-tiered construct that is split yet bound by its “traditional” and “popular” forms, both of which shall be defined and addressed in this chapter. The idea of authorship as an intersubjective strategy, capable of undergoing its own conceptual transition via the process of cross-cultural cinematic recycling, in this case from popular European cinema into post-New Hollywood cinema, will also be explored. The following theoretical equation, an important precursor to the analysis presented in the final chapter, shall then be addressed: same filmic text + different authorial mode = conceptual, cultural and cinematic difference.

The third chapter will present a case study analysis, informed by the socio-cultural theoretical framework presented in the preceding chapters. A primary aim in presenting this case study shall be to demonstrate that transnational, cross-cultural cinematic recycling can provide a privileged point of access to the interpretation and use

discussion of the global/local interface that offers particular relevance to this study, see Marsha Kinder, *Blood Cinema: The Reconstruction of National Identity in Spain* (Berkeley: California UP, 1993) 388-440.

of categories, such as film authorship and national cinema, and their specific socio-cultural historical contextualisations. The analysis shall discuss Alejandro Amenábar's *Abre los ojos* (*Open Your Eyes*, 1997, Spain/France/Italy) and Cameron Crowe's *Vanilla Sky* (2001, USA), two contemporary, postmodern films and filmmakers that offer a pertinent instance of the remake process. It should be noted, that the canon of original films and their remakes that has emerged, for the most part during the past two decades, allows for an array of cases to be studied, on an equally wide range of issues (formal aspects, gender, star discourses and industry practices). In this instance, it is intended that the selection of Amenábar's *Abre los ojos* and Crowe's *Vanilla Sky*, as only one case study out of an impressive list of candidates (see Appendix A), offers itself as a discussion point that demonstrates the potential for further specific cases studies of the remake phenomenon.

While Amenábar emerges as an integral part of contemporary Spanish cinema's global/local resurgence and its tendency to debunk traditional notions of European auteurism by merging them with popular cinema, Crowe promotes an American cultural specificity that displaces claims to post-New Hollywood cinema's exclusively global status. In this respect the authorial modes of Amenábar and Crowe, through the recycling of *Abre los ojos* into *Vanilla Sky*, will be conceptualised as simultaneously demarcated and aligned, encouraging a consideration of the way in which film authorship, as a form of intersubjective agency and reception, is re-shaped and re-addressed by its transition from popular European to post-New Hollywood cinemas. Additionally, this case study offers an open affiliation between both filmmakers that uniquely, if not unprecedentedly,

positions the creative, cultural exchange that can result from the remake process in a positive, as opposed to pejorative, way.

In the concluding stages of this study I expect to have demonstrated that cross-cultural cinematic recycling is a valid point of research from which to consider contemporary transnational film discourse and practices, despite a theoretical and critical tendency to dismiss the remake phenomenon as a practice that personifies Hollywood's attempt to assert commercialism at the expense of artistic credibility. I aim to have offered the notion of authorship as an inherently fluid concept (thus arguing for its continual and changing theoretical, critical relevance to film studies); capable, in this respect, of shaping and guiding (just as much as it is shaped and guided by) notions of the national and the global, which in many ways operate as "two sides of the same coin" (Hjort and MacKenzie 2).

A point that becomes highlighted by the above outline is this study's intention to challenge traditionally dichotomous conceptions of "high" and "low" cultural formations, and in doing so provoke their re-thinking. In his Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste, Pierre Bourdieu discusses the concept of taste and cultural capital, the latter being the notion that taste distinctions are marked by one's access to culture in the same way that class distinctions are marked by one's access to economic capital. Bourdieu offers three variants of taste: legitimate (elite), middle-brow and popular. Consequently, one's cultural capital correlates to a particular taste variant, although that correlation is not exclusive and can involve a certain level of what could be considered cultural capital exchange. For instance, as part of her discussion on the provocatively

postmodern filmmaker Luc Besson, Susan Hayward contextualises Bourdieu's argument in relation to film:

Because different sections of society have different competences and dispositions they will consume cultural forms in different ways [...] [Therefore] certain groups will have the cultural competence/baggage to understand and appreciate a futurist sci-fi film (such as *Blade Runner*), others a heritage film (such as *Sense and Sensibility*), others still a European art film (such as Kieslowski's trilogy, *Bleu, Blanc, Rouge*). Some groups may well be able to make sense of all three types of film which could be described as popular, middlebrow and elite. (1998: 68)

Significantly, Bourdieu's concept of taste formations reveals its own self-serving paradox in that, as Hayward explains, "you cannot have a concept of high art without having also a concept of low art (which you then reject as lacking)" (68). In other words, purveyors of legitimate taste define themselves by their rejection of popular taste. Inversely, however, purveyors of popular taste define themselves by "a refusal of that refusal" (68), capable of appreciating legitimate culture but rejecting the need to do so in order to actively participate in a culture rather than observe it from a critical distance. In this respect popular taste aims to break down culturally legitimate ("high") and non-legitimate ("low") distinctions, into multiple channels of cultural exchange and accessibility that promote their interaction and co-existence.

There is a tendency in film discourse to establish legitimate (“high”) areas of study while eschewing their popular (“low”) counterparts. This tendency reveals itself, for instance, in the following binary oppositions commonly used in film studies, which are of specific relevance to this study: art/commerce, national/global(Hollywood), European/American.¹⁸ These oppositions suggest a Bourdieu-type legitimization of “highbrow interest in lowbrow culture” (Elsaesser 1975: 200)¹⁹ that has, by an insistence upon the above distinctions, fuelled postmodern conceptualizations of the popular within film studies. What has resulted from this recognition of the popular is a recent shift in critical and theoretical attention toward previously dismissed areas of film, such as popular forms of cinema,²⁰ rescued from “critical neglect on the grounds that their success suggests and their internal structure confirms the closeness of their issues and images to the concerns of their audience” (Perkins 199).²¹

The aim of this study is to demonstrate the significance of notions of the national and authorship in contemporary film studies, via a correspondence with the concerns of

¹⁸ For a particularly insightful discussion of this tendency, see Nataša Ćurovićová, “Some Thoughts at an Intersection of the Popular and the National,” *The Velvet Light Trap* 34 (1994) 3-9. For an even more recent indication of this tendency, see Eleftheriotis *Popular Cinemas*.

¹⁹ The context for Elsaesser’s point is the emergence of *Cahiers du Cinéma* in post-WWII France. Equally relevant here is the question he poses, “what does the enthusiasm for Hollywood tell us about intellectual or scholarly interest in popular culture, and particularly American culture?” See Elsaesser, “Two Decades in Another Country: *Hollywood and the Cinéphiles*,” *Superculture: American Popular Culture and Europe*, ed. C.W.E. Bigsby (Bowling Green: Bowling Green University Popular Press, 1975) 200.

²⁰ On a general level, for example, see Joanne Hollows and Mark Jancovich, “Introduction: Popular film and cultural distinctions,” eds. Hollows and Jancovich, *Approaches to Popular Film* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1995). Specifically regarding popular European cinema, see Dyer and Vincendeau *Popular*; with regards to post-New Hollywood cinema, see Jim Collins, Hilary Radner, and Ava Preacher-Collins, eds. *Film Theory Goes to the Movies* (New York: Routledge, 1993). Additionally, for a useful discussion on possible definitions of “popular” in relation to film, see Colin MacCabe, *The Eloquence of the Vulgar: Language, Cinema and the Politics of Culture* (London: BFI Publishing, 1999) 74.

²¹ Perkins offers an interesting word of caution against launching blindfolded into this kind of revisionist approach, arguing that while there is value in readdressing filmic texts that have previously been treated

popular cultural studies that inevitably emerge when these notions are considered within the context of the remake phenomenon. It is the intention of this study to present the argument that, as a cultural product that threatens to destabilise the artistic credibility of an original source by remaking it within a different socio-cultural and cinematic context, post-New Hollywood remakes of popular European cinema position themselves at the core of oppositional binaries such as art/commerce, national/global(Hollywood), European/American, and in doing so have the potential to dismantle and challenge any acceptance of what are inherently problematic paradigms. By framing my approach around the significance of concepts of authorship and national cinema to cross-cultural cinematic recycling I hope to illustrate the importance of this practice to film theory and discourse, as one that must necessarily be considered beyond the critical and theoretical limitations of artistic credibility and commercial viability.

pejoratively purely on an anti-populist basis, it's important to do so without "attempting to redeem the work by giving it undue credit for being what it must always be, a product of its time" (203).

1. THE (TRANS)NATIONAL AND CROSS-CULTURAL CINEMATIC RECYCLING

The National

A discussion of national cinema and the theoretical treatment that this category has received in film studies is fundamental for a study on transnational film practices. This chapter shall begin by establishing why the notion of national cinema has gained such prominence in film discourse. This will serve as a necessary pretext for this study's conceptual framework, placed within the context of popular European and post-New Hollywood cinemas and situated at the interface of global/local thinking. In recent years the issue of national cinema and terms such as "national identity," "nationalism" and "nation" have come under close scrutiny and re-evaluation in film studies.²² To a great extent this attention coincides with similar preoccupations in other disciplines, most notably for the purposes of this study, those of anthropology, sociology and cultural studies. Before proceeding to the relevance of these discursive developments on the national to this study, however, an overview of this subject as it pertains to film studies is in order.

Discussions of the national in film studies have been heavily influenced by Benedict Anderson's Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of

²² For instance, see Crofts "Concepts"; "Reconceptualizing"; Higson, "The Concept"; "National Cinema(s), International Markets and Cross-cultural Identities," Moving Images, Culture and the Mind, ed. Ib Bondebjerg (Luton: Luton UP, 2000); Mette Hjort and Scott MacKenzie, eds. Cinema and Nation (London: Routledge, 2000); and Willemen "The National."

Nationalism.²³ Anderson's concept, developed within a modernist framework aligned with that of Ernest Gellner,²⁴ focuses on the metaphorical idea that national identity exists as part of an "imagined community." Essentially, Anderson perceives the nation as a cultural construct, one that expresses a communal sense of nationhood that enables the recognition of its creation by both real and "imagined" means. Subsequently, Anderson's theory has been appropriated within film studies as one that rejects national cultural homogeneity by encouraging cultural hybridity. Considering the national as an "imagined community" has proven a productive step towards the conceptualization of national cinema, an area that nevertheless remains the subject of much contention and interest and about which, it seems, "there is not a single universally accepted discourse" (Higson 1989: 36).

In "The Concept of National Cinema," Andrew Higson sets out to determine what processes are involved in formulating a cinema as "national." Under what conditions do ideas of "nationhood" and "national identity" emerge? Adverse to usage of the term "national cinema" as solely categorizing, Higson is interested in exploring its discursive implications alongside theoretically contextualised notions of "film industry, film culture" in relation to ideas of agency and reception (36). Contextualising Anderson's theory as a springboard for "establishing or identifying the imaginary coherence, the specificity, of a national cinema" (38), Higson draws upon the notion of the national as

²³ For example, see Crofts "Reconceptualizing," 49-67; Wimal Dissanayake, "Issues in World Cinema," The Oxford; Higson "The Concept," 36-46; Hjort and MacKenzie Cinema and; and Duncan Petrie, ed. Screening Europe: Image and Identity in Contemporary European Cinema (London: BFI Publishing, 1992).

²⁴ In brief, Gellner's view is that ethnic-national traditions are largely fabricated in order to contribute to the establishment of the modern nation-state. In other words, they are the imaginary construct that emanates from nationalism, which in turn is an effect of industrialism ("industrial social organization"). See Vincent P. Pecora, ed. Nations and Identities (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2001) 292-308.

an “imagined community” to discuss two considerations of the idea of national cinema. Firstly, while the term “national cinema” serves to reinforce the aforementioned resistance to Hollywood and its inherently populist ideology, it creates a double bind that thrusts essentialism and marginalisation upon cinemas categorised as “national.” Secondly, Higson argues that “national cinema” becomes a euphemism with which to strengthen and endorse a nation state’s cultural, economic, and at times political, status. In effect, however, the first consideration of this term can act to re-conceptualize the second, by creating an “*inward-looking*” way of building nationhood (38-42).²⁵

Higson therefore makes the point, which is an important one for this study, that constructs of the national need to be placed within their respective socio-historical context, enabling a recognition of their inherently fluid and changing status. He calls for the need to “pay attention to historical shifts in the construction of nationhood and national identity: nationhood is always an image constructed under particular conditions” (44). Significantly, Higson has recently re-addressed notions of the national as a theoretical and critical construct, to the point that he questions the very validity and viability of framing and viewing cinemas as nation-based, as shall be discussed later in this chapter.

The Global/Local Interface

Various approaches in film studies have taken up where Higson’s left off, primarily with the aim of dismantling problematic terms and assumptions that have

²⁵ For example, a “Britishness” in films can be expressed separately from, but also alongside a distinctly Hollywood influence, thus working together to inform a “national cinema” of Britain (42).

surfaced within the concept of national cinema.²⁶ What has emerged from this re-thinking is the debunking of an essentially modernist theoretical paradigm, which has undergone its own postmodern re-assessment. A text that situates itself at the gateway of this shift toward (trans)national, cultural modes of agency and reception in relation to national cinema is Hjort and MacKenzie's *Cinema and Nation* (2000).²⁷ This volume's primary focus is the identification and exploration of viewpoints that "mediate successfully between macrosociological and agential levels of description," in an attempt to cross "disciplinary boundaries and methodological divides" (5). Offering the conjunction of both modern and postmodern views as they pertain to "cinema" and "nation," the viewpoints covered are those that have emerged in film, sociological, philosophical, and cultural studies over the past few decades (1-5).

Hjort and MacKenzie comment that, "in many ways the premise underwriting *Cinema and Nation*" is the "matter of mobilising" Anderson's modernist claim of "imagined communities," given its wide deployment within film studies, by encouraging an awareness of "competing accounts" within what is otherwise "the most limited corpus of relevant theoretical texts" (2). As a result, *Cinema and Nation* is a study that offers the confluence of notions of film and the national within an array of discourses. In this respect Hjort and MacKenzie's anthology is relevant to this study's focus on recent critical and theoretical shifts that contribute to an acknowledgement of the significance of cross-cultural cinematic recycling, to concepts of national and transnational cinema.

²⁶ For instance, see Crofts "Concepts"; "Reconceptualizing"; Dissanayake "Issues"; Ľ urovičová "Some Thoughts"; and Willemsen "The National."

²⁷ As Hjort and MacKenzie note, there are distinct and opposing views regarding this conceptual shift in direction. On the one hand, that "globalisation and postnationality are salient features of the modern landscapes of artistic production," and on the other hand, the contestation that "nation-states are being rapidly undermined" (1).

Returning, for a moment, to Higson and his recently re-articulated position regarding national cinema, he identifies four developments in film studies that have influenced contemporary global/local discourses on “national cinemas and cultural identities” (2000b: 205). Firstly, Higson recognises a tendency toward an “archive-based revisionist film history,” as well as, secondly, toward textually-oriented approaches, most notably those related to “local and global contexts of production, distribution, promotion, and reception” (205). The third point of identification for Higson is the implementation of post-colonial and postmodern discourses that challenge “essentialist concepts” of the national and cultural identity and call for a recognition of hybridised, “unstable formations.” Lastly, he refers to a querying of the “value of evaluative criticism,” with regards to the establishment of a canon of films within a particular nation-state as a way of evaluating and defining its national cinema (205).

Higson’s position, which reinforces his earlier one by insisting on situating films within and outside of their national context, validates Hjort and MacKenzie’s exploration of the emergence of newly adopted terms, such as “hybridity,” “transnationalism” and “globalisation” (1). The acknowledgement and usage of such terms indicates a clear shift towards postmodern *re*-conceptualizations of *post*-national discourse, which in turn enables the distinction between universalising and non-universalising tendencies; the former resisting, while the latter embracing, these terms’ ability to assert difference and resistance. In this respect, both Higson’s and Hjort and MacKenzie’s approaches are a welcome departure point for my own exploration of these terms, particularly in terms of how they are placed within a postmodern framework, alongside transnational, cross-cultural cinematic recycling.

At this point it is worth considering the role a postmodern framework plays within this study's theoretical agenda. A useful way of considering "postmodern" in this instance is along the same lines as Caughie's suggestion that, with regards to the term "postcolonial," the prefix "post" is "actually about how that colonialism is being renegotiated" (quoted in Petrie 55). This allows for the possibility of a degree of seepage between modernist and postmodern formations that adequately reflects the transitional nature of contemporary cultures and geographic (dis)placement that occurs within postmodern contexts.²⁸ Interpreting the postmodern in this way is extremely useful with regards to the concept of transnational processes such as cross-cultural cinematic recycling, in that these processes are grounded in postmodern discourse yet remain formed and informed by their modernist theoretical heritage.

In other words, the global and local operate as separate constructs aligned by their postmodern and modernist "imaginings," when framed within a post-national, *transnational*, discourse. Rob Wilson and Wimal Dissanayake suggest (re-asserting Anderson's aforementioned "modernist" position) that there is a "synergy" within the global/local that emerges as the "*transnational imaginary*" (2). They frame the "transnational imaginary" in relation to "imagined communities of modernity" being "reshaped at the macropolitical (global) and micropolitical (cultural) levels of everyday existence" (6). In this respect, despite film undergoing considerable conceptual scrutiny

²⁸ For more on this subject, see Anders Stephanson, "Regarding Postmodernism: A Conversation with Fredric Jameson," *Universal Abandon? The Politics of Postmodernism*, ed. Andrew Ross (Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 1988). For an example of this point in relation to film, and of particular contextual relevance to this study, see Rosanna Maule, "Juanma Bajo Ulloa's *Airbag* and the Politics of Spanish Regional Authorship," *Post Script* 21.2 (2002) 72.

when removed from the security of its national context,²⁹ this displacement has also proven an extremely rich and resilient framework for locating an alignment of postmodern (global) and modernist (local) “imaginings.”

Wilson and Dissanayake argue that film remains “the crucial genre of transnational production and global circulation for refigured narratives, [and] offers speculative ground for the transnational imaginary and its contention within national and local communities” (11). When placed within the context of transnational, cross-cultural cinematic recycling, their point serves to illustrate that the remake process provides fertile ground for the consideration of a “transnational imaginary” as expressed through “refigured narratives.” In Mazdon’s words:

Indeed it is one of the central paradoxes of the remake that while demonstrating the *transnationalism* that lies at the heart of cinematic production it is also mobilised to reinforce the *national* identities which continue to dominate so much discussion of film and film industries. (67)

A cross-culturally recycled film inherently demonstrates that the national and transnational exist separately but remain interconnected; they are stable yet transitory.

Popular European and Post-New Hollywood Cinemas

²⁹ For instance, Ľurovičová notes that cinema may be “among the chief reasons” (3) that national cultures currently find themselves in a state of crisis, given that the “sound film phenomenon offers perhaps the most complex faultline of any cultural product which would allow us to follow the shift from the nationally grounded earlier stage (‘market’) to its transnationally grounded present stage (‘consumer’)” (8n. 1).

Given that the notion of cross-cultural cinematic recycling is here contextualised alongside popular European and post-New Hollywood cinemas, it is necessary to consider their meaning within the framework of the national and transnational. Of central concern at this point is the need, as discussed earlier, to dismantle the presently exhausted Hollywood-as-(blockbuster)global/European-as-(artistic)national binary opposition, by “expanding the object of study and by challenging the geographical limits imposed on it” (Eleftheriotis 33). In breaking down this opposition, the serious undertaking of a discourse of popular European and post-New Hollywood cinemas is encouraged by “placing the films in a wider cultural context and by defining this context as fundamentally trans-cultural and trans-national” (33).

The study of cross-cultural cinematic recycling is one way of facilitating the collapse of current binary oppositions in film studies, as it is endowed with an insistence that the national “must be understood as a confluence rather than an essence, and understood in the context of the long-standing internationalism of cinema and the global scale of its markets” (Higson 2000b: 206). The remake, when contextualised as a transnational process, contributes to the dissolution of Hollywood/national, popular/art dichotomies by placing an emphasis on the study “of a national *film culture* rather than the study of a national *cinema*” (Eleftheriotis 33). In turn, this prompts the question of how popular European and post-New Hollywood cinemas, as film cultures, are framed in relation to the global/local interface, specifically with regards to transnational, cross-cultural cinematic recycling.

European Cultural Identity and Popular European Cinema

When contextualised within the post-World War II reconstruction years of the 1950s and 60s, European cinema is primarily defined with the premise that “state support became firmly linked to the promotion and development of national Art Cinemas [...] under the pressure of the presence of America and Hollywood in Europe” (Neale 1981: 30). Although it was by no means the first instance of using cinema as a form of European nation-building,³⁰ this period’s emphasis upon national cultural policy has since become a common reference point for the emergence of the aforementioned binary oppositions in film studies.

European cinema has since tended “either to be reduced to the work of a few auteurs, under the concept of ‘European art cinema,’ or to be split between studies of national cinema, movements, and individual filmmakers” (Vincendeau 1998: 440). Such tendencies position art cinema as a pre-eminent, and ultimately essentialising, construct of European cinema.³¹ The result has been an unfortunate theoretical chasm within film studies, between Europe’s widely recognised “national Art Cinemas” and its lesser regarded popular European cinema. This has proven the case despite the two cinemas’ long-time co-existence, however precarious. Vincendeau notes,

³⁰ See, for example, Higson “National Cinema(s)”; Higson discusses attempts to establish a pan-European cinema during the late 20s and early 30s, commenting that, “‘Film Europe’ set itself the task of adhering to a market-driven logic of profit-maximisation on an international scale [...] At the same time, it promoted its commodities, the international films which it produced, as culturally distinctive, ‘deeply rooted in the national soil,’ in order to appease national critics and appeal to local sensibilities” (208-211). See also Victoria de Grazia, “European cinema and the idea of Europe, 1925-95,” Hollywood and Europe: Economics, Culture, National Identity: 1945-95, eds. Geoffrey Nowell-Smith and Steven Ricci (London: BFI Publishing, 1998).

[...] the essence of European cinema has been defined as residing in works that are, to various degrees, aesthetically innovative, socially committed, and humanist in outlook [...] fundamentally different from the industrially based and generically coded Hollywood. (1998: 440)

Significantly, however, Vincendeau then challenges this definition by pointing out that “genre and stardom, the twin foundations of popular cinema, have always existed in European cinema” but they operate “in an unsystematic way compared to Hollywood,” indicative of a European tendency to produce “national inflexions to universal genres,” specifically that of comedy, melodrama, horror and musicals (445). Any reliance solely upon a European-model art cinema, therefore, asserts and promotes a misguided formulation of European cinema at the expense of its necessary *reformulation*; one that encompasses both its artistic and populist models. Additionally, this reliance proves problematic when re-conceptualizing European national cultural identity alongside transnational film practices such as cross-cultural cinematic recycling.

A possible way out of this impasse is the notion of a pan-European identity, a continental identity within which several national identities are located at the interface of localisation and globalisation, modernism and postmodernism. The recognition of a pan-European identity encourages a “re-imagining” of Europe and Europeanness, “in the face

³¹ My use of the term “cinema” within its European context is collective and hereinafter should be seen to encompass the various national cinema that exist within European cinema. For more on this point, see p.26 of this study.

of historical change” (Petrie 48).³² In Screening Europe: Image and Identity in Contemporary European Cinema, Ien Ang claims,

[...] [the] forging of a new, pan-European identity suited to the economic and political necessities of the twenty-first century [...] is invested with considerable desire in official European culture today. However, it is clear that such a project is bound to be contradictory and full of conflicts [...] In a time when the ruthless, levelling force of global capitalism is spawning to an ever more encompassing extent the establishment of a global *cultural* order, the politics of cultural identity, construed as the foregrounding and promotion of particular, local-bound senses of cultural distinctiveness and difference, has gained an unprecedented relevance and urgency all over the world. (22-23)

A European “re-imagining” has been slowly gaining prominence, in part due to global/local tensions and pressures (as the above citation from Ang suggests), and in part due to what Victoria de Grazia refers to as a prevalence in recent years of “Euro-pessimism accompanied by denunciations of Eurocrats, together with a championing of a European cultural space – more specifically a Euro-audiovisual area and a Euro-cinema” (19). De Grazia poses a series of pertinent questions in relation to this shift on notions of

³² In “Framing National Cinemas,” Cinema and, Susan Hayward offers a re-alignment of Anderson’s “imagined communities” that is similar to the one being suggested here, positing nations as historically, traditionally constructed communities under the guise of nationalism that can, however, be re-constructed, re-imagined and in turn, avoid the networks of power and knowledge that have dominated their previous appropriations (88-102).

“Europe” and “European cinema.”³³ Her attempt to address these questions details the “slippage between nationalism and Europeanism” (21), revealing a convergence of nationalist identity in order to “uphold large-scale sectoral interests, reinforce ethnic and national solidarity, and curtail cultural diversity,” and European identity, in order to reconcile “local interests with national and transnational ones in pursuit of common strategies” (21).

The framing of a “European cultural space,” at the intersection of localization and globalization, of “nationalism and Europeanism,” signals a re-formulation of the idea of “European” cinema. Indicative of a larger pan-European identity, one that encompasses both art and the popular, European cinema reveals itself as a “varied and heterogeneous” collective of nations, of cinemas (Ľ urovièová 4). One way of positioning this re-conceptualization, for instance, is to consider European cinema as one that embodies its own genre of traditional cinematic conventions and characteristics, within which European “national” cinemas emerge, be it as popular, art or socio- political realist films.³⁴ Such a re-thinking allows for the recognition of a truly transnational European cinema and cinematic culture, nationally and culturally demarcated yet simultaneously defined by its pan-Europeanness. In other words, as Duncan Petrie puts it, the recognition of an “interplay between the local and the international,” an exchange that

³³ Those of particular relevance to this study are, to paraphrase de Grazia: What constitutes “European cinema?” If a “European cinema” can be determined, is American Hollywood cinema automatically posited as its Other? How is “European cinema” posited alongside notions of “national cinema,” as well as those of artistic or commercial output? What characteristics define films as “European?” (20). See also Mike Wayne, The Politics of Contemporary European Cinema: Histories, Borders, Diasporas (Bristol: Intellect Books, 2002) 1-32, 73-92.

³⁴ In addition to Ľ urovièová, see Dyer and Vincendeau Popular; Eleftheriotis Popular Cinemas; Jill Forbes and Sarah Street, eds. European Cinema: An Introduction (Hampshire: Palgrave, 2000); Neale “Art”; Petrie Screening; Vincendeau “Issues”; and Wayne The Politics.

represents “the reconstitution of Europe, beyond national boundaries, as a map of regional subcultures” (82).

Perhaps even more importantly, a re-assessment of European cinema offers a possible way out of the theoretical and critical impasse its popular form continually finds itself in, on the one hand having “consistently failed to meet the ‘cultural’ qualifications required to achieve the status of ‘national culture’,” and on the other hand never having the industrial, economic, political support to compete with Hollywood (Maltby 105). In undertaking to demonstrate a way out of this impasse by making “the popular in European cinema visible beyond national boundaries” (1), Dyer and Vincendeau offer an approach to European cinema that encourages the necessary recognition of its pan-European identity.³⁵ While acknowledging that “‘Europe’, like the ‘popular’, is both a self-evident term and almost impossible to define,” they argue that the notion of whether there is a “European culture which is more than the sum of the cultures of its nation states” is fundamental when considering the “specificities of the situation within which cultural production takes place in Europe” (5). Dimitris Eleftheriotis, identifying Dyer and Vincendeau’s attempt to establish “the legitimization of popular European cinema as an object of study and research” (xiv), similarly suggests that “Europe” remains a “slippery term,” encyclopaedically and geographically defined, yet conceptually elusive within film studies discourse.

As both Dyer and Vincendeau’s and Eleftheriotis’ contributions toward a discourse on popular European films demonstrate, it is in this subject of study that the

³⁵ It’s important to recognise the distinction I make here, between a collective yet diversified European cinema and its pan-European cultural identity. While the latter adequately conveys the existence of a contemporary “European cultural space,” the same claim cannot be made of a “pan-European popular

juncture of unification and diversity can be located, revealing expressions and representations of a collective “Europeanness.”³⁶ What becomes apparent, therefore, is the validity in re-assessing both European cinema and national cultural identity with the (long overdue) recognition of popular European films. The study of transnational, cross-cultural cinematic recycling is a resourceful and privileged way to realise this need, as shall be demonstrated later in this chapter. Prior to this, it is necessary to consider how American cinema and national cultural identity, at the site of the global/local interface, is posited in relation to post-New Hollywood cinema.

American Cultural Identity and Post-New Hollywood Cinema

In contrast to its trans-Atlantic counterpart, post-New Hollywood cinema is defined less against a cinematic heritage of national policy that reinforces cultural specificity than by its globally hegemonic status. There are two points, distinct yet interconnected, of relevance here: firstly, post-New Hollywood’s status as “global,” one which invariably and mistakenly excludes it from the conceptual framework of national cinema, and secondly the use of the term “Americanisation,” which is slowly gaining

cinema,” primarily due to such interventions as language difference and Hollywood familiarity (Dyer and Vincendeau 8-10). See also Wayne The Politics (73-92).

³⁶ For detailed analyses and/or discussions of popular European films that demonstrate this point, see Tim Bergfelder, “The Nation Vanishes: European Co-Production and Popular Genre Formulae in the 1950s and 1960s,” Cinema and; Dyer and Vincendeau Popular; Eleftheriotis Popular Cinemas; Forbes and Street European.

wider use in film discourse, particularly with regards to Hollywood and the remake process.³⁷

Despite various changes and doomsday predictions that have accompanied its long existence, the studio-based industry that is Hollywood has remained relatively stable and constant (Hillier 1992: 18).³⁸ Nevertheless, there has been a defined shift within the last couple of decades toward what I refer to as post-New Hollywood cinema, wherein vertical integration of production, distribution and exhibition has given way to a multi-media super-highway of cross-promotional, package-driven product. As Jim Hillier comments,

Under the studio system, the majors made movies, they controlled their distribution to and exhibition in theatres, and that was most of what they did. Today, these activities are only one element, even if arguably a pre-eminent one, in integrated media empires that also include television production and syndicated companies, cable distribution networks, home video distribution, record companies, book and magazine publishing, theme parks, and much else. (1992: 23)

³⁷ On a broader level, for instance, see Douglas Kellner, "Hollywood Film and Society," American Cinema and Hollywood: Critical Approaches, eds. John Hill and Pamela Church Gibson (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000); and Richard Maltby, "'D' for Disgusting: American Culture and English Criticism," Hollywood and Europe. Specifically in relation to Hollywood and the remake process, see Durham Double Takes; Forrest and Koos Dead Ringers; and Mazdon Encore Hollywood.

³⁸ See Thomas Schatz, "The New Hollywood," Film Theory; Schatz makes a similar point, that contrary to claims of Hollywood's post-classical "death" the major studio companies survived, as did feature film, albeit not without various transitions taking place which led to the use, however widely defined, of the term New Hollywood. For a more recent appraisal of this point, see Elsaesser "The New," as well as "The

In other words, while the marketplace has proven that there remains space for American “indie” and alternative cinema, “blockbuster hits are, for better or worse, what the New Hollywood is about,” representative of the “global multimedia marketplace at large” (Schatz 1993: 10-11).

Perhaps inevitably, therefore, this pronounced commercial shift has only served to strengthen the widely-held critical and theoretical opinion that Hollywood “sets the agenda and creates the model for movies” (Hillier 1992: 27), asserting its status as “global” rather than “national.” The strategically multi-faceted, commodified and corporatised approach that personifies post-New Hollywood cinema is part of a defined business agenda that has always been integral to the industrial, economic foundations of Hollywood. In sticking to this inherently capitalist formula, personified by “very cautious, very conservative, very expensive film-making” (17), contemporary studios have demonstrated that now more than ever before, film production, distribution and exhibition are part of a highly profitable synergistic enterprise that remains globally defined by the Hollywood brand.³⁹

However, given that American entertainment has “become the second largest American export category (after military hardware), and the studios are organised to promote and expand their activity both at home and abroad” (23),⁴⁰ post-New Hollywood

Blockbuster: Everything Connects, but Not Everything Goes,” The End of Cinema As We Know It: American Film in the Nineties, ed. Jon Lewis (New York: New York UP, 2001).

³⁹ With regards to synergy and its implementation in New Hollywood and post-New Hollywood filmmaking, see Hillier, The New Hollywood, (New York: Continuum, 1992) 27; Schatz “The New,” 25-32; and Elsaesser “The Blockbuster.” In Encore Hollywood, Mazdon discusses this shift having led to a situation wherein “major Hollywood productions [...] can no longer be reduced to cinema alone” and instead are “diverse cultural commodities” (22).

⁴⁰ See Durham Double Takes, for an updated version of this claim: “In the United States, cultural ‘commodities’ have become the most lucrative export after aerospace technology” (7). The point, however,

cinema has experienced a severe theoretical and critical backlash within the territories it has permeated, amongst which Europe is at the forefront.⁴¹ The result has tended to be a leaning toward the dismissal of Hollywood's legitimacy alongside concepts of national cinema.⁴² Both Higson (as discussed above) and Crofts (1993; 1998b) warn against such a tendency⁴³ and have instead established important conceptual and discursive workings of national cinema and Hollywood.

Crofts, like Higson, argues for a reassessment of preconceived uses of the term "national cinema," notably its widespread use as a categorizing device, in order to illustrate that its re-conceptualization can only occur alongside and in relation to a recognition of other key proponents, such as the production, distribution and reception of films within nation states. The assertion of culturally and nationally specific discourses in place of imperialist interpretations and declarations often appearing under the guise of the "self/other model" (1993: 63) is of fundamental importance when historicizing or theorizing these proponents in relation to definitions of "national cinema." This is particularly the case, Crofts claims, given the "various possibilities of cross-cultural reception" that can result in skewed foreign constructions of national images within other nations (59-60) – a point that rings especially true when considering the remake process.

is to indicate the high level of importance with which Hollywood as an exported American product is regarded.

⁴¹ As Hillier points out, "American entertainment (and American-style entertainment) is dominant in large parts of the world. Japan and Europe are the most lucrative markets for American movies" (*The New* 24). See also Angus Finney, *The State of European Cinema: A New Dose of Reality* (London: Cassel, 1996); Nowell-Smith and Ricci *Hollywood and Europe*; Petrie *Screening*; and Wayne *The Politics*.

⁴² See, for example, Charlie Keil, "'American' Cinema in the 1990s and Beyond: Whose Country's Filmmaking Is It Anyway?" *The End*.

⁴³ As does Hayward, opposed to any framing of the term "national cinema" in opposition to the dominance of Hollywood, arguing that this results in a reduction of the idea of a national cinema "to economies of

What becomes apparent in both Higson and Crofts' approaches to discourses of the national within the context of film studies, is the need to recognise and allow for a certain amount of seepage; for shifts and digressions between the national and transnational, between cultural and transcultural modes of representation and reception. In other words, an acknowledgement of the larger socio-cultural shifts that have taken place with the emergence of global/local thinking. Crofts again (quoting Marsha Kinder):

If nation-state cinemas and their marketing constitute a point of resistance to the growing pressures against the state from within and without, many argue that they cannot resist for long: 'the concepts 'cinema,' 'nation,' and 'national cinema' are increasingly becoming decentred and assimilated within larger transnational systems of entertainment.' (1998b: 393)

The tendency to rely too heavily upon traditionally categorical uses and concepts of national cinema ultimately leads to reductive inscriptions of the national, eschewing the variegation of (trans)national, (trans)cultural exchange that occurs within and between distinct film practices.

What needs to be more widely realised in the case of post-New Hollywood cinema, therefore, is that its overtly industrial, commercially package-driven formula operates as part of a global-wide agenda but nevertheless continues to originate from within a nationally culturally specific context. To offer an analogy, Ulf Hedetoft

scale and therefore to one concept of *value*: namely, economic wellbeing. It also reduces the ideology of national cinema to a set of binaries" ("Framing," 91).

discusses the way the English language, as an originally national cultural product, can be appropriated on a transnational or global scale toward a “universality of meanings, impact and acceptance” (280). He suggests that such a process results in that product being “transnationally adopted [...] treated as an admirable (role) model for emulation,” and in turn, “de-nationalised” (280).⁴⁴ When Hedetoft’s point is placed within the context of conceptualising the national in film, what becomes apparent is the need for a reconsideration of how the term “national cinema” operates. Given the aforementioned outwardly global yet inherently local characteristics of post-New Hollywood cinema, for example, such a reconsideration must necessarily point toward a more transnational definition. As Hedetoft argues,

‘National cinema’ in the context of globalisation thus reappears as a *changeable and non-permanent notion*, as a *transboundary process* rather than a set of fixed attributes. ‘Hollywood’ (as well as all other national cinemas of international reach) is constantly undergoing a (re)nationalisation process, temporally and spatially, a process which does not stamp out the US flavour of these cinematic products, but which negotiates their transition into and assimilation by ‘foreign’ mental visions and normative understandings. (281-282; emphasis added)⁴⁵

⁴⁴ For a more specific account of “de-nationalising” in relation to American cultural product and Hollywood, see de Grazia “European,” 25-26.

⁴⁵ Hedetoft’s re-conceptualization of the term “national cinema” as cited here is one to keep in mind, as it reveals a striking similarity to my own with regards to authorship. Interestingly, Crofts appears to pre-empt Hedetoft by observing but not elaborating upon the “transnational reach” of Hollywood as a possible reason

Possibly the most pronounced link between this “(re)nationalisation process” and post-New Hollywood cinema can be traced back to Hollywood’s long-time use of genres, with their insertion of specifically American (no matter how universally appropriated) values and ideologies. For instance, Douglas Kellner notes that “Hollywood film from the beginning was deeply influenced by the dominant genres in its studio system” (131), which were used to “promote the American dream and dominant American myths and ideologies”:

The Hollywood genres taught that money and success were important values; that heterosexual romance, marriage, and family were the proper social forms; that the state, police, and legal system were legitimate sources of power and authority; that violence was justified to destroy any threats to the system; and that American values and institutions were basically sound, benevolent, and beneficial to society as a whole. (132-133)

In other words, Hollywood as an essentially American cinema has always operated as part of an ideological construct,⁴⁶ invariably more heavily mobilised during times of social crisis.⁴⁷

why, within discussions of national cinema, Hollywood is hardly ever referred to as such (“Reconceptualizing,” 49-50).

⁴⁶ For more on this subject, see Kellner “Hollywood Film”; and Neale, “New Hollywood Cinema,” *Screen* 17.2 (1976). Additionally, Mazdon’s discussion of *La totale* and its remake *True Lies*, for example, effectively demonstrates how American ideology and socio-cultural norms are inscribed into Hollywood films (123-139).

⁴⁷ While key periods such as the First and Second World War, as well as the years of McCarthyism and the Hayes Production Code of the nineteen-fifties come to mind, it’s perhaps unavoidable here to make a more

The cinematic expression of American dreams, myths and ideologies becomes the basis, therefore, for America's "imagined community," its citizens' national, cultural identity. Thomas Elsaesser, for example, suggests that the cinema, "once one looks at it as both an industry and a culture, is really these two systems sitting on top of each other, loosely connected, or rather connected in ways intriguingly intertwined" (2001: 15). In relation to contemporary American "blockbuster" cinema (read post-New Hollywood), Elsaesser argues that its films are "engineered for maximum meaning, which is to say its different parts function as a cultural database, in a process that is both 'analytical' (it breaks down culture into separate items and individual traits) and 'synthetic' (it is capable of apparently reconciling ideologically contradictory associations)" (19). On a cinematic level, America's national "community," no matter how global its reach appears at present, is not unlike any other, always in the process of being re-invented and "re-imagined."

In his Cultural Transmissions and Receptions: American Mass Culture in Europe, Rob Kroes discusses the study of, and discourse surrounding, American culture; specifically how this culture is "perceived and received" in Europe (302). He focuses on two terms that have emerged as "key concepts in this discourse: Americanism and Americanisation" (302). The former, according to Kroes, has predominantly been "a term of rejection in Europe. In its negative sense it symbolised America as the antithesis of Europeanism, to everything that European intellectuals conceived of as their common cultural heritage," while the latter has generally been adopted within "a discourse of

recent link to the events of September 11, 2001 and their aftermath, in response to which Hollywood's role in promoting American ideological and socio-cultural values and beliefs seems to have gone into over-drive.

rejection to point to the variety of processes through which America exerts its dismal influence on European cultures” (302-303).⁴⁸

As with any conceptually reductive tendency, it's important to consider the above point within a wider socio-cultural, historical context. This is particularly the case with regards to Euro-American relations, keeping in mind the “virtual conquest of the entire world by European powers” following the emergence of industrialism in Western Europe during the nineteenth century (Gellner 295-296). More relevant for the purposes of this study, however, is the increasing use of the term “Americanisation” following America's foray into the arena of global domination since the end of WWII. In particular, the way in which an inherently postmodern “cultural apparatus” (Stephanson 8), which has accompanied the reinforcement of this power, is juxtaposed against Europe's apparent inability to relinquish its modernist heritage. In Fredric Jameson words:

The old cultural slate had to be wiped clean, and this could happen in the United States instead of Europe because of the persistence of *l'ancien régime* in European culture. Once modernism broke down, the absence of traditional forms of culture in the United States opened up a field for a whole new cultural production across the board [...] The system of postmodernism comes in as the vehicle for a new kind of ideological hegemony that might not have been required before. (quoted in Stephanson 8)

⁴⁸ For an example of the debates circulating around this type of discourse within the context of film studies, see Nowell-Smith and Ricci Hollywood and Europe; in particular Jean-Pierre Jeancolas, “From the Blum-

Once again, however, this kind of oppositional rhetoric reinforces an insistence on Euro-America binaries that tends to “oversimplify and reduce the complexity” of both European and Hollywood cinemas (Eleftheriotis 10). These two cinemas, and their respective cultures, impact and influence one another to the point that they reveal a contradictory and complicated history that cannot simply be reduced to an “us and them” scenario.⁴⁹ Just as popular European films are too often theoretically and critically dismissed on the grounds that they don’t illustrate or contribute to any distinct national cultural identity, so too are post-New Hollywood films too often disregarded as globally formulaic, lacking any credibility as nationally culturally specific product.

Globalization, however, seems to have created an impasse for recent theoretical and critical accounts of post-New Hollywood cinema, indicating that they are unable to adequately conceptualize and/or define it alongside any kind of American national cultural specificity, or American “national cinema”.⁵⁰ Richard Maltby maintains that the ability to determine a “specifically American national identity” is problematic due to its popular culture having “long been so much a part of everyday life in other countries,” operating more as a “multinational popular culture which recognises no frontiers” and is therefore dictated by a “circulation across national boundaries” (105). Writing with concern to Europe’s “diverse forms of resistance to American culture,” he claims that, as

Byrnes Agreement to the GATT affair.”

⁴⁹ There’s a tendency in film studies, for example, to create an “us and them” situation by implying a unified European pessimism towards America as a global power, despite different European nations having diverse, at times opposing attitudes and/or policies with regards to this situation. See Finney The State; Forbes and Street European; Nowell-Smith and Ricci Hollywood and Europe; and Wayne The Politics.

⁵⁰ For more on this point, see Lewis The End. It’s also worth noting that the study of Hollywood genres offers the closest exception to this point. In “Economy and Aesthetics in American Remakes of French Films,” Dead Ringers, Michael Harney offers an interesting proposition regarding this distinction, between (Hollywood) “genericism” and (national cinema) “individualism”: “The former without the latter inclines towards the predictable and the formulaic; the latter without the former is predisposed to an ‘intensifying

opposed to its transatlantic counterpart, Hollywood continues to remain “substantially free from comparable cultural criteria,” and therefore “significantly less constrained by an obligation to behave as if it were a national cinema” (105).

However, given that Maltby’s argument encompasses present-day Hollywood by referencing its past, such an assertion fails to recognise the aforementioned shift towards a truly global/*local* post-New Hollywood cinema. Alternatively, using a selection of films from the nineties as cases in point, Dana Polan poses the “emergence of a new globalist practice in recent American cinema” that reveals itself as a deceptively complex mechanism for negotiating this cinema’s global context, as much concerned with “accommodations of representation to new multinational political and economic concerns as with ostensible deconstructions of American ideology” (1996: 260). Polan identifies “several motifs” that reflect this emerging “new global-American culture”: an emphasis on movement, whether real or virtual; on communication, specifically new media; on services, with regards to commodity-consumer dynamics; on interaction, which is more “cybernetic” than corporeal; and on narrative or plots, which are “about the mediation between various subcultures of the global economy” (263-269).

It is not unrealistic to suggest that Polan’s “new global-American culture” can be similarly appropriated and posited alongside the notion of other “new global-[local]” cultures. Of specific relevance to this study, for example, is the concept of a “new global-European culture”; one that marks the interface of global and local film practices, characterised by globally identified themes, media and modes of production but ones that retain local cultural inflections. This point shall be further addressed with the analysis

hermeticism.’ While ‘genre is an implicit critique of individualism,’ artistic individuality ‘irrigates the desert of the merely generic’” (67). See also p.42 of this study.

presented in the third chapter of this study, which will examine how concepts are shaped and re-shaped by the (cross-cultural) remake.

Cross-cultural Cinematic Recycling vis-à-vis Popular European and Post-New Hollywood Cinemas

It is now worth addressing in more detail the notion of transnational, cross-cultural cinematic recycling, in order to then consider this film practice within the context of popular European and post-New Hollywood cinemas. Of particular relevance here is this study's positioning of the remake as an important subject of study, one that provides a privileged point of access from which to explore concepts located at the intersection of the national and global, such as Polan's "new global-American culture." As equally pertinent, as shall be defined below, are the interrelated notions of cultural specificity and difference, from which emerges a process of "transcultural hybridization," that surface through cross-cultural cinematic recycling.

Setting out to "determine why [remakes] are produced and what they reveal about the cinematic and cultural contexts from which they emerge" (2), Mazdon examines notions of the national, and by extension the transnational, that reveal themselves through the remake process. Offering various case studies to support her argument, specifically of French films that are re-made by the American (Hollywood) film industry, Mazdon presents a broader theoretical premise that is of particular relevance to this study. Most notably, she calls for the dissolution of stagnant Franco-American binarisms (which extends here to Euro-American ones) that are so commonly associated with the remake

process. Mazdon suggests that such binarisms entrench French cinema as art/national while American (Hollywood) cinema remains populist/global, by maintaining that reactions to this process must not be “merely about ‘Americanisation’ but should be located within the wider concerns about French identity in the emerging global arena” (11).

Mazdon draws upon the work of Carolyn Durham, who also considers the remake process within the context of Franco-American relations, identifying it as an inherently transnational film practice that reveals the distinctly transcultural potential of cinema. She presents, as does Mazdon, a series of case studies that centre on issues of national cinema, art and commerce, gender and socio-cultural identity. Durham acknowledges the increasing transnationalism of contemporary filmmaking and in doing so presents the cross-cultural remake as a phenomenon that encourages and facilitates such filmmaking. Concluding an analysis of *Trois Hommes et un couffin* (Coline Serreau, 1985) and *Three Men and a Cradle* (Leonard Nimoy, 1988), Durham makes the following observation:

By telling the same story differently – to the paradoxical point of both relating two different stories and repeating the same story – *Trois Hommes* and its American remake help reveal the particularly complex ways in which culture and gender interact, in which narrative is simultaneously engendered by culture and acculturated by gender. (81)

Importantly, Durham's study reveals the remake practice as one of growing relevance, however contentious, to (re)conceptualizations located at the crossroads of the national and transnational, cultural and transcultural.

Texts such as those offered by Mazdon and Durham, addressed alongside others in the third chapter of this study, call for the necessary recognition, therefore, of cross-cultural cinematic recycling as a process that locates both the local and global within certain categories in film discourse.⁵¹ They pave the way for traditionally reductive, essentialist concepts, such as film authorship and the national, to be challenged and dismantled. Consider the following comment from Maltby:

The ideal of a national cinema that meets both commercial and cultural criteria is by definition not far short of an oxymoron, at best occurring only in the isolated instances of individual films, and certainly not with sufficient frequency to sustain the notion of a national cultural industry. Europeans have frequently failed to perceive the ways in which American purveyors of American culture do not recognise their product as part of a national culture [...] [American culture as] national [is perceived] only outside the geographic boundaries of the United States. (105)

Firstly, the "ideal of a national cinema that meets both commercial and cultural criteria" is not so much an oxymoron as a rather curious anomaly within filmic discourse. Secondly, as the above discussion on Hollywood genres inferred, "American purveyors

⁵¹ See also Vincendeau "Hijacked," 23-25; Horton and McDougal Play It Again; and Forrest and Koos Dead Ringers.

of American culture” are never unaware of their product being globally exported and appropriated yet identified as American – hence the existence and widespread use of the internationally ubiquitous term “Americanisation.” The very practice of cross-cultural cinematic recycling by the American Hollywood film industry serves to illustrate these two points. For instance, while remaking the Norwegian film *Insomnia* (Eric Skjoldbjærg, 1997) into a Hollywood production of the same title (Christopher Nolan, 2002) resulted in a commercially successful, exportable remake that profited from the original’s creative concept, distinct cultural inflections marked Nolan’s version as an American product first and foremost, however much it was globally exported. Perhaps the most overt example of this is the widely recognised Hollywood actor Al Pacino’s star billing in Nolan’s *Insomnia*. Pacino’s role reveals an identifiably American portrayal of a man with, as Vincendeau phrases it, “clear-cut motivation, both of causality (no loose ends) and character (good *or* evil)” (1993: 23). This portrayal contrasts notably with Skjoldbjærg’s essentially European protagonist’s “ambiguity” (23),⁵² with regards to his moral standing as a detective who, in both films, attempts to solve a homicide while being investigated by his own department over suspicious circumstances surrounding his partner’s death.

The inherently transnational process of cross-cultural cinematic recycling works, therefore, to challenge and re-assess a position such as Maltby’s by identifying distinct cultural inflections, located within a filmic text as signifiers of cultural difference, hybridization and exchange. Dyer and Vincendeau suggest these inflections are apparent

⁵² In an article that offers a pertinent argument to that being presented here, Vincendeau makes this point specifically, and with several examples, regarding the Franco-American remake process. In this respect she offers a similar theoretical framework as those of Mazdon and Durham, discussed above.

on a range of levels, such as with “landscapes, language, gestures, clothing, kinds of heroes and heroines, the kinds of things people find funny, the kinds of stories they tell and are used to having told and so on; in short, whole and distinctive ways of thinking and feeling” (11). As discussed with regards to post-New Hollywood cinema, a fairly widely recognised way of locating such cultural indicators is within the study of genres; as also discussed earlier, this is likewise the (less recognised) case with regards to popular European cinema. More specific to the concerns of this study, a relatively unexplored approach to locating these “cultural signs” is within the study of authorship, as shall be demonstrated in the following chapter. Before moving forward to this point, however, the terms “cultural specificity” and “cultural difference,” as well “transcultural hybridization,” need further clarification.

Cultural Specificity, Difference and Transcultural Hybridization

Firstly, my use of the term “cultural specificity” is not as an alignment of nationalism,⁵³ but rather as the configuration of “social community levels,” amongst which the national is the predominant but not only aspect:

The question of cultural specificity can be posed on other, social community levels (and these community levels may themselves be

⁵³ See Willemsen “The National.” Taking Britain as a case in point, Willemsen warns against such an alignment, arguing that a particular cinematic representation, such as race, may be clearly identified as national (i.e. British) but not necessarily indicative of that country’s nationalism: “part of a British specificity, but not of a British nationalism.” In sum, he argues that “discourses of nationalism and those addressing or comprising national specificity are not identical. Similarly, the construction of the analysis of a specific cultural formation is different from preoccupations with national identity” (209-210).

transnational, as are some constructions of gender- and class-based politics). But in film studies, the issue of specificity is primarily a national one [...]. (Willemen 208-209)

The acknowledgement of multi-level cultural formations as indicators of specificity eschews any assumption that the language of film is universal, an assumption that ignores, as Paul Willemen puts it, the “specific knowledges that may be at work in a text” (211).

Instead of a reliance on universalist tendencies, a “cross-eyed dialectic” (217-218) thus becomes necessary as a means of reinforcing the relevance of “specificity” as placed alongside “difference,” within a cultural cinematic context. In conceptualising the importance of this “cross-eyed dialectic,” Willemen draws upon Mikhail Bakhtin’s notions of the dialogic mode and creative understanding, both of which allow for a continual interplay between cultures, without discounting their alterity: “Such a dialogic encounter of two cultures does not result in merging or mixing. Each retains its own unity and open totality, but they are both enriched” (214). By offering such concepts as a way, in film studies, of “using one’s understanding of another cultural practice to re-perceive and rethink one’s own cultural constellation at the same time” (214), which in turn reinforces the point that, “if this cross-eyed dialectic is forgotten, the term ‘specificity’ loses any meaning and with it any notions of ‘creative understanding’” (218), Willemen’s Bakhtinian approach is of significant relevance to my own with regards to the term “cultural specificity” and its usage in this study.⁵⁴

⁵⁴ See also James Morrison, Passport to Hollywood: Hollywood Films, European Directors (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998); Morrison offers a similar conceptual interconnectedness between

Integral to the idea of cultural specificity is its manifestation as cultural difference, which as Stuart Hall notes, “persists – in and alongside continuity” (708). Hall references Jacques Derrida’s use of *différance*, in which the “a” positions it between the two French verbs “to differ” and “to defer,” and subsequently suggests that “meaning is always deferred, perhaps to the point of an endless supplementarity, by the play of signification” (709). Offering this interpretation is useful in that it posits difference as a formation that “challenges the fixed binaries which stabilize meaning and representation and show how meaning is never finished or completed in this way, but keeps on moving to encompass other, additional or supplementary meanings” (709). In taking this approach and directing it towards cinematic representation and reception, Hall suggests that identity is appropriated “not outside but within representation,” and as such cinema does not act as a mirror that reflects such identities, it instead plays an active role of representation “which is able to constitute us as new kinds of subjects, and thereby enable us to discover who we are” (714). In other words, cinema not only exposes cultural specificities but shapes and re-tells them alongside notions of difference (as *différance*).

Significantly, Hall positions his argument alongside cultural studies theorist Homi Bhabha, who in turn draws extensively upon both Derrida and Bakhtin, particularly on the insistence of a “sharp distinction between cultural diversity and difference, asserting the latter as a dynamic process of producing and signifying new positions and identities”

Bakhtin’s dialogic mode and “hybridity in cultural formations,” in a work that reveals a distinct likeness to my own approach: “Certainly [Bakhtin’s] notion of the function and interrelation of differential systems in cultural production has shaped how I have understood the interaction of Hollywood and European cinemas as cultural institutions” (15-16).

(Eleftheriotis 31).⁵⁵ This distinction is an important one for the purposes of this study, in that cultural diversity implies, as Eleftheriotis suggests, a process of cultural relativism in which cultures are perceived “in isolation from each other [...] beyond politics and beyond interaction,” while cultural difference offers one of cultural re-articulation and intervention in which cultures “must be understood as political, positional and essentially fluid” (49-51):

The positional character of difference reintroduces the possibility of similarity, the possibility for a cultural product to reach out beyond the borders of its cultural (usually national) context to texts and constituencies placed in similarly marginal positions [...] Similarity and difference exist in a dialectic and dynamic relationship of mutual interdependence rather than of exclusion. (51)

An exchange between cultural specificity and cultural difference paves the way for the emergence of “transcultural hybridization” in that it reinforces the notion that cultural identity extends beyond the national, into constructs like gender, sexuality, class, ethnicity and politics.⁵⁶ Via such transcultural, hybrid formations, which evolve and

⁵⁵ In Bhabha’s own words, “Designations of cultural difference interpellate forms of identity which, because of their continual implication in other symbolic systems, are always ‘incomplete’ or open to cultural translation” (quoted in Eleftheriotis Popular European 162-63).

⁵⁶ My use of this term is informed by Eleftheriotis’ discussion of hybridity alongside Mary Louise Pratt’s concept of “transculturation” as a way to understand and theorize cultural exchange, “as long as we understand that interaction takes place in a field of complex and unequal power relations, which transform to a degree both parties involved in the process” (53). I demonstrate a similar use of this concept as Eleftheriotis’ when discussing the case study in Chapter 3, in order to reveal the “dynamics of cultural exchange/transculturation” that this approach allows on a textual level, “as representation of cultural

diverge from this exchange, emerges a “powerful means of celebrating cultural diversity, transnational experiences and multinational identities” (Higson 2000b: 67). This process of transcultural hybridization subsequently allows for the probability that, with regards to cinematic reception, there’s “no guarantee that all audiences will makes sense of [viewing] experiences in the same way, since audiences will translate each experience into their own cultural frames of reference, using them in different contexts and for different ends” (65).

Consequently, when considering the transnational, transcultural practice of cross-cultural cinematic recycling, the process of transcultural hybridization becomes foregrounded within this practice as an integral way to understand and assess such “cultural frames of reference,” as they pertain to cinema produced initially in one context and re-produced – recycled – within another context. For instance, an American audience exposed to the French film *La Cage aux folles* (Edouard Molinaro, 1978) will invariably identify this film’s linguistic, visual and thematic cultural inflections as distinctly French, or at the very least distinctly non-American, as opposed to an American audience exposed to the cross-culturally recycled version by Hollywood of Molinaro’s film, *The Birdcage* (Mike Nichols, 1996), with its distinctly American linguistic, visual and thematic cultural inflections. Both Durham and Mazdon offer detailed discussions on this point with regards to these two films, particularly the films’ respective portrayals of sexuality.⁵⁷

As previously mentioned, genre study is a commonly deployed method of identifying the process of transcultural hybridization that occurs via transnational film

difference and exchange,” but even more relevantly on a contextual one, “as the relationship between the film and critical reception and/or audiences” (53); see also 101-102.

practices, such as cross-cultural cinematic recycling. A far less explored theoretical and critical approach to understanding textual and intertextual levels of cultural specificity, difference and exchange, is the study of authorship. Specifically, the notion of film authorship as a shifting, malleable form of intersubjective agency and reception. Discussing the cultural differences that arise from the study of “multiple language versions” (MLVs), which dominated pre-sound cinema and share the same kind of pejorative treatment designated to the remake process, Vincendeau observes that what emerges is “the crucial importance of intertextual familiarity with genres and narrative patterns in the source material [...] for audience appeal and identification” (1988: 35). She swiftly concedes that this claim could be justifiably challenged on the grounds it “disregards the importance of the director” (35). It is this surprisingly common omission regarding the study of transnational practices in film, such as cross-cultural cinematic recycling, that shall be explored in the following chapter.

⁵⁷ See Double Takes (194-198) and Encore Hollywood (139-145) respectively.

2. TRANSITORY FILM AUTHORSHIP: FROM POPULAR EUROPEAN CINEMA TO POST-NEW HOLLYWOOD CINEMA

Authorship as Postmodern Auteurism

Despite its contentious existence, the concept of authorship, particularly auteurism, appears to have reached a juncture in contemporary film studies. As a critical and theoretical approach, auteurism continues to attract resistance and support, increasingly defined by a globalized fusion of the popular into art, which I would contend has driven it into its own kind of authorial paradox. On the one hand, there has been a breakdown of the modernist paradigm of authorship in film, while on the other hand auteurism, offering enduring cinephilic fascinations and desires, has demonstrated an intriguing resilience in both popular culture and film studies, to the point that previous modernist valorizations of the auteur are re-surfacing – only this time round they are accompanied by a postmodern counterpart: the popular auteur.

The focus on auteurism as a “cult of personality” (Buscombe 26) has shifted from the individual as artist to the branded individual as a marker of commodification, intertextuality and intersubjectivity. Or rather, it has been conceptually divided in two: while what I shall call “traditional” auteurism remains, there has emerged what I will refer to as “popular” auteurism. The former is implicitly bound to its modernist heritage and manifestation as “auteur desire” (Polan 2001: 1), which despite being conceptually controversial has re-emerged as not only a highly desirable but also as a widely implemented theoretical and critical approach. The latter finds itself situated at the

global/local interface, enabling Timothy Corrigan's "*business of being an auteur*" (104), discussed below, to be positioned within the "commercial transition of authorship in the global film system" (Maule 1998: 114).⁵⁸

In other words, the postmodern revival of the concept of authorship in film studies has allowed auteurism to reinstate itself as a "commercial as well as a critical strategy" (Crofts 1998a: 321), indicating popular auteurism has by no means replaced its traditional counterpart. Rather, to draw from a theory Barry Smart offers in relation to the co-existence of modernism and postmodernism, the former positions the latter in a "nascent state" (34-35). Presenting a similar notion to Smart, but specifically with regards to auteurism, Naremore suggests that modernist configurations of auteurism and the auteurs belies their essentially postmodern nature. Referencing Andreas Huyssen's suggestion that, circa 1960, the Pop aesthetic movement in America broke with the "austere canon of high modern[ism],"⁵⁹ Naremore argues that this break revealed the "sometimes baffling mixture of elitism and populism" (18) so attractive to the French auteurist movement at the time: "Huyssen doesn't mention Godard or Truffaut, but it

⁵⁸ See Polan, "Auteur Desire," which offers a similar take on these terms as my own, referring to them instead as "classical auteurism" and "new auteurism," active in promoting the simultaneous study of "persons" and "social processes" respectively. He argues that with the former, "director study is essentially the same practice as in the classical days, or rather is a transformation of original premises," proceeding as if "structuralism, Marxist theory of ideology, post-structuralism, postmodernism never existed," while the latter reveals an awareness of these theories' critiques of "authorship, voice and identity" and have made them implicit in its own re-modelling and re-theorizing (5-6). See also Eleftheriotis *Popular Cinemas*, on authorship's "two most commonly theorized strains" in film studies: "auteurism" and "commodification" (134).

⁵⁹ See Andreas Huyssen, *After the Great Divide: Modernism, Mass Culture, Postmodernism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986) 187-188; Huyssen's view is pertinent to this study's aims, specifically with regards to what he considers to be the pseudo divide between modernism and postmodernism. For a similar approach, specifically with regards to this pseudo divide and film discourse, see McCabe *The Eloquence*, in particular the section titled "Defining Popular Culture" (73-78).

seems to me that auteurism and the New Wave belong on his list of postmodern artifacts” (18).

While ties to its traditional counterpart are therefore apparent, the popular auteur has nevertheless become defined by its engagement in the “commercial performance of *the business of being an auteur*” (Corrigan 104), a postmodern, intersubjective realisation of Foucault’s “author-function” (125).⁶⁰ Corrigan defines this “commercial performance”⁶¹ by contextualising it alongside two key developments: firstly, the rise of technology, such as VCRs and cable television; and secondly, increasingly global approaches to the production, distribution and exhibition of films. These implementations, Corrigan maintains, have subsequently led to the deconstruction, and re-construction, of agency and reception within film practices, in clear contrast to the previously modernist tendency of experiencing films with a subjective immediacy that reflected predominantly cohesive and unified on-screen images:

The four walls of theatrical viewing, which might have once reflected the way movies were able to ‘capture’ an audience within carefully constructed cultural parameters, are thus no longer, it seems to me, an

⁶⁰ Foucault’s term has been so widely and varyingly disseminated within discourses on authorship, aside from just film studies, that it may be worth offering the following summation as a point of clarification for its relevance to this study: “Finally, the author’s name characterizes a particular manner of existence of discourse. Discourse that possesses an author’s name is not to be immediately consumed and forgotten; neither is it accorded the momentary attention given to ordinary, fleeting words. Rather, its status and its manner of receptions are regulated by the culture in which it circulates [...] It points to the existence of certain groups of discourse and refers to the status of this discourse within a society and culture” (123).

⁶¹ Specifically in relation to Francis Ford Coppola, Alexander Kluge and Raúl Ruiz as “auteurs of commerce,” a term discussed further below. An interesting prefigurement to Corrigan’s notion is Sheila Johnston’s “The Author as Public Institution: The ‘New’ Cinema in the Federal Republic of Germany,” Screen Education 32/33 (1979/80), which offers a discussion of New German Cinema as an *Autor* cinema that promoted films as “personal statements” and as “products of an institutional framework” (67-68).

appropriate metaphor with which to describe who watches movies, how they watch them, and how movies acknowledge this new audience. (2)

Hence the viewing experience becomes one of multi-faceted, intersubjective reflexivity, subject to postmodernism's "seeming dehumanizing vacuities and shifting, centerless visions (through its notorious pastiche sensibilities, retro-obsessions, and empty simulations of simulations)" (2). It prompts audiences to "claim their own place and perspective as the essential authority" and "remove images from their own authentic and authoritative place within culture and disperse their significance across the heterogeneous activity that now defines them" (6).

In many ways, this kind of postmodern (re)configuration of consumer-spectatorship dynamics is the signatory style of the contemporary new media cinematic culture. Cristina Degli-Esposti notes,

Educated by the visual language of computers and by television sets that function as baby-sitters, the new generations have acquired their own systems of reading and re-reading the visual language embedded within postmodern texts. We all becomes unconscious beneficiaries, the consumers of the products we help to create in an array of hyper-self-reflexivity. (13)

This kind of cinematic literacy, which Degli-Esposti refers to as the “nomadic postmodern mind” (13),⁶² becomes central to contemporary interpretations (taking Corrigan’s as a point of departure) of authorship as a commercial and cultural strategy of intersubjective agency – within which auteurism plays, I would argue, the most prominent role. As Dudley Andrew suggests, in relation to the contemporary existence of the auteur as reformulated and reassessed according to Corrigan’s premise: “Auteurs may exist but they do so by the grace of spectators” (80).

Offering the above postmodern (re)conceptualization of auteurism validates its viability as a theoretical and critical approach within post-Barthesian discourses of “authorless” postmodernism.⁶³ It also poses the question, or perhaps the “millennial speculation” (Grant 101): how is auteurism defined within contemporary discussions of authorship in film theory? Likewise, how do contemporary authorial practices, when placed within the context of film production and reception, ensure auteurism’s “enduring appeal as an alternative form of cultural agency, located in shifting patterns of meaning formation” (Maule 1998: 113)? Or, to put these questions another way, in Catherine Grant’s words:

⁶² Borrowing from Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of “nomadology,” Degli-Esposti refers to this “mind” as one that “remembers and directs any thought through a never ending, multicode legitimation of what is perceived as real” (13). Mazdon reveals a similar kind of thinking, arguing that the “bricolage and intertextuality of postmodernism have become a built-in feature of numerous cultural artefacts, as manifested by their knowing references to previous texts, both cinematic and other” (150).

⁶³ Various recent articles on authorship and film reinforce this statement. For example, Corrigan comments, “Auteurs are far from dead [...] they may in fact be more alive now than at any other point in film history” (135); Naremore notes, “Auteurism is surely dead, but so are the debates over the death of the author” (20); Stam argues that “auteurism no longer provokes polemics partially because it has *won* [...] now widely practiced by those who have reservations about the ‘theory’” (6); Eleftheriotis argues that the concept of the author, “of the director as the most obvious and powerful organizing principle in the production of film,” has “undoubtedly survived” its controversial existence within “cinema culture and scholarship” (134); and Polan states, “Auteurs are now everywhere, not just in the stratum of directors” (“Auteur Desire,” 5). See also Elsaesser, “The New”; Gerstner and Staiger *Authorship*; Grant

And how might auteurism continue to adapt itself to the process of ‘globalization’, namely the apparent ‘deterritorialization’ of some forms of cultural production and the elaboration of new transnational systems of distribution with the accompanying fragmentation of mass markets and the targeting of particular audience segments? (101)

These questions and considerations become particularly pertinent in relation to the viability of contemporary authorship, in this case as a theoretical category that can be applied to the transnational film practice of cross-cultural cinematic recycling. Specifically, this kind of re-thinking reflects a growing need to recognise the role concepts such as auteurism play at the intersection of (trans)national, (trans)cultural cinematic modes and meanings. For instance, the very nature of taking a filmic text, such as Luc Besson’s *Nikita* (1990), from its original and distinct national cultural context and recycling – re-authoring – it as another filmic text within another distinct national cultural context, such as with John Badham’s *Point of No Return* (1993), displaces the notion of film authorship, or auteurism, as a fixed, unchanging category by foregrounding its ability to shift, by way of the same filmic text, between conditions and contexts that vary socio-culturally and historically.

Film authorship at the global/local interface

“www.auteur.com?” 101-108; Maule “De-Authorizing”; Helen Stoddart, “Auteurism and Film Authorship Theory,” *Approaches*; and Vincendeau “Issues.”

At this point consideration needs to be given to how distinct yet aligned strategies of authorship are placed at the global/local interface. Film authorship is framed within this context as both a textual and intertextual strategy, capable of being appropriated as a form of either artistic expression and/or industrial reception, and in turn valorizing the fluid, changing aspect of authorship from one cultural, cinematic context to another, in terms of cross-cultural cinematic recycling. Thus, before exploring this notion further with regards to popular European and post-New Hollywood cinemas, it is necessary to consider exactly how Corrigan's "business of being an auteur" is implicated, from its modernist context of traditional auteurism as individual creativity to "its contemporary return, under the umbrella of postmodernism, to a newly 'globalized' market place" (Stoddart 38).

Since, as Neale puts it, the "collapse of the studio system and its replacement by the 'package' system in which the director is more overtly institutionalised in a role analogous to the author" (1976: 118), product-branding has been at the forefront of New Hollywood and now post-New Hollywood cinematic "event" releases. Crofts suggests that this has led to a greater emphasis being placed on "marketing labels than previously under the package system, especially as genres have destabilized, and audiences fragmented beyond the entertainment-art split towards a larger number of relatively uncoordinated subgroups" (1998a: 322). This shift towards media conglomeration and cinematic packaging has thus enabled "an industrial strategy in which one product or performer can be sold across a range of media and/or generate a series of other, associated products" (Tasker 214). When this "industrial strategy" is to promote and sell a film on a director-as-author basis, which is as common-place now within an artistic

context as well as a commercial one (as discussed further below), this strategy becomes one of selling the film's author-as-brand name.⁶⁴

In other words, the auteur, either traditional or popular, is marketed and established as "a relationship between audience and movie in which an intentional and authorial agency governs, as a kind of brand-name vision that precedes and succeeds the film, the way that movie is seen and received" (Corrigan 102).⁶⁵ Referring to this brand-name vision as an "auteur-star," Corrigan identifies two particular types: the "commercial auteur" and the "auteur of commerce" (105-108). The former overtly takes on the role as brand-name, to the point where his or her name is bigger than the film itself, both before and after its release, an ideal example of this type being Steven Spielberg.⁶⁶ The latter more subtly manipulates his or her position as an auteur-star, especially on the level of intersubjective agency, by creating an interplay of apparent transparencies that attempts to undermine – "trouble, confuse, or subvert" – his or her commercial status, as Corrigan discusses in relation to Francis Ford Coppola (108-115).

⁶⁴ Other prominent, although by no means exclusive, levels of branding are the film itself, star performers or a combination of these. With regards to Hollywood, the studio system can also be given an authorial status, whether in relation to its classical era – see Thomas Schatz, The Genius of the System (New York: Pantheon Books, 1988) – or contemporary one, as is indicated by the following comment from John Ptak, in Toby Miller, "Hollywood and the World," The Oxford: "We have created a product that by, say, putting the name of Warner Brothers on it is a stamp of credibility. But that could be an Arnon Milchan film, directed by Paul Verhoeven, starring Gérard Depardieu and Anthony Hopkins, and shot in France and Italy, and made with foreign money" (377).

⁶⁵ Neale, prefiguring Corrigan's notion of authorial branding by ten years, discusses this tendency in relation to "Art Cinema," noting that "the name of the author can function as a 'brand name,' a means of labelling and seeing a film and of orienting expectation and channelling meaning and pleasure in the absence of generic boundaries and categories" ("Art," 36).

⁶⁶ See Ulf Hedetoft, "Contemporary Cinema: Between Cultural Globalisation and National Interpretation," Cinema and; Hedetoft refers to "Spielberg's self-avowed and widely publicised intent and message" in relation to his discussion of *Saving Private Ryan*, and in turn reveals a demonstration, as a useful case in point, of Spielberg as "commercial auteur" (278-297).

Transnational, cross-cultural cinematic recycling offers a fascinating area of research, as shall be demonstrated in the third chapter of this study, when the same filmic text is considered alongside distinct yet aligned authorial strategies, such as those suggested by Corrigan. In other words, the very nature of the cross-cultural remake serves to strengthen ways of defining and re-defining previously impermeable notions of auteurism, enabling, for example, both an “auteur of commerce” (Alejandro Amenábar) and a “commercial auteur” (Cameron Crowe) to be applied to the same filmic text (*Abre los ojos/Vanilla Sky*), yet situated within markedly different cinematic and cultural traditions (Spain/America).⁶⁷

It is important to recognise, however, that Corrigan’s notion of an authorial brand-name vision should not be applied exclusively to Hollywood and its overt commercialism. On the contrary, it is not without reason to argue that cinematic authorial branding first emerged in Europe not America, from the *politique des auteurs* writers in *Cahiers du Cinéma* and *nouvelle vague* filmmakers during the nineteen-fifties.⁶⁸ As Jean Luc Godard comments,

⁶⁷ Although Mazdon comes close when noting, with the example of film adaptations, that the process of reproducing an original text can tend to “decentre the work, to threaten its identity and that of the author” (3), it is an interesting aside that the approach I am positing, of theoretically applying the practice of cross-cultural cinematic recycling to (trans)national concepts of authorship, appears absent from studies on this practice, save for brief allusions to this practice’s controversial standing on the contractual legalities of authorial rights, such as that offered by Vincendeau “Hijacked” (25).

⁶⁸ The situation is, of course, more complex than this statement implies. The point being to illustrate that these two movements operated within “high” art theory and criticism by rejecting French popular cinema and applauding the films made by popular, mainstream Hollywood studio directors such as Hitchcock – in other words, used their intellectual standing for what were essentially populist means. This art/commerce duality is one that is too willingly dismissed by proponents of auteurism on the basis of modernist high culture. See Caughie *Theories* 9-16; Crofts “Authorship,” *The Oxford*; Elsaesser “Two”; Hillier *Cahiers*; and James Naremore, “Authorship and the Cultural Politics of Film Criticism,” *Film Quarterly* 44.1 (1990) 14-23.

We defended a lot of individual American movie-makers and said ‘they are the real artists’ – we said Hitchcock can be the author of his films as well as Proust. It was perhaps an exaggeration, but after that his name came above the title of the film whereas before it was under. (quoted in Petrie 100)

This emergent “brand-name vision,” now widely associated with European art films but defined artistically not commercially,⁶⁹ has been appropriated as one that rewards national, cultural and aesthetic credibility, in opposition to the (Hollywood) kind that smacks of global, commercial and formulaic strategies.⁷⁰

However, as Steve Neale suggests in relation to the “economic infrastructure of Art Cinema,” auteurist

marks of enunciation [...] tend to be unified and stabilised within the space of an institution which reads and locates them in a homogenous way (each mark serving equally as the sign of the author) and which mobilises that meaning in accordance with commodity-based practices of

⁶⁹ For a counter to this widely-held definition, see Maule “De-Authorizing,” who discusses authorship “as a marketing appeal” in Europe since the fifties, positioned as an alternative to Hollywood both nationally and internationally, as well as commenting that, particularly within Western Europe, “film authorship has traditionally claimed its expressive distinction from commercial production” (114-115).

⁷⁰ Consider Germany’s *Autorenkino*, “deliberately cultivated (in conjunction with certain industrial, political and cultural developments) rather than accidentally propitious” (Johnston 68); Italy’s *film d’auteur*, propelling directors such as Antonioni, Fellini, Pasolini and Bertolucci to national and international thanks in large part to the “social function” of the Italian Aid Law of 1965 (Neale “Art,” 28); and of course France’s *auteur cinéma*, emerging during a time of national cultural crisis and subsequently appropriated as emblematic that “French cinema is not just an economic fact” but rather “a cultural fact, a creation of the spirit” (Jeancolas 57).

production, distribution and exhibition (the mark of the author is used as a kind of brand name, to mark and to sell the filmic product). (1981: 15)

Little appears to have changed since Neale offered this point over twenty years ago, in fact if anything the “traditional” auteur has become, in terms of commodification, assimilated alongside the “popular” auteur as a recognised branding strategy, albeit for a different market. Kathleen Vernon argues (quoting José Luis Borau),

Finally, the old art vs. commerce arguments are turned on their head as an auteur ‘label’ is adduced to a contributing factor if not a necessary requirement in a film’s commercial success: ‘So much is this so that even at the risk of exaggeration it can be claimed nowadays that an auteur film in principle almost guarantees success. And conversely, success is harder to achieve if a film is considered merely commercial.’ (94)

What emerges, therefore, is the juncture of authorial and national theories and film practices:

Despite the rush in certain Cultural Studies quarters to embrace the inevitability of ‘deterritorialization’ under globalization, auteurism still appears to be playing a rather similar role within regional frameworks [...] as it has since the 1950s and 1960s. (Grant 105)

This alignment, of film authorship and the (trans)national, has resulted in the clear yet qualified realisation of Corrigan's "cinema without walls" in which, "in the global film market, national cinema demarcate meaning formations also insofar as they provide the cultural and material conditions for authorship to survive as a local practice and circulate as an absolute cultural currency" (Maule 1998: 121). There may be no walls, but there are simultaneously demarcated boundaries, able to be crossed yet insisting to be recognised. Within the context of transnational, cross-cultural cinematic recycling, this allows for the positioning of strategies of authorship, and auteurism, at the global/local interface. It illustrates the fluid and changing nature of film authorship, as a concept that enables national and cultural demarcations whilst simultaneously revealing its inherently hybrid nature.

A fluid, malleable definition of film authorship paves the way, as Rosanna Maule suggests in relation to Juanma Bajo Ulloa's film *Airbag* (1997), for "a type of authorial cinema that defends its 'cultural identity' by using global strategies of representation aimed at domestic and international film markets" (2002: 68). It also reveals the dismantling of didactic modernist and postmodern concepts of authorship, specifically auteurism, in which each is the other's antithesis. While it is maintained by some that auteurist studies "now tend to see a director's work not as the expression of individual genius but rather as the site of encounter of a biography, an intertext, an institutional context, and a historical moment" (Stam 6), "auteurism desire" (Grant 106-107) and "auteur desire" (Polan 2001: 1) have ensured that both "individual genius" and socio-historical, industrial-commercial readings are widely deployed within film studies, and should continue to be.

The above discussion encourages the conceptualization of authorship within a transnational perspective, wherein films “emerge in a transnational space in which even overt local messages of localism are at once transformed into universal ideas of some kind” (Petrie 88). Film authorship, as a concept capable of shifting from different cultural, cinematic contexts via the cinematic recycling of one text into another, addresses postmodern considerations of the popular and the national on levels of both cultural specificity and difference, in order to explore formations of transcultural hybridization. What shall be considered now, is how this assessment of film authorship is framed in relation to contemporary popular European and post-New Hollywood cinemas.

Film Authorship and Popular European Cinema

In a section tellingly titled “Authorship in European cinema: the canon and how to challenge it” (1998: 444-445), Vincendeau notes that while the “figure of the director has always been central to European cinema,” this has almost invariably been in relation to “significantly art-cinema oriented” auteur-type categorizations (444-445).⁷¹ She points out that although the “category of ‘popular auteur’ is an important one in European cinema,” it is by and large “critically unrecognized” (445).⁷² Eleftheriotis also identifies

⁷¹ Later in the article Vincendeau makes the point that the European star system has received “relatively low attention [...] in direct (inverse) relation to the attention lavished on auteurs, who in a sense *are* the stars of European cinema” (“Issues,” 447).

⁷² At this point Vincendeau offers a “selective list” of traditionally perceived European auteurs, “simply meant to identify the canon as well as ways of challenging it.” She then discusses the need to acknowledge the existence of a canon of popular auteurs alongside this, such as Luc Besson, as well as “some ‘cross-overs,’” such as Almodóvar (444-445). Similarly, she and Dyer write about the assumption that popular European cinema can be “differentiated from art cinema by having no great auteur directors,” despite the reality that “directors in the art cinema pantheon, like Jean Renoir or Luchino Visconti, in fact worked in popular cinema” (11). Were a canon similar to the likes of Sarris’ one on American cinema put together on

this tendency, bemoaning the fact that “directors of popular European films are rarely acknowledged as *auteurs*” (78). He suggests that the methodology of auteurism should contribute to rather than inhibit an exploration of popular cinemas within Europe.

This argument is slowly gaining wider critical and theoretical currency within film studies, as one that is opposed to the assumption that auteurism renders popular European cinema inaccessible in film studies, by its reinforcement of an “exclusive canon of European directors and films considered to be worthy of serious critical attention” (134-135). Vincendeau, for instance, notes that the “critical revaluation of Hollywood and the rise of cultural studies produced a (critical) devaluation of art cinema and European auteurs, and arguably of European cinema altogether” (1998: 445). She recognises this shift as one that prefigured the notably more postmodern revival of auteurism that occurred in the eighties and nineties, in order to reclaim previously overlooked or dismissed areas, such as popular European cinema.⁷³

In this respect, there has been a move towards acknowledging that while “in the international film market European authorship counts in measure of its capability to make aesthetic distinctiveness viable and to uphold cultural and industrial strategies in a dialectic relation to each other” (Maule 1998: 118), within the European market authorship does function as a mark of commercial branding. While it is not yet widely recognised, in that “European cinemas, globally and individually, have been treated with little reference to their industrial context” (Vincendeau 1998: 441-442), a cinematic

popular European cinema, Dyer and Vincendeau argue it would be easily filled, randomly citing several examples (11).

⁷³ This example is my own; Vincendeau more directly cites the “renaissance of film history” following the post-theoretical heaviness of the seventies, and the emergence of gender studies, especially feminism (445).

authorial strategy centered around Corrigan's "brand-name vision" reveals itself in popular European cinema in a similar fashion to its Hollywood counterpart. The distinct difference being that the popular auteur exists as a point of tension alongside the traditional auteur, the latter still part of a widely valorized European modernist heritage.

This point is perhaps nowhere more evident than in France, birthplace to the traditional auteur, and in many ways a nation that epitomises the desire to cling to its European modernist heritage in the face of global postmodernism.⁷⁴ As an interesting case in point, the following sentiments were expressed by Claire Denis and Chantal Akerman at a conference focusing on notions of contemporary European identity and how this is portrayed within cinema: "Cinema is [...] a very personal medium, and if European cinema is anything it is a reflection of European subjective experiences" (Denis quoted in Petrie 66). "For me, cinema is about personal stories [...] I decided to make films after seeing *Pierrot le fou*. I realised then that cinema was a language, as strong and fulfilling an experience as literature or painting" (Akerman quoted in Petrie 66). With their references to subjectivity, particularly Akerman's to "high" cultural formations (language, literature, painting), these two contemporary French directors demonstrate that traditional auteurism, "as an index of singularity in the face of industry standardization, and as 'the last artist' of 'the last artistic practice still held in the last artistic space, that of Romanticism'" (Darke 375), continues today albeit "in a sophisticated and self-conscious manner" (Andrew 78).

⁷⁴ See, for example, Chris Darke, "Rupture, continuity and diversification: *Cahiers du cinéma* in the 1980s," *Screen* 34.4 (1993) 362-379, for a discussion of *Cahiers du Cinéma* which makes the argument that "*Cahiers*' re-engagement with its critical heritage expresses itself in a double movement of rupture and continuity" (365). See also Durham *Double Takes* 3-4; and Mazdon *Encore Hollywood* 5-12.

While it continues to endure, traditional auteurism does so in France by being strategically positioned against its so-called nemesis, the popular auteur – in turn ironically validating the latter’s existence according to Bourdieu’s earlier discussed concept of taste formation. In contrast to its traditional, subjectively based counterpart, the popular auteur in France is associated primarily with the intertextually-oriented *cinéma du look*, a style “heavily influenced by advertising aesthetics” (Darke 375), and not unlike the commonly derided “MTV aesthetic” widely associated with post-New Hollywood cinema (Jenkins 115-116). Luc Besson, for example, is considered one of the forerunners of this aesthetic. Significantly, this dualistic authorial presence within French cinema allows for a “continued polemicization for a particular vision of French cinema” (Darke 378), especially alongside and in reaction to American cinema. I would add that it can also allow for an acknowledgment of the contribution popular auteurs within French filmmaking, such as Besson, make toward this vision.⁷⁵

While in this instance the focus is on French cinema as an example of the way authorship, specifically auteurism, is framed within the wider context of popular European cinema, the case study in the third chapter shall offer another, with its focus on contemporary Spanish cinema vis-à-vis (trans)national authorial practices. It is worth noting that similar explorations have recently surfaced in film studies, most relevantly with regards to how both traditional and popular auteurism are located within other

⁷⁵ As Hayward’s study on Besson demonstrates (1998). Additionally, for an interesting non-academic discussion of this at times uncomfortably yet increasingly accepted conjunction of traditional and popular auteurs in contemporary French cinema, see Stanley Hollings, “French Cinema: the feel-good factor,” *Time Out* (Summer 2002) 13, 15; in reviewing the performance of French cinema in France during the last few years, Hollings comments: “Paradoxically, the French stock-in-trade, the *auteur* movie, did not suffer from the audience enthusiasm for straightforward entertainment” (13). He then goes on to note that “the French film industry is now less encumbered by the perception that ‘commercially successful’ equals ‘artistically suspect’” (15).

European nations.⁷⁶ Although, as with European cinema per se, each study on this issue would clearly present its differences, an overriding commonality is the need to accommodate the growing recognition of popular auteurism alongside its traditional counterpart; popular auteurism finally appearing as a challenge to any claims to exclusivity traditional auteurism may assume, despite the latter's continued entrenchment within Europe's cinematic tradition as a form of cultural specificity.

Film Authorship and Post-New Hollywood Cinema

Authorship also reveals its own strategic positioning within post-New Hollywood, as part of a distinct American cultural specificity, despite it commonly being defined by a more global agenda (as discussed in the previous chapter). By the same token, any discussion of authorship and Hollywood leads to something of a paradox. On the one hand, given that the foundations of auteurism are based upon the aforementioned European valorization of Hollywood directors during the fifties, traditional auteurism has always been theoretically and critically applied to the Hollywood system. On the other hand, it is done so by means of asserting artistic individuality and rescuing it from the very system from which it emerged. This has resulted in the current tendency to side-step auteurism, as an artistically credible authorial status, in favour of "authorless" authorship as defined within the context of Hollywood, in terms of studio-based commercial agendas over individual style and creative control.

⁷⁶ See, for example, Marvin D'Lugo, "Recent Spanish Cinema in National and Global Contexts," *Post Script* 21.2 (2002) 3-11, in relation to Spanish cinema; Eric Rentschler, "From New German Cinema to the Post-Wall Cinema of Consensus," *Cinema and* 260-277, in relation to German cinema; and Petric *Screening* 74, 77-78, in relation to Soviet cinema.

Yet the auteur in Hollywood cinema has always existed, albeit in a kind of reverse scenario to the one discussed regarding European cinema. In other words, the presence of the traditional auteur is situated as a point of tension alongside the popular auteur – who in turn is defined commercially as opposed to artistically. It is a tension that is perhaps best demonstrated within the context of the emergence of New Hollywood cinema. Integral to this emergence was a group of young directors displaying “distinctive *artistic* visions and styles” that were to become the signature style of *commercial* New Hollywood cinema, “more varied, diverse, and socially critical than in previous eras” (Kellner 133; emphasis added).⁷⁷ By offering a “very significant feedback loop from the French Nouvelle Vague to Hollywood” (Crofts 1998a: 315), these directors contributed to a growing awareness of the critical practice of auteurism within America. As Yvonne Tasker suggests: “At stake in the claims made for a director such as Coppola during the 1970s was a new status as author-director, modelled on the European art cinema, for those working within the American cinema” (221).

While these directors clearly demonstrate elements of traditional auteurism, their positions within the Hollywood filmmaking system, no matter how precarious or “independent,”⁷⁸ invariably dictate and determine their status as commercially valid or invalid brand-name visions. No matter how more or less commercial the authorial status of contemporary directors working within the American cultural arena, one way or

⁷⁷ The canon of these young and predominantly American directors includes, amongst others: Steven Spielberg, George Lucas, Martin Scorsese, Mike Nichols, David Lynch, Brian DePalma, Francis Ford-Coppola, Stanley Kubrick, Arthur Penn, Woody Allen and Robert Altman. In addition to Kellner “Hollywood Film,” see Henry Jenkins, “Historical poetics,” *Approaches*; Yvonne Tasker, “Approaches to the New Hollywood,” *Cultural Studies and Communications*, eds. James Curran, David Morley, and Valerie Walkerdine (London: Arnold, 1996); and Schatz “The New.”

⁷⁸ Take, for example, Coppola’s notoriously fraught, (in)dependent relationship with the studio system. See Corrigan *A Cinema*.

another they are associated with, and their careers have been influenced by, the commercial underpinnings of the Hollywood system.⁷⁹ This tendency is inextricably linked to an American cinematic tradition as a form of cultural specificity. Pioneering blockbuster directors such as Steven Spielberg or George Lucas, for instance, may be viewed as “superstar directors” whose “knack for engineering hits has transformed their names into virtual trademarks,” as opposed to those “on the margins” whose “creative control and personal style are considerably less constrained by commercial imperatives,” such as Kevin Smith or the Coen brothers (Schatz 1993: 35). This, as opposed again to more “established genre auteurs” like Scorsese or Lynch, who, “like Ford and Hitchcock and the other top studio directors of old,” are the “most perplexing and intriguing cases – each of them part visionary cineaste and part commercial hack” (35).⁸⁰ In sum, although some may be more contingent to the “commercial performance of *the business of being an auteur*” than others, traditional and popular auteurism co-exist within contemporary Hollywood, albeit operating as different forms of intersubjective agency.

Consequently, while within a European cinematic context the popular auteur struggles to gain legitimacy within concepts and practices of traditional auteurism, within the Hollywood context, the traditional auteur struggles to maintain credibility within a system that has increasingly favoured the “director-as-superstar ethos” over the “director-as-author” (Schatz 1993: 20). This situation may, however, be in the process of changing. While popular auteurism has only become further accentuated within post-

⁷⁹ As Jon Lewis comments, “What made certain films and filmmakers important in the nineties had less to do with relative quality than with success in the marketplace, a success complicated and multiplied exponentially by merchandising, global distribution, ancillary formats, and the multitude of delivery and exhibition systems” (3).

⁸⁰ These different levels of auteurism are therefore not distinct but rather, as Schatz points out, “in a state of dynamic tension with one another and continually intermingle” (“The New,” 35).

New Hollywood cinema, its traditional counterpart has recently been reclaimed and re-asserted, as discussed above, perhaps now more strongly than ever before.

Moreover, the juncture of concepts of film authorship and the national is reinforced. Catherine Grant, for instance, discusses the cross-promotional nature of commercial auteurism within American cinematic society as part of what she terms “auteurist reception” (107). This is, in her words, a “reflexive cultural practice which is consciously (and, presumably, unconsciously) invested in and accumulated by consumers in various ways”:

The interactive, intersubjective formulations of contemporary US auteurism have recently been ‘commercially enhanced’ by the ‘infotainment extras’ supplied on DVDs and by the near ubiquity of promotional documentaries on the ‘Making of the Latest Hollywood Release.’ In addition, there are large numbers of auteur-based promotional and fan websites, online ‘Q&A sessions’ with directors, cybercasts, film downloads and other paraphernalia. (107)

Grant argues that the intertextual analysis that results from “specific stories we require from particular kinds of auteurs” can contribute to a more informed understanding of intersubjective auteurism (107). In other words, the foregrounding and exchange of “expressive explanation and authorial intention” encourages a closer intersubjective reading of the “effect on certain filmmakers of gender, sexuality, ethnicity or *national context*” (107; emphasis added).

Same Filmic Text + Different Authorial Mode = Conceptual, Cultural and Cinematic Difference

It is at this point that the previous chapter's concerns have intersected with those discussed here, leading back to the seemingly simplistic equation offered in the introduction to this study: same filmic text + different authorial mode = conceptual, cultural and cinematic difference. Contrary to being simplistic, however, this equation offers a useful point of departure for some complex yet illuminating studies of authorship as a theoretical and critical approach with which to consider – and compare – particular transnational, transcultural cinematic practices.⁸¹ In this sense what is being postulated is the process of “cross-fertilisation” (Mazdon 3) that results when analysing the “effects of films on other films” (Buscombe 32). An exploration that is made even richer when the text in fact remains the same. As Mazdon points out, “The act of remaking the films and the various ways in which they are received should be seen as related components of a wider process of cross-cultural interaction and exchange” (1-2). In order, therefore, to connect the issues that have been covered in the first two chapters of this study, and the (inter)textual considerations that are presented in the case study to follow, further clarification of this equation is in order.

Central to this equation is the notion that authorship, as a changing, fluid concept, undergoes a transitory process, in terms of both meaning and connotation, when it shifts via the same text from one cultural, cinematic context to another. It is perhaps useful to

⁸¹ In this case being that of European-to-America cross-cultural cinematic recycling; as Grant suggests in the above citation, the contexts that can be revealed in such an approach are many and varied.

consider this process alongside Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari's concept of "nomadism."⁸² Essentially one of placement and displacement, this notion allows for stable yet interchanging, malleable interpretations of authorship in film theory. As Maule notes, nomadism operates as "an alternative relation to a milieu, characterized by multiple, immediate, and vectorial tactics of orientation and appropriation, and engaged 'in a perpetual field of interaction' with dominant apparatuses" (1998: 115). More specifically, Maule argues that the positioning of authorship "as a nomadic tactic of enunciation" enables a transformation of "the appearance of the filmmaker-author into a *shifting vector of meaning* that relieves the spectator from perceiving it as an authoritative mark of enunciation" (121; emphasis added).

In other words, within contemporary global/local, transnational practices of film representation and reception, authorship, and auteurism, can take on an "authoritative role as enunciative presence, interpellating an 'expert' audience prefigured in multimedia and global reception practices" (117). In this sense authorship, whether as (inter)textual artistic auteurism (traditional or popular) or commercial "brand-name visions," shifts from one cultural, cinematic context to another by way of the same filmic text, be it as the same *or* different authorial strategy of intersubjective agency.⁸³ In Corrigan's words:

⁸² As used by Degli-Esposti Postmodernism; and Maule "De-Authorizing."

⁸³ As a side-point, it's interesting here to consider multiple authorship as conceptualized by Jack Stillinger, Multiple Authorship and the Myth of Solitary Genius (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1991), wherein any form of cross-referencing becomes a kind of co-authorship. For instance, upon titling his introductory chapter "What Is an Author?", Stillinger includes the following note: "I need hardly point out that my chapter title is intentionally taken over from Foucault, who thus at the beginning of this book becomes one of *my* coauthors" (215).

In the cinema, auteurism as agency thus becomes a place for encountering [...] the different conditions through which expressive meaning is made by an auteur and reconstructed by an audience, conditions that involve historical and cultural motivations and rationalizations. (105)

The malleable nature of film authorship therefore reinforces the “impossibility of any holistic theory of authorship” (Crofts 1983: 17), by insisting upon its consideration (and I include auteurism here) in historical and, more relevantly for this study, socio-cultural terms.⁸⁴ This is necessary given that the “conditions under which author-names may – or may not – be ascribed to texts vary historically, culturally and according to the kind of text” (20); this is particularly the case in terms of cross-culturally recycled films.

Vincendeau suggests, in relation to the remake process, that the issue regarding “what constitutes the auteur of a film” is not solely commercial: “As with the films themselves, the differences reveal as much about cultural traditions as they do about commerce” (1993: 25). It is these “cultural traditions,” after all, that make it impossible to merely ascribe any kind of universality to authorship as a theoretical and critical approach within film studies. The very act of transnational, cross-cultural cinematic recycling demonstrates this point. When a film is made within the context of European cultural, cinematic specificity and then made again but within the context of American cultural, cinematic specificity, this difference in time and place, to offer Crofts words, “will, almost always, divide the moment of production from the moment of reading. The

⁸⁴ See also Polan (“Auteur Desire”), who calls for an assertion of auteurism as “itself a historical activity – arising in particular social and cultural situations as a way of responding to them” (14); and Sue Clayton and Jonathan Curling, “On Authorship,” *Screen* 20.1 (1979) 35-61, who argue it is “the discursive

‘meaning’ of any text will thus vary, as will that of any author-name which may be attached to it” (1998a: 322).

What becomes evident here is the need, as cited earlier, to “mediate successfully between macrosociological and agential levels of description”:

Any successful attempt, for example, to deal cogently with the nationalist dimensions of a given work is likely to involve some account of the historical specificity of a given nationalist context, as well as an exploration of the ways in which the artist’s focal beliefs about national identity, and self-deceptions linked to the psychologies of nationalism, find expression. (Hjort and MacKenzie 1)

In this respect, the cultural specificities that have impinged upon European notions of auteurism, as opposed to those appropriated within the context of American post-New Hollywood cinema, become foregrounded by cinematic difference that surfaces when the recycling of films is conceptualised and analysed, be it on an artistic or commercial level. Examining cinematic difference in this context frees the films themselves from conventional and reductive stereotypes, while also freeing the concept of authorship from a tendency towards reductive absolutes within film studies.

Eleftheriotis suggests, “Art movies do not exist in an idealistic, non-commercial sphere and popular films are not totally devoid of aesthetic sophistication or intentions of creativity” (73). Likewise, traditional auteurism doesn’t exist in an “idealistic, non-

engagements produced by the film in different places which is significant, and the significance of each engagement is conditioned by their different histories – and contributes to those histories” (38).

commercial sphere” and popular auteurism is not “totally devoid of aesthetic sophistication or intentions of creativity.” The study of cinematic recycling, specifically from the angle of same filmic text + different authorial mode, is an effective way of demonstrating this point. It reinforces the notion that authorship, in all its guises, operates within “complex and dynamic relationships between the national and the transnational,” articulating and expressing “key ideological themes and visions of nationhood” that circulate “within transnational critical, historical and cultural contexts” (79).⁸⁵

Consequently, the concept of authorship remains a viable and valid critical and theoretical approach in film studies. Authorship offers an avenue of study that, as Helen Stoddart maintains, is of “central importance in film theory and one which touches on all aspects of film discussion and analysis” (38). In turn, the concept of authorship illustrates the theoretical and textual exchange that surfaces from the re-igniting of such fundamental questions as “who is the author of the text?” or “who defines what the text means and for whom?” (38). As Sue Harper argues, “Visual texture is not superficial; it is the site where we can see the material signs of clashes between different cultural cross-currents” (102). An analysis of cross-cultural cinematic recycling allows, therefore, for a discourse on the way in which films offer different ways of “coping with difference” when they cross national cultural borders, as well as strengthening theories and practices of transnational, transcultural cinematic exchange (Eleftheriotis 49).

Returning once more to Mazdon, she notes that the remake process crosses “both spatial (national) and temporal (historical) boundaries” (2). It is capable of crossing

⁸⁵ As with the previous citation, Eleftheriotis makes these comments in relation to the oppositional binary of art and popular cinemas in film studies; I find them equally applicable and relevant to my concept of

conceptual boundaries as well, and in doing so, contributes to a less reductive positioning of cinematic traditions, cultures and the concepts surrounding them. Hence we return to the equation: same filmic text + different authorial mode = conceptual, cultural and cinematic difference. What is at first an apparently simple formulation becomes, having explored its workings further, a potentially fascinating starting point from which to consider the transitory capabilities of authorship via the remake and its “process of appropriation and reinscription” (Harney 77). The case study in the following chapter shall demonstrate this contention.

3. CASE STUDY: Alejandro Amenábar's *Abre los ojos* (1997) recycled into Cameron Crowe's *Vanilla Sky* (2001)

Taking as its point of departure the preceding equation, same filmic text + different authorial mode = conceptual, cultural and cinematic difference, the following case study will illustrate the shifting nature of film authorship within the context of transnational, cross-cultural cinematic recycling. Alejandro Amenábar's *Abre los ojos* (1997, Spain/France/Italy) and Cameron Crowe's *Vanilla Sky* (2001, USA) have been chosen as a pertinent instance of the potential movement of contemporary authorial between different national cultural, cinematic contexts. The process of *Abre los ojos* being recycled into *Vanilla Sky* offers the authorial modes of Amenábar and Crowe as demarcated by culturally and cinematically specific contexts, while also aligned by their promotion of, and participation in, the postmodern, transnational nature of their authorial strategies.

The (re)positioning of Amenábar and Crowe's authorial modes, due to the cross-cultural cinematic recycling of *Abre los ojos* into *Vanilla Sky*, frames the following analysis on two levels. Firstly, both filmmakers reveal a distinctly postmodern agenda that works to problematize and challenge the Hollywood-as-(populist)global / European-as-(artistic)national binary opposition discussed earlier, most notably by merging aspects of traditional and popular auteurism, art and commerce, in order to encourage an increased recognition of their co-existence in contemporary cinematic culture. Secondly, both Amenábar and Crowe demonstrate an understanding of the potential of authorial film practices to promote intersubjective forms of agency, as exemplified by Corrigan's

notion of contemporary authorship as the “commercial performance of *the business of being an auteur*” (104). The unique, if not unprecedented, sense of collaboration that emerges between Amenábar and Crowe from *Abre los ojos* being recycled into *Vanilla Sky* further strengthens the remake’s viability as a subject of increasing relevance to the study of cinematic cultures and contexts.

Accordingly, the following analysis shall expose the relevance of cross-cultural cinematic recycling to film studies, as a transnational film practice that encourages the existence of authorship as a fluid, changing critical and theoretical concept. In the instance of Amenábar’s *Abre los ojos* and Crowe’s *Vanilla Sky*, here addressed, film authorship acquires different meanings and connotations as it shifts, by way of the same filmic text, from one cultural cinematic context, popular Spanish cinema, to another cultural cinematic context, post-New Hollywood cinema. This case study will draw upon those contemporary (re)assessments of authorship discussed earlier, most notably Corrigan’s, Maule’s (1998) and Grant’s, and apply them to notions of cultural specificity, difference and transcultural hybridization, which serve to both demarcate and align Amenábar’s *Abre los ojos* with Crowe’s *Vanilla Sky*.

In addition to concepts of film authorship and the (trans)national, the following analysis draws significantly upon the status of the remake as a transnational, transcultural film practice, as theorized and contextualised in recent studies.⁸⁶ A common focus throughout these studies is the critical and theoretical tendency to treat remakes

⁸⁶ Specifically, Durham *Double Takes*; Forrest and Koos *Dead Ringers*; Horton and McDougal *Play It Again*; Mazdon *Encore Hollywood*; and Vincendeau “Hijacked.”

pejoratively,⁸⁷ in particular Hollywood's recent resurgence of remaking French films, to which the broader application of Euro-American binary oppositions surfaces. However, as Vincendeau points out, the remake process reveals a great deal more about film cultures, production and theory than these binaries imply, and with which it has previously been attributed:

As *Sommersby* and *The Assassin* hit British screens in rapid succession, the issue – the ‘scandal’ – of Hollywood remakes of European films comes back on the agenda. Reviewers usually note that these films – and many recent others [...] – are based on European (most often French) titles, and then content themselves with pointing out that they are inferior to the originals. But remakes are interesting beyond this well-rehearsed dichotomy of Hollywood commerce versus European art. (1993: 23)

Vincendeau proceeds by discussing the way in which remakes work to “throw into relief” notions of national cultural identity in cinema, conveyed, for example, by narrative pattern, the portrayal of gender or race, and the way in which celebrities are framed, all of which “undergo considerable change as they cross the Atlantic – despite a seeming similarity of plot” (23). Mazdon and Durham (as discussed earlier) present similar theoretical frameworks to Vincendeau. They each call for the necessary recognition of the remake process as a transnational film practice that reveals a privileged point of analysis from which to draw upon, as Mazdon suggests, “notions of the national,

⁸⁷ See Durham *Double Takes* 5, 11; Forrest and Koos *Dead Ringers* 6-7, 30; Mazdon *Encore Hollywood* 1-5; and Vincendeau “Hijacked,” 23.

of the distinction between high and mass culture and indeed what we understand a cinematic text to be” (5).

While acknowledging that their anthology Dead Ringers: The Remake in Theory and Practice (2002) is “heavily weighted toward an examination of American remakes, particularly those of French films” (26), Jennifer Forrest and Leonard R. Koos offer a discussion of the remake process that extends beyond the arena of Euro-American relations. In this respect their approach reflects the expansive potential this area of research offers within film studies. The two editors are quick to note, for instance, the need to locate the remake process as truly (trans)national, in that it occurs both culturally and cross-culturally, within America’s Hollywood and beyond, at times completely unattached to this hugely powerful filmmaking industry: “Remaking is far from being a uniquely American phenomenon, but because American film production has dominated world cinema since the late teens, Hollywood receives the lion’s share of critical attention” (2).⁸⁸

The texts discussed above play an important role in the theoretical framework of this study. However, they are instrumental more as a theoretical and contextual point of departure rather than as a guideline to which the following analysis shall adhere. While these studies rely heavily upon textual analysis between a film and its remake,⁸⁹ primarily in order to demonstrate notions of cultural identity (gender, family, sexuality, race) that

⁸⁸ See also Horton and McDougal Play It Again, which presents a similar view to that expressed by Forrest and Koos, covering more extensively the cultural and transcultural, national and transnational character of cinematic recycling, in particular by dedicating a significant proportion of the collection to contemporary Hollywood remakes of past Hollywood films.

⁸⁹ This scenario extends in some cases to more than two films, as is the case with Laura Grindstaff’s analysis of *La Femme Nikita* (Luc Besson, 1990, France/Italy), *Point of No Return* (John Badham, 1993, USA) and *Black Cat* (Stephen Shin, 1992, Hong Kong) in “Pretty Woman with a Gun: *La Femme Nikita* and the Textual Politics of ‘The Remake’,” Dead Ringers 273-308.

reveal themselves via the remake process, I have chosen to depart from such an approach, notably for two reasons. Firstly, this departure is necessary in order to focus upon the *intertextual* aspects of transnational authorial strategies that surface with cross-cultural cinematic recycling. Secondly, it is appropriate given my intention to demonstrate that studies of the remake process can extend beyond text-to-text comparisons, toward an analysis of concepts, such as film authorship, as they shift through and between different cinematic cultural contexts. That being said, the following pages provide an overview of both *Abre los ojos* and *Vanilla Sky*, as the necessary (con)textual backdrop against which to develop the broader concerns of this study.

A (Con)Textual Overview: *Abre los ojos* and *Vanilla Sky*

Shifting between past and present, real and virtual time, *Abre los ojos* navigates the conscious and subconscious mind of twenty-five year old César. He is initially portrayed as an arrogant yet charming young man, living aimlessly off the inheritance received from his father's successful restaurant chain, following the death of both his parents in a car accident several years earlier. The film's darker side is quickly revealed, however, when we shift to a scene which shows César in a prison cell, charged with murder, and we realise that the earlier portrayal is a part of César's past. It's a past that he reluctantly tries to piece together, with the help of Antonio, a psychologist whose job it is to determine César's mental state in light of his alleged crime.

The events leading to this crime, which unfold through staggered flashbacks, are traced back to a party César gives for his birthday. At this party he spurns the

advancements of his current lover, Nuria, and instead pursues the object of his best friend's affections, Sofia.⁹⁰ After spending the night at Sofia's apartment, where he remains uncharacteristically attracted to her despite their not having sex, César more characteristically accepts a ride with Nuria when she confronts him in Sofia's street. Nuria, still struggling to come to terms with César's insensitive treatment of her, suddenly drives her car off the road. She is killed instantly and César's once-handsome face is left severely disfigured, prompting him to wear a prosthetic facemask during his meetings with Antonio.

César's memories of the time after his accident seem real at first, in which he is unable to accept his grotesque appearance and continues to pursue Sofia, with whom he seems to have fallen in love. Once again, however, the film shifts toward a darker tone, into what appears to be a dream-state turned nightmare. At first Sofia returns César's love, despite his disfigurement, and they are living happily together. His face is even restored to its original state. Then César's mind starts playing tricks, and he keeps seeing Nuria in Sofia's place. Tormented and confused beyond any sense of rationality, César appears to suffocate and kill Sofia in a deluded rage – at least until, having slowly unravelled his memories to Antonio, the missing pieces of his mind begin to fit together

⁹⁰ A further point of interest regarding this film and the transnational practice of cross-cultural cinematic recycling can be located in the role of Sofia, which suggests a further angle of study, between the remake and star discourse. Sofia is played by Penélope Cruz in *Abre los ojos*, is reprised by her in *Vanilla Sky*, to the point of maintaining the character name of Sofia. Add to this Cruz's highly publicised relationship with Tom Cruise surrounding the release of *Vanilla Sky*, which Cruise not only stars in but co-produced, revealing his professional connection with Amenábar, not only regarding negotiating the rights to remake *Abre los ojos* but also as executive producer of Amenábar's follow-up feature *Los Otros* (*The Others*, 2001), starring Nicole Kidman, and the truly cyclical nature of film as a transnational practice reveals itself. See www.vanillasky.com, which openly acknowledges the sense of collaboration that exists between *Abre los ojos* and *Vanilla Sky* (discussed further below), detailing the aspect of Penélope Cruz's repeat performance and including her own comments on playing the same role for two different directors, in two different cinematic contexts.

and an American company called “Life Extension,” specializing in cryogenics, enters what has so far been perceived as his “reality.”

In “fact,” César never saw Sofia again and was never able to restore his face to its original state. Instead, he committed suicide after signing a contract with “Life Extension,” on the agreement that this company would freeze his body until life-renewal was possible, whereupon he would resume the life he knew, but as a dream, under “artificial perception.” Subsequently, César’s renewed mind plays and re-plays a virtual reality, one that he has chosen in place of the reality he actually lived. César, upon realising his dream “reality” has malfunctioned and turned into a nightmare, is offered a choice by the man who sold him the “Life Extension” package: have his dream “reality” re-programmed, and keep “living” the life he has always known but without it becoming a nightmare, or be woken from his dream and awake in the year 2145, to live a new life without disfigurement, and with no knowledge of his past existence.

Abre los ojos was directed and co-written by Alejandro Amenábar,⁹¹ who is included, with names such as Juanma Bajo Ulloa, Julio Medem and Alex de la Iglesia, amongst a handful of young Spanish directors that have facilitated and encouraged the recent emergence of their nation’s cinema at the forefront of global/local film production and reception.⁹² As is increasingly the case in contemporary European cinema, particularly a commercially driven, popular film such as *Abre los ojos*, Amenábar’s

⁹¹ Mateo Gil is the film’s other screenwriter, as well as one of its assistant directors. He and Amenábar also co-wrote Amenábar’s feature film debut, *Tesis* (*Thesis*, 1996) (discussed below), which suggests that Gil has contributed significantly to Amenábar’s authorial vision. Amenábar is also credited, alongside Mariano Marin, for the music in *Abre los ojos*.

⁹² For more on this subject, see Christina A. Buckley, “Alejandro Amenábar’s *Tesis*: Art, Commerce and Renewal in Spanish Cinema,” *Post Script* 21.2 (2002); D’Lugo “Recent”; Barry Jordan and Rikki Morgan-Tamosunas, eds. *Contemporary Spanish Cinema* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1998); and Kinder *Blood Cinema*.

essentially Spanish film is officially a transnational, pan-European product, with financing received from production companies in Spain (Las Producciones del Escorpion), France (Les Films Alain Sarde) and Italy (Lucky Red), as well as the jointly formed Sogetel, founded by France's Canal + but based within Spain.⁹³

Following its release in 1997, *Abre los ojos* received both critical and commercial attention within and beyond Europe, and only four years later, American filmmaker Cameron Crowe paid homage to Amenábar with *Vanilla Sky*, his “cover story” of the Spaniard's film (Crowe). Wanting to be a “part of the conversation” that Crowe felt *Abre los ojos* inspired when he first saw it in 1997 (Crowe), he paired up with Tom Cruise to make *Vanilla Sky*. As well as starring in this film, Cruise co-produced it with his business partner Paula Wagner, the other half of Cruise/Wagner Productions.⁹⁴ Subsequently, as a joint production between Cruise/Wagner Productions and Crowe's production company, Vinyl Films, and with Cruise and Crowe undertaking an extensive global marketing campaign prior to its release by Paramount Pictures, *Vanilla Sky* sits comfortably within the “blockbuster” parameters of American post-New Hollywood cinema.

The narrative of *Vanilla Sky* remains remarkably faithful to the one presented in *Abre los ojos*. There are, however, distinct changes in Crowe's version that need to be

⁹³ Additionally, *Abre los ojos* received the participation, collaboration and/or financial support of Sogetel's affiliated, Spanish-based international sales company, Sogepaq, and its pay TV company, Canal + España, as well as of the Council of Europe funding body, Eurimages. The two executive producers of *Abre los ojos*, Fernando Bovaira and José Luis Cuerda, further illustrate the Spanish-European character of Amenábar's film, given their respective roles in both the contemporary Spanish film industry and popular European cinema. Bovaira, for instance, has been the CEO of Sogetel since 1996 and also co-produced Amenábar's *Los Otros*, while Cuerda, a prominent Spanish director, actor, writer and producer, is head of Las Producciones del Escorpion, which also co-produced Amenábar's *Tesis* and *Los Otros*.

⁹⁴ For more on the professional collaboration between Cruise/Wagner Productions and Amenábar, see note.88, above.

identified in order to establish each film's defining characteristics, similar and different, for the analysis below. For example, while *Vanilla Sky* also shifts between past and present, real and virtual time, it instead navigates the conscious and subconscious mind of thirty-three year old David Aames. Almost identically to César, David is initially portrayed as an arrogant yet charming young man, living audaciously off the inheritance received from his father's successful publishing house, following the death of both his parents in a car accident several years earlier. As in *Abre los ojos*, we realise that this early portrayal is a part of David's past, when the film shifts swiftly to a scene which shows the protagonist in an interrogation room, charged with murder, and reluctantly trying to piece together his past with the help of a psychologist called McCabe.

As is also the case in *Abre los ojos*, the events leading to David's alleged crime begin with a party he gives for his birthday, at which he spurns the advancements of his emotionally attached lover, Julie, and instead pursues the object of his best friend's affections, Sofia. After spending the night at Sofia's apartment, where a chemistry between she and David is clearly ignited, David's sexual drive gets the better of him and he accepts a ride with Julie, who confronts him in Sofia's street. As did Nuria with César, Julia struggles to come to terms with David's insensitive treatment of her, and suddenly drives her car off the road. She is killed instantly and David's once-charming face is left severely disfigured, and so he wears a prosthetic facemask during his meetings with McCabe.

David's memories of the time after his accident also seem real at first, showing him unable to accept his grotesque appearance yet continuing to pursue Sofia. In scenes that are lifted directly from *Abre los ojos*, *Vanilla Sky* then shifts again in tone, into what

appears to be a dream-state turned nightmare. At first Sofia returns David's love, despite his disfigurement, and they are living happily together. His face, as was César's, is restored to its original state. Then David's mind starts playing tricks on him, and he keeps seeing Julie in Sofia's place. In a deluded rage, David appears to suffocate and kill Sofia, but then as he slowly unravels these memories to McCabe, the missing pieces of his mind begin to fit together and an American company, also called "Life Extension" and specializing in cryogenics, enters what has so far been perceived as his "reality."

David discovers he never won Sofia's love and was never able to restore his face to its original state. Instead, like César, he committed suicide after signing a contract with "Life Extension," on the agreement that this company would freeze his body until life-renewal was possible, whereupon he would resume the life he knew, but as a "lucid dream." Subsequently, David's renewed mind has been playing and re-playing his virtual reality, one that he chose in place of the reality he actually lived. Upon realising his dream "reality" has malfunctioned and turned into a nightmare, David yells out for "tech support," which comes in the form of a "Life Extension" representative. David is offered the same choice as César: have his "lucid dream" begin again but without the nightmarish "glitch," and keep "living" the life he has always known, or be woken from his dream and awake in the future, to live a new life without disfigurement, and with no knowledge of his past existence.

As postmodern texts that examine the correlation between commodification and popular culture, *Abre los ojos* and *Vanilla Sky* share an almost identical storyline, one that defies any fixed genre allocation by tapping into several at once (science fiction, suspense, horror, melodrama and romance). This similarity is underscored, however, by

contextual and cultural differences that shall provide a pretext for the following discussion of these films, regarding the concept of authorship as capable of shifting in both meaning and connotation through cross-cultural cinematic recycling.

Firstly, *Abre los ojos* is set against the backdrop of contemporary Madrid, but is rarely reliant upon the overt identity of this setting, which more often than not becomes universally ascribed in its abstractness. The most overt moment of recognition occurs when César runs through the empty streets of Madrid's central area, but even then the shot remains predominantly non-descript. In contrast, *Vanilla Sky* is set very clearly within the heart of contemporary Manhattan, with few universal abstractions apparent. This is evident from the opening scene, in which the camera swoops high above central park, to the scene in which David runs through an eerily empty Times Square, to the final scene, in which the former twin towers of downtown Manhattan are framed in the distance against the building David is about to fall from, in order to wake from his "reality." Purely in terms of identifiable cultural settings, of time and place, *Vanilla Sky* eschews the assertion of a Hollywood-as-global paradigm by revealing its setting as distinctly American, far more overtly than *Abre los ojos* chooses to reveal its postmodern Spanish setting.

Secondly, the depiction of science and technology's rapidly advancing impact on humanity, which is an issue central to both films, reveals a more subtle contextual and cultural point of difference between Amenábar's *Abre los ojos* and Crowe's *Vanilla Sky*, which underscores their textual similarity. *Abre los ojos* depicts the globally commodified world that encompasses César's existence (computer enhancement, cryogenics and virtual reality) as one that, while alluring, has the potential to erase an

individual's ability to function morally and ethically. As Christina Buckley observes, the result is a film located at the intersection of postmodern, global yet local concerns:

[...] *Abre los ojos* seems to shun the very scientific technology upon which it bases its sci-fi thriller appeal. As one critic declares of this film's representation, 'In the wake of rapidly advancing computer technology, cryogenics, virtual reality, and the global economy, what threatens to proliferate is Eurocentrism, American capitalism, and the suppression of 'difference'.' (18)

Amenábar's "distinctively chilly" style (Smith 50), which has prompted comparisons of his three feature films to Hitchcock,⁹⁵ contributes greatly to the ambivalent depiction of science and technology in *Abre los ojos*, particularly the way it informs our everyday perceptions and ideas of the real world. Presenting César's "reality" as endemic of a rush to embrace the excitement of postmodernism despite its possibly ominous undercurrent, is emblematic of Amenábar's desire to simultaneously entertain and probe the minds of his audience. This distinctly authorial intention of Amenábar's, discussed further below, resonates in *Abre los ojos*, a film contextually

⁹⁵ These three films being *Tesis* (1996); *Abre los ojos* (1997); and *Los Otros* (2001). As well as Paul-Julian Smith, "Open Your Eyes," review of *Abre los ojos*, *Sight and Sound* 10.3 (2000) 50, see Buckley "Alejandro Amenábar's *Tesis*," 12-25; Nick James' discussion of *The Others*, "Dread Again," *Sight and Sound* 11.11 (2001) 18-19; and Rob Stone, *Spanish Cinema* (Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2002); Stone, for example, discusses direct links between *Abre los ojos* and Hitchcock's *Vertigo* (1958). Interestingly, Marsha Kinder identifies various Spanish directors who have been notably influenced by Hitchcock, not just aesthetically but also as an instance of Hollywood filmmaking that recognises both creative and commercial integrity; an approach (as discussed below) central to Amenábar's authorial mode (*Blood Cinema* 350-352).

indicative of the (re)positioning of contemporary Spanish cinema, embodying issues that surface at the interface of global/local processes.

In contrast, *Vanilla Sky* portrays the imminent acceleration of science and technology upon humanity as a thrill that, despite its detrimental effect on David, remains a rush by never fully emerging as a serious threat. In this respect *Vanilla Sky* eschews *Abre los ojos*' darker edge, revealing a more celebratory, as opposed to cautionary, take on popular culture, depicted by Crowe as an idealism based upon humaneness.⁹⁶ It's an approach that is ideologically and economically amenable to the Hollywood film market, which is not only in many ways the demagogue of popular culture, but has long promoted the inherently populist idea that, as Kellner notes, "money and success were important values" (132). Additionally, the distinct lean towards celebrating, despite a little cautioning, the possible immersion in and commodification of popular culture in today's postmodern era, is emblematic of Crowe's self-confessed preoccupation with the "sweet and sour" in life,⁹⁷ discussed further below.

At this point, therefore, *Abre los ojos* and *Vanilla Sky* serve to strengthen the argument put forward in previous studies, such as Durham's or Mazdon's, that textual similarity and contextual, cultural difference co-exist, however obscurely at times, within the practice of cross-cultural cinematic recycling. As mentioned above, however, this

⁹⁶ See Mark Olsen, "The Uncool," *Film Comment* 36.5 (2000) 61-66; Todd McCarthy, "Vanilla Sky," review of *Vanilla Sky*, *Variety* 10-16 Dec. 2001, 32; and John Wrathall, "Some Like It Sweet," *Sight and Sound* 11.1 (2001) 38-39. This difference, between caution and celebration, is particularly apparent in the films' respective endings. Whereas César is shown shooting people dead in the final moments of *Abre los ojos*, as the desperation of his "life" (or lucid dream) turns to violence before clarity, David is shown reaching a point of passive self-acceptance in the final moments of *Vanilla Sky*, as the desperation of his "life" (or lucid dream) turns to an emotional, and notably more romantic, clarity than that experienced by César.

study shall steer away from a traditionally based analysis of the remake process, toward a consideration of the cinematic, cultural specificity and difference that is evident between *Abre los ojos* and *Vanilla Sky*, on an authorial level. In other words, the question here is how is Amenábar's authorial strategy positioned alongside Crowe's, and how does this positioning reveal the cross-cultural movement, and subsequent transnational character, of film authorship via the remake process?

Re-negotiating Auteurism at the Global/Local Interface: Alejandro Amenábar

Much has been written in recent years about the resurgence of Spanish cinema.⁹⁸ A common thread that emerges in this body of writing is the recognition of contemporary Spanish cinema as one that situates itself at the forefront of the global/local interface, indicative of a recently implemented nationalist agenda, "where the Socialist Ministry of Culture has been active in financially supporting the promotion of its cinema and auteurs for world consumption" (Kinder 1993: 8). There is a sense that Spain "is at last recast in a starring role" (14) within the "re-imagining" of a pan-European identity, considered earlier in this study, by situating its own "community" as one of hybridity; capable of

⁹⁷ Crowe alludes to this preoccupation several times on the commentary he provides for the DVD release of *Vanilla Sky*, as does David's best friend Brian, as well as the "Life Extension" representative, in the film itself.

⁹⁸ See, for instance, D'Lugo "Recent"; Peter William Evans, ed. Spanish Cinema: The Auteurist Tradition (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999); Jordan and Morgan-Tamosunas Contemporary; Kinder Blood Cinema; Kinder, ed. Refiguring Spain: Cinema/Media/Representation (Durham: Duke UP, 1997); and Stone Spanish. Additionally, for an overview of most of these and other texts, see Kathleen M. Vernon, "Review Essay: Recent Books on Spanish Cinema in the 1990s: A Global Perspective," Post Script 21.2 (2002) 90-100.

retaining its specific cultural (local) roots whilst embracing a distinctly transcultural (global) agenda.⁹⁹

The result of Spanish cinema's recent resurgence, as Marvin D'Lugo comments, has been an impressively "diverse thematic, stylistic and cultural range of recent Spanish cinema" (3), in large part shaped by astute young directors "whose objective is to chart the ongoing series of renegotiations between Spain's past of cultural and political isolation and its future as part of a regional as well as a globalized media culture" (8). Of particular interest, within this "objective," is the awareness and willingness of contemporary Spanish directors to merge art and commerce. Offering Pedro Almodóvar and Fernando Trueba as examples, D'Lugo recognises this "recent marriage of art and commerce in Spanish film" (8) as one that is exemplified by the presence of intersubjective authorial strategies: "Almodóvar and Trueba have come to recognize that the success of a film *owes as much to business astuteness as to artistic vision*. The achievement of each director has not been merely the result of good luck but of a well-defined commercial strategy" (4; emphasis added).

Alejandro Amenábar is no exception to D'Lugo's "recent marriage" in Spanish cinema. He promotes an authorial mode that celebrates hybridity by situating itself not only at the interface of the global and local but also at the forefront of a cinema that repositions itself within the parameters of intersubjective agency and reception. As D'Lugo notes, Amenábar can be counted amongst those young Spanish directors who, in

⁹⁹ As Kinder goes on to conclude, this agenda positions Spain as an ideal instance of a "European case study for the global/local nexus" (*Blood Cinema* 391). Recognising the validity of such a claim, Stone more recently observes that while "Spaniards fear that Spain might also be losing its identity by allowing its cultural differences to be erased by the flood of American culture and subsumed into the concept of a united Europe [...] it's a worry that originates with an older generation [...] younger Spaniards embrace the optimistic, multi-cultural definition of Spanishness that makes them free citizens of their world" (202).

the last decade, have been “transforming the look of Spanish film while responding to and also reshaping the multiple audiences of that cinema” (5). This young generation of Spanish filmmakers, which as earlier mentioned includes Juanma Bajo Ulloa, Julio Medem and Alex de la Iglesia, have been quick to embrace an “aesthetic consciousness” (7) that draws upon American popular culture, particularly the “blockbuster” genre films that define post-New Hollywood. What consequently distinguishes these young Spanish filmmakers from their predecessors, as D’Lugo points out, is their unashamedly global/local vision:

Indeed, what makes the presence of this generation significant to audiences and scholars outside of Spain is the apparent ease with which their films cross borders; films like Alex de la Iglesia’s futuristic *Day of the Beast / Día de la bestia* is shown at science fiction festivals, while thrillers like *Open Your Eyes [Abre los ojos]* gain distribution in the U.S. and European youth market. (7)

Amenábar dropped out of a film course at Madrid’s Complutense University after he “famously failed the narrative component of the course” (Smith 50). As Paul Julian Smith notes, Amenábar’s subsequent arrival on the Spanish film scene was indicative of the young Spaniard’s swift rejection of an institutional approach to filmmaking, in favour of asserting his authorial autonomy:

His revenge at the age of just 24 was *Tesis/Thesis*, a sleek, taut thriller on the theme of snuff movies in which the serial killer, a professor of media studies, was given the same name as Amenábar's own luckless tutor. Shown in the UK only at the London Film Festival, *Tesis* was a sensation in Spain, where it had almost a million domestic admissions and won a clutch of Goyas, the Spanish Oscars. (50)

Even at this initial stage of his filmmaking career, Amenábar's creative vision is combined with his ability to reach a popular youth audience, winning Goyas and creating a box office frenzy, while also displaying a cinephilic admiration for the art of cinema that is clearly recognised by purveyors of the international film festival circuit.

The release of *Abre los ojos* in 1997, which enjoyed similar commercial and critical success to *Tesis*, cemented Amenábar's status as an "auteur-star" (Corrigan 105) both within Spain and abroad. This status is emblematic of an auteur tradition in Spanish cinema that embraces the alignment, rather than demarcation, of traditional (artistically based) and popular (commercially driven) auteurism,¹⁰⁰ and which has subsequently encouraged the positioning of "auteur-star" films, that would in most other film markets be labelled "art-house," as part of popular Spanish cinema (Evans xviii).¹⁰¹ Directors such as Almodóvar and Trueba, as discussed above, are ideal examples of this tradition, as is Amenábar an ideal example of how this tradition is continuing within contemporary Spanish cinema, to the point that the generation of young directors of which Amenábar is

¹⁰⁰ For more on this subject, see D'Lugo "Recent"; Evans *Spanish Cinema*; and Vernon "Review."

¹⁰¹ As Buckley also notes, "This cult of the auteur [...] is hardly a new phenomenon for Spanish cinema" (15).

a part, have ensured their artistic, auteurist credibility is compatible with recapturing Spanish audiences at the box office (Vernon 94).

The continuation and advancement of Spain's auteur tradition, as embodied by a filmmaker such as Amenábar, has facilitated, as Buckley argues, a "transformation in the Spanish philosophy towards the seventh art: the acceptance by audiences, directors, producers, critics, and the media that art and commerce are not necessarily an incompatible combination" (12). Subsequently, there is a current resurgence of the traditional auteur in contemporary Spanish cinema, re-positioned along the lines of Corrigan's "commercial performance of *the business of being an auteur*" (104), in that it demonstrates the capacity to recognise the commercial and even critical popularity that can accompany such auteurism.¹⁰² Amenábar's positioning of himself as an "auteur of commerce" (107-108) is apparent, for instance, with his promotion of a cinema that on the one hand, as Peter William Evans observes and as was noted above, participates in an "intertextual cross-fertilization with Hollywood,"¹⁰³ while on the other hand strives at "educating its audience into developing a taste for mature treatment of sophisticated material" (3).

Buckley notes that Amenábar addresses "in almost every interview his desire to make movies that will entertain audiences, as well as force them to question what they may passively accept" (18). Amenábar's authorial strategy reveals itself in the interview process, a convenient channel through which to engage his auteurism as a form of

¹⁰² Aside from Almodóvar, Trueba and Amenábar, Juanma Bajo Ulloa, Carlos Saura, José Luis Borau, Julio Medem and Bigas Luna are other (by no means exclusive) examples that come to mind. See D'Lugo "Recent"; Evans Spanish Cinema; Stone Spanish; and Vernon "Review."

¹⁰³ This "cross-fertilization" with Hollywood has something of a history in Spanish cinema, identified by Kinder as a tendency to combine both "Hollywood conventions and Spanish specificity" (Blood Cinema 347), which in itself further strengthens the global/local inflections of Spanish cinema (340-347).

intersubjective agency and reception. This point is further substantiated by the following remarks made by Amenábar, to an online publication:

When I wrote my first film, I could see that I could have some input, apart from the plot and the tricks, that I could create suspense and raise questions. I imagine an audience's point of view. I try to work on both levels [...] I like to ask questions that are big to me, but have an audience ask them of themselves, in their own way. (Fuchs)

Amenábar's authorial strategy, it can be concluded, is defined by both an awareness of the populist agenda of post-New Hollywood cinema, as well as an acknowledgement of his country's auteurist tradition, as one that ensures commercial auteurism is compatible with artistic auteurism. In this respect Amenábar locates himself at the crossroads of popular and traditional auteurism, and at the interface of local and global concerns, encouraging the "re-imagining" of a new global-Spanish culture, informed by its artistic heritage yet shaped by the recognition of transnational, global commercialism. As Smith concludes in his review of *Abre los ojos*, "Amenábar's virtuoso style and connection to the youth audience [...] make him a plausible model outside Spain for a European cinema that bridges the gap between arthouse and mainstream" (50).¹⁰⁴

Smith's observation can be extended further, in that Amenábar, as a recognised (trans)national filmmaker, becomes a "plausible model" to bridge gaps not only between "arthouse and mainstream" but between local and global film markets, narrowing this gap

in terms of Hollywood's dominating claim to the latter, and a cinema such as Spain's as the former. Auteur-stars such as Amenábar, in narrowing this gap, further enable a recognition of the transnational, transcultural exchange – heralding an instance of Bakhtin's "cross-eyed dialectic" – that can result when cinema is posited at the juncture of the global/local interface, by way of a process such as cross-cultural cinematic recycling. This is the case, for instance, when an American filmmaker, Cameron Crowe, turns to a Spanish film, such as *Abre los ojos*, as a source of inspiration for his own national cultural "re-imagining" of that filmic text, *Vanilla Sky*.

Locating the American within the Global: Cameron Crowe

A former music journalist with the popular magazine Rolling Stone, Cameron Crowe adapted his own novel, Fast Times at Ridgemont High, into his first feature film, of the same title, in 1982. Since then, Crowe became increasingly known, with films such as *Say Anything* (1989), *Singles* (1992), *Jerry Maguire* (1996) and *Almost Famous* (2000), as a director-screenwriter whose films "take a hip, wry, reflective approach to 80s and 90s youth culture" (Katz 311). The huge success of *Jerry Maguire*, starring Tom Cruise, marked Crowe's rise to Hollywood notoriety, and the two reunited to make *Vanilla Sky*, as earlier discussed. Crowe meanwhile continued with his directing-screenwriting talents, adapting Amenábar's screenplay of *Abre los ojos* himself.

¹⁰⁴ A similar implication is made by Stone, who argues that Amenábar "feeds off Hollywood and MTV, video games and the Internet, but has harnessed this enthusiasm to an astute sense of narrative and an exemplary way with genre" (201).

Crowe's high profile in the American music and film industries denotes his deep affiliation with, and love of, popular culture.¹⁰⁵ Heavily intertextual, his films are imbued with various cultural icons and artifacts (particularly those associated with music and film), to the point that they offer the audience "a life defined by popular culture, where it is impossible to tell where pop leaves off and reality begins" (Hampton 53). Crowe himself seems defined by this preoccupation with popular culture, promoting an "auteurist reception" (Grant 107) based upon this culture's commodification, which reveals its close resemblance to the global promotion of American popular culture that has notably affected contemporary theories of "Americanisation," discussed earlier in this study.

Crowe fills his commentary on the Paramount DVD release of *Vanilla Sky* (2002), for instance, with mention of popular icons that are either directly or indirectly referenced in *Vanilla Sky*, icons such as Howard Hawks, Billy Wilder, Bob Dylan and the French New Wave. Pausing at one point to contemplate their omnipresence in David's life, he speaks specifically of a scene in which David is in his cell drawing pictures of Sofia, while the camera shows an image of Sofia sitting opposite David, posing for him in different ways. Crowe comments that this scene, which doesn't occur in *Abre los ojos*, is "a little bit of an homage to the French New Wave heroine," and concludes that such moments necessarily inform and pervade the protagonist's life (and the viewer's eye)

¹⁰⁵ Writing specifically about *Vanilla Sky*, for instance, McCarthy observes that Crowe's pervasive use of pop culture as a form of intertextuality becomes a kind of "fetishism" in *Vanilla Sky*, to the point that "it begins to reflect what we know of Crowe much more than it illuminates anything about David" (32); this observation is expanded upon in the following pages. See also Howard Hampton, "Clear Vanilla Skies: 'Cryotainment' and the Modern Science of Transcendence," *Film Comment* 38.2 (2002) 52-53; and Olsen "The Uncool".

because they act as part of David's conscience, central to the process of "a man trying to figure himself out."

Aside from the culturally specific rhetoric apparent in Crowe's approach, specifically that of the individual (read: white American male) as the narrative's driving force, which reveals an exploration of American masculinity as a form of existential crisis,¹⁰⁶ his comments reveal more to his audience about his own cultural identity than about the film itself. As discussed earlier in this study, within the framework of Hedetoft's "(re)nationalisation process" (282) and post-New Hollywood, this cinema relies upon a tradition of inserting specifically American (no matter how universally appropriated) values and ideologies, such as those that define notions of masculinity.¹⁰⁷ Crowe's observation during his DVD commentary, that the prevailing psychological confusion of *Vanilla Sky* is "all [David's] consciousness [...] the whole movie is rattling around inside his brain," suggests the postmodern, post-feminist crisis of contemporary masculinity, which finds its parallel in the postmodern de-fragmentation of post-New Hollywood films, such as Crowe's.

The cultural specificity apparent in Crowe's approach regarding *Vanilla Sky* subsequently informs his authorial mode, his "commercial performance of *the business of being an auteur*." Having always widely promoted his love of the film industry and its stars, Crowe claims particular admiration for Hawks and Wilder, having recently

¹⁰⁶ Discussing the "kind of exquisite thing" about Cruise's performance, for instance, Crowe claims the actor is "using what you know of him as Tom Cruise, to put a spin on pop culture and the psyche of the American male."

¹⁰⁷ A re-assessment of traditional notions of masculinity, for instance, can be traced back to the emergence of New Hollywood, such as *Easy Rider* (1969) and *Taxi Driver* (1976), right through to a surge of post-New Hollywood films that deal with the crisis of (American) masculinity, such as *Falling Down* (1993), *Fight Club* (1999) and *Cast Away* (2000).

published an extensive book of interviews with the latter, as well as of French New Wave cinema and its directors, particularly François Truffaut (Crowe).¹⁰⁸ Additionally, his self-confessed favourite novel is *To Kill a Mockingbird* (Crowe). Scenes from the film *To Kill a Mockingbird* (Robert Mulligan, 1962) are shown throughout *Vanilla Sky*, at first subtly (on the prison warden's monitor) and then directly towards the film's end, as David travels up the lift in the "Life Extension" building and his "reality," his "lucid dream," is visually realised as a chronology of rapidly edited moments that are shaped, through his conscience, by popular culture.¹⁰⁹

In terms of his authorial strategy, it can be concluded that Crowe's heavily intertextual promotion of and participation in popular culture, as a form of both discourse and entertainment, reveals a distinctly postmodern vision of creativity, apparent in *Vanilla Sky*, from which emerges his own "re-imagining" of a "new global-American culture" (Polan 1996: 263). David's existence, for instance, in which his perceived "reality" morphs with the trappings of his "lucid dream," recalls Polan's identification of "several motifs" that embody the above culture as conveyed by Crowe in *Vanilla Sky*. There is an emphasis on movement, whether real or virtual (David's perception, which becomes the viewer's perception); on communication, specifically new media (David's immersion in popular culture, heightened by the surroundings of Manhattan, a global communications/new media hub); and on services, with regards to commodity-consumer dynamics (David's contract with "Life Extension," an American company he locates on

¹⁰⁸ See also a section in Olsen "The Uncool," titled "A Fan's Notes by Cameron Crowe," which details the director's love of these (and other) popular culture icons (64).

¹⁰⁹ As his "technical support" says to David while they are travelling up the lift: "[...] you sculpted your lucid dream out of the iconography of your youth." Tellingly, given the previous point regarding Crowe's own preoccupation with the popular culture of his own youth, the images that flash before the screen show not only *To Kill a Mockingbird*, but also a Bob Dylan album cover and Truffaut's *Jules and Jim* (1961).

the web). *Vanilla Sky* also focuses on interaction, which is more “cybernetic” than corporeal (David’s “lucid dream”), and on narrative or plots (the rapid advancement of science and technology, of which America plays a leading role, and its impact on humanity), which are “about the mediation between various subcultures of the global economy” (263-269). Crowe’s championing of a “new global-American culture” emerges from his authorial positioning with *Vanilla Sky*, itself facilitated by the transnational process of cross-cultural cinematic recycling.

Creative Collaboration: Amenábar/*Abre los ojos* and Crowe/*Vanilla Sky*

Abre los ojos and *Vanilla Sky* provoke a particularly interesting examination of the remake process given the way they have been jointly, positively associated. The uniquely open affiliation Amenábar and Crowe encourage between the two films departs from the traditionally pejorative treatment of the remake process, wherein such an acknowledgment is rarely, if at all, welcome. Given that *Vanilla Sky* by no means proved an exception to the “blockbuster” release strategy that is emblematic of post-New Hollywood cinema,¹¹⁰ its release was uncharacteristically promoted, both commercially and critically, as a “cover version” of Amenábar’s *Abre los ojos*.¹¹¹ Asked in an online

¹¹⁰ Particularly given Tom Cruise’s involvement as both co-producer and star of *Vanilla Sky*; his extensive campaigning of this film aside (see “Hitting it Hard” on the DVD release), Cruise’s brand-name power in Hollywood is such that any project associated with his name invariably assumes “blockbuster” potential.

¹¹¹ See also Xan Brooks, “Vanilla Sky,” review of *Vanilla Sky*, *Sight and Sound* 12.2 (2002) 63-64. For examples of this endorsement on a commercial level, which is essentially embodied by the film’s entire marketing strategy, see the DVD release of *Vanilla Sky*, specifically Crowe’s commentary and the two short films “Prelude to a Dream” and “Hitting it Hard”; www.vanillasky.com (the site also references the idea of Crowe’s film being a “cover” of Amenábar’s); and James Mottram, “Cameron Crowe: Vanilla Sky,” <www.bbc.co.uk/films/2002/01/24/cameron_crowe_vanilla_sky_interview.shtml>. On a critical level, which offers an insight into the possible dissolution of the traditionally pejorative treatment of

interview whether he was “careful about paying homage” to Amenábar’s film, Crowe responds,

Any interest in doing the movie came from us being fans of *Open Your Eyes*. We really wanted to do something different. We wanted Alejandro to embrace our movie as an extension, or a conversation, not a remake, as such, but a way to build on the poetry of his movie. (Mottram)

Crowe’s response indicates a desire to include Amenábar as a collaborator to the American director’s own brand-name vision; a point which in itself offers a fascinating example of authorship as a transnational form of intersubjective agency.

In reference to the final scene in *Vanilla Sky*, for instance, Crowe discusses David’s final farewell to Sofia on the rooftop of “Life Extension” as a moment when his creative strategy collaborates with Amenábar’s, without ever being identical:

[This scene] is just one of the more original ways two lovers can say goodbye in a story, and I gotta hand it to Alejandro Amenábar, because it’s his creation. When he saw the movie, he said some really inspiring stuff to me [...] he really loved [David’s] line, ‘I’m frozen, you’re dead, and I love you’. He said, ‘Oh man, I wish that was in my movie’, but [...] they’re all in both movies, the different interpretations, and the different roads you can travel. (Crowe)

remakes when the original source is considered part of the overall creative process, see Brooks “Vanilla”; and McCarthy “Vanilla”.

Similarly, in an approach that defies traditional Euro-American binarisms (typical to his own authorial mode), Amenábar openly supports the cross-cultural process that is apparent on both a filmic level, in terms of *Abre los ojos* and *Vanilla Sky*, and an authorial one, in terms of himself and Crowe:

I'm very excited. I haven't been involved at all but I think it's been very carefully adapted and with a lot of respect. Something that Cameron [Crowe] and Tom [Cruise] insisted on was that it be treated well, like a cover of an old song. I feel very flattered and I think that Cameron is very, very talented. ("Vanilla to")

Amenábar and Crowe's authorial collaboration paves the way for an acknowledgement of the textual, cultural and conceptual exchange that can occur via the process of cross-cultural cinematic recycling, in this case between *Abre los ojos* and *Vanilla Sky*. Just as valid, therefore, as the equation that drives the analysis presented in this case study – same filmic text + different authorial mode = conceptual, cultural and cinematic difference – is that of: same filmic text + different authorial mode = conceptual, cultural and cinematic *collaboration*. An ideal illustration of this point appears on the additional footage of the DVD release of *Vanilla Sky*. It shows the two filmmakers together in Madrid, toward the end of an extensively publicised campaign for *Vanilla Sky*. Penélope Cruz stands in the middle of Amenábar and Crowe, arms around them both, while Crowe says to the camera, "A path travelled, by both of us."

Significantly, the collaborative aspect of the Amenábar's *Abre los ojos* and Crowe's *Vanilla Sky* reveals the inherently transnational, shifting nature of authorship (and auteurism) as a concept that is informed by creative, as well as contextual and cultural, similarity and difference.

Equally significant, with regards to the collaborative aspect of Amenábar's *Abre los ojos* and Crowe's *Vanilla Sky*, is the way in which traditionally pejorative notions of cross-cultural cinematic recycling are challenged and subverted. Both films, and by extension Amenábar and Crowe, offer themselves as creative *and* commercial products, individually distinct yet aligned by an ever-changing, nationally and culturally dialogic filmmaking process. Cross-cultural cinematic recycling, therefore, is an enduring film practice that situates itself proudly at the intersection of global and local concerns in film studies. It is capable of illuminating each filmmaker's (trans)national, (trans)cultural characteristics and approaches, all the while providing invaluable insights into the theoretical and critical viability of notions such as film authorship.

Conclusion

My aim with this study has been to demonstrate that cross-cultural cinematic recycling offers a valid and viable topic of research in film studies, as a transnational film practice that both illuminates and encourages the notion of film authorship as a fluid, transitory concept, capable of shifting from one cultural cinematic context to another. My intention has been to argue that the practice of cross-cultural cinematic recycling has significance to notions of national cinema and film authorship, that must necessarily be considered in distinct historical, socio-cultural and cinematic contexts. In this instance, the remaking of popular European films by post-New Hollywood was offered as a contextual framework for the encouragement of a re-examination of concepts of authorship and national cinema. Situated at the interface of global/local processes, cross-cultural cinematic recycling demonstrates that the conditions under which national cinema and film authorship may, or may not, be assigned to filmic texts vary according to the cinematic, cultural (historical) context within which they are produced, viewed and interpreted.

The framing of popular European and post-New Hollywood cinemas as this study's two cinematic, cultural points of contextualisation enabled a consideration of notions of cultural specificity, difference and transcultural hybridization that exist within and between them. Whereas popular European cinema has been traditionally defined against a European cultural identity reliant upon its modernist heritage, one that has tended to denounce the popular in favour of the artistic as a form of national cultural expression, post-New Hollywood cinema has been widely defined within the postmodern

parameters of its globally hegemonic status, one that has tended to overlook individual creativity in favour of corporate commercial productivity.

My analysis of these traditionally held definitions of popular European and post-New Hollywood cinemas in film studies served to demonstrate their reductive character, through its argument that contemporary European cinema is undergoing a “re-imagining” according to Anderson’s modernist notion of the nation as an “imagined community,” alongside its increasingly pan-European status, located at the interface of localisation and globalisation, modernism and postmodernism. The “popular” in contemporary European cinema has emerged as an integral aspect of the acknowledgment of this “re-imagining,” most notably by encouraging the alignment, rather than demarcation, of art and commerce. Likewise, my analysis presented the commonly ascribed “global” status of post-New Hollywood as one that mistakenly precludes its consideration as a national cinema, despite its inherently American cultural identity, most notably with regards to the promotion, no matter how universally appropriated, of specifically American values and ideologies.

Having considered the cinematic and cultural contexts of popular European and post-New Hollywood cinemas alongside notions of the national, in order to demonstrate the significance of concepts of national cinema to transnational film practices such as cross-cultural cinematic recycling, I was then able to direct this consideration toward a recognition of transnational authorial practices. In particular, postmodern auteurism was defined in the second chapter of this study as both a textual and intertextual strategy, capable of being appropriated as a form of artistic expression and/or industrial reception. This conceptualization in turn demonstrated the fluid, changing nature of authorship, its

ability to shift from one cultural, cinematic context (popular European cinema) to another (post-New Hollywood cinema), by way of transnational, cross-cultural cinematic recycling. Of particular relevance at this point, therefore, was the consideration of Corrigan's concept of intersubjective commercial auteurism, manifest as a strategic "brand-name vision" (102), when associated with the same filmic text yet situated within markedly different cinematic and cultural traditions.

The above approach reinforced the need to dismantle previously reductive binary oppositions within film studies, specifically in this case that of Hollywood-as-(blockbuster)global cinema/European-as-(artistic)national cinema, by demonstrating that the "traditional" auteur is not averse to its own form of commodification, in turn positioning it alongside the "popular" auteur as an aligned yet distinct branding strategy within both European and American film cultures. This prompted the (re)assessment of authorship within a (trans)national perspective, in particular its transition, in terms of both meaning and connotation, between different cultural, cinematic contexts, in this instance as significant to the remaking of popular European films by post-New Hollywood cinema.

The above consideration brought to attention two needs. Firstly, within a European context, there is a need to accommodate the growing recognition of what I defined as "popular" auteurism, shaped by postmodern intersubjective authorial strategies, alongside what I termed "traditional" auteurism, informed by a modernist heritage that promotes individual creation, manifest as "auteur desire" (Polan 2001: 1) and subject to a recent resurgence, despite its contentious history within film studies. Secondly, within an American (Hollywood) context, there is a need to recognise the

existence of individual style and creative control (traditional auteurism) within an industry with a predominantly studio-based, populist agenda. In other words, to acknowledge the interchangeability of traditional and popular types of auteurism, according to their cultural, cinematic context.

My exploration in this study of the significance of notions of authorship and national cinema to transnational, cross-cultural cinematic recycling, led to the proposal, and subsequent application, of the following equation: same filmic text + different authorial mode = conceptual, cultural and cinematic difference. Fundamental to the theoretical framework of this study, this equation provided the conceptual backbone for the case study in the third chapter, presented in order to demonstrate the viability of authorship as a theoretical and critical approach with which to consider – and compare – particular transnational, transcultural cinematic practices, such as cross-cultural cinematic recycling.

The analysis of Alejandro Amenábar's *Abre los ojos* and Cameron Crowe's *Vanilla Sky* as an instance of cross-cultural cinematic recycling demonstrated Amenábar's authorial mode as one that is characterised by both traditional and popular auteurism, defined by an intertextual participation with the commercial underpinnings of the post-New Hollywood system, while at the same time opposing this to distinctly artistic, culturally specific auteurist inflections. This particular interpretation of film authorship underwent its own re-assessment, however, when it shifted, via the same filmic text, into Crowe's authorial mode, characterised by the promotion of and participation in popular culture as a form of cinematic entertainment, from within which emerges the re-imagining of a new global-American culture. My analysis of Amenábar's

Abre los ojos and Crowe's *Vanilla Sky*, and their individual authorial strategies, led to the revelation of an authorial collaboration between Amenábar and Crowe that indicates the malleable potential of film authorship as a form of cultural exchange, as well as a concept capable of revealing itself as both a national and *transnational* type of intersubjective agency.

This last point led to the acknowledgment, fundamental to the concerns of this study's original purpose and outcome, that traditionally pejorative notions of cross-cultural cinematic recycling can be, and may gradually be in the process of being challenged and subverted. It reveals a move towards the recognition, in other words, that a film and its recycled version can be defined as both creative and commercial products, individually marked yet aligned by the interchangeable, dialogic filmmaking process of cross-cultural cinematic recycling. As Mazdon argues,

What is certain is that as a form of cross-cultural exchange, the remake provides a privileged point of access for [the] very necessary reconsideration of the nation and its relation to cinema and of the various oppositions between high and popular cultural forms which result from a positing of distinct national cultures. (8)

Echoing Mazdon's thinking, this study has argued ultimately for the recognition of cross-cultural cinematic recycling as a transnational film practice that provokes a re-assessment of various on-going and emergent concepts in film studies. In this case, the consideration of post-New Hollywood recycling films from popular European cinema encouraged a re-

examination of notions of authorship and national cinema, by revealing the remake phenomenon as a “privileged point of access for [the] very necessary reconsideration” of what are ultimately enduring and relevant, yet inherently transitory, critical and theoretical approaches in film studies.

Works Cited

- Anderson, Benedict. Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism. 2nd ed. London: Verso, 1991.
- Andrew, Dudley. "The Unauthorised Auteur Today." Film Theory Goes to the Movies. Eds. Jim Collins, Hilary Radner, and Ava Preacher Collins. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Bordwell, David. "Art Cinema as a Mode of Film Practice." Film Criticism. 4.1 (1979): 56-64.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1984.
- Brooks, Xan. "Vanilla Sky." Review of *Vanilla Sky*. Sight and Sound. 12.2 (2002): 63-64.
- Buckley, Christina A. "Alejandro Amenábar's *Tesis*: Art, Commerce and Renewal in Spanish Cinema." Post Script. 21.2 (2002): 12-25.
- Buscombe, Edward. "Ideas of Authorship." Theories of Authorship. Ed. John Caughie. London: Routledge, 1981.
- Caughie, John. "Teaching through Authorship." Screen Education. 17 (1975): 3 -13.
- , ed. Theories of Authorship. London: Routledge, 1981.
- Clayton, Sue and Jonathan Curling. "On Authorship." Screen. 20.1 (1979): 35-61.
- Collins, Jim, Hilary Radner, and Ava Preacher Collins, eds. Film Theory Goes to the Movies. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Corrigan, Timothy. A Cinema Without Walls: Movies and Culture after Vietnam. New

- Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1991.
- Crofts, Stephen. "Authorship and Hollywood." Wide Angle. 5.3 (1983): 16–22.
- . "Reconceptualizing National Cinema/s." Quarterly Review of Film and Video. 14.3 (1993): 49-67.
- . "Authorship and Hollywood." The Oxford Guide to Film Studies. Eds. John Hill and Pamela Church Gibson. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998 (a).
- . "Concepts of National Cinema." The Oxford Guide to Film Studies. Eds. John Hill and Pamela Church Gibson. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998 (b).
- Crowe, Cameron. Commentary on DVD Release of *Vanilla Sky*. Paramount Pictures, 2002.
- Darke, Chris. "Rupture, continuity and diversification: *Cahiers du cinéma* in the 1980s." Screen. 34.4 (1993): 362-379.
- Degli-Esposti, Cristina, ed. Postmodernism in the Cinema. New York: Berghahn Books, 1998.
- de Grazia, Victoria. "European cinema and the idea of Europe, 1925-95." Hollywood and Europe: Economics, Culture, National Identity: 1945-95. Eds. Geoffrey Nowell-Smith and Steven Ricci. London: BFI Publishing, 1998.
- Dissanayake, Wimal. "Issues in World Cinema." The Oxford Guide to Film Studies. Eds. John Hill and Pamela Church Gibson. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998.
- D'Lugo, Marvin. "Recent Spanish Cinema in National and Global Contexts." Post Script. 21.2 (2002): 3-11.
- Durham, Carolyn A. Double Takes: Culture and Gender in French Films and Their American Remakes. Hanover: New England UP, 1998.

Ľurovičová, Nataša. "Some Thoughts at an Intersection of the Popular and the National."

The Velvet Light Trap. 34 (1994): 3-9.

Dyer, Richard and Ginette Vincendeau, eds. Popular European Cinema. London:

Routledge, 1992.

Eleftheriotis, Dimitris. Popular Cinemas of Europe: Studies of Texts, Contexts and

Frameworks. New York: Continuum, 2001.

Elsaesser, Thomas. "Two Decades in Another Country: Hollywood and the Cinéphiles."

Superculture: American Popular Culture and Europe. Ed. C.W.E. Bigsby.

Bowling Green: Bowling Green University Popular Press, 1975.

---. "The New New Hollywood: Cinema Beyond Distance and Proximity." Moving

Images, Culture and the Mind. Ed. Ib Bondebjerg. Luton: Luton UP, 2000.

---. "The Blockbuster: Everything Connects, but Not Everything Goes." The End of

Cinema As We Know It: American Film in the Nineties. Ed. Jon Lewis. New

York: New York UP, 2001.

Evans, Peter William, ed. Spanish Cinema: The Auteurist Tradition. Oxford: Oxford

UP, 1999.

Finney, Angus. The State of European Cinema: A New Dose of Reality. London: Cassel,

1996.

Forbes, Jill and Sarah Street, eds. European Cinema: An Introduction. Hampshire:

Palgrave, 2000.

Forrest, Jennifer and Leonard R. Koos. Dead Ringers: The Remake in Theory and

Practice. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002.

Foucault, Michel. "What Is an Author?" Language, Counter-Memory, Practice. Ed.

- Donald F. Bouchard. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1977.
- Fuchs, Cynthia. "Interview with Alejandro Amenábar." PopMatters. [undated]. 17 Mar. 2003. <www.popmatters.com/film/interviews/amenabar-alejandro.html>.
- Gellner, Ernest. "Nations and Nationalism." Nations and Identities. Ed. Vincent P. Pecora. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2001.
- Gerstner, David A. and Janet Staiger, eds. Authorship and Film. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Grant, Catherine. "www.auteur.com?" Screen. 41.1 (2000): 101-108.
- Grindstaff, Laura. "Pretty Woman with a Gun: *La Femme Nikita* and the Textual Politics of 'The Remake'." Dead Ringers: The Remake in Theory and Practice. Eds. Jennifer Forrest and Leonard R. Koos. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002.
- Hall, Stuart. "Cultural Identity and Cinematic Representation." Film and Theory: An Anthology. Eds. Robert Stam and Toby Miller. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2000.
- Hampton, Howard. "Clear Vanilla Skies: 'Cryotainment' and the Modern Science of Transcendence." Film Comment. 38.2 (2002): 52-53.
- Harney, Michael. "Economy and Aesthetics in American Remakes of French Films." Dead Ringers: The Remake in Theory and Practice. Eds. Jennifer Forrest and Leonard R. Koos. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002.
- Harper, Sue. "Studying Popular Taste: British Historical Films in the 1930s." Popular European Cinema. Eds. Richard Dyer and Ginette Vincendeau. London: Routledge, 1992.

- Hayward, Susan. Luc Besson. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998.
- . "Framing National Cinemas." Cinema and Nation. Eds. Mette Hjort and Scott MacKenzie. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Hebdige, Dick. "Subjects in Space." New Formations. 11 (1990): v-x.
- Hedetoft, Ulf. "Contemporary Cinema: Between Cultural Globalisation and National Interpretation." Cinema and Nation. Eds. Mette Hjort and Scott MacKenzie. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Higson, Andrew. "The Concept of National Cinema." Screen. 30.4 (1989): 36-46.
- . "The Limiting Imagination of National Cinema." Cinema and Nation. Eds. Mette Hjort and Scott MacKenzie. London: Routledge, 2000 (a).
- . "National Cinema(s), International Markets and Cross-cultural Identities." Moving Images, Culture and the Mind. Ed. Ib Bondebjerg. Luton: Luton UP, 2000 (b).
- Hill, John. "Film and Postmodernism." The Oxford Guide to Film Studies. Eds. John Hill and Pamela Church Gibson. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998.
- Hillier, Jim, ed. Cahiers du Cinéma. The 1950s: Neo-Realism, Hollywood, New Wave. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1985.
- . The New Hollywood. New York: Continuum, 1992.
- Hjort, Mette and Scott MacKenzie, eds. Cinema and Nation. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Hollings, Stanley. "French Cinema: the feel-good factor." Time Out. (Summer 2002): 13, 15.
- Hollows, Joanne and Mark Jancovich. "Introduction: Popular Film and Cultural Distinctions." Approaches to Popular Film. Eds. Joanne Hollows and Mark Jancovich. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1995.

- Horton, Andrew. "Cinematic Makeovers and Cultural Border Crossings: Kusturica's *Time of the Gypsies* and Coppola's *Godfather* and *Godfather II*." Play It Again, Sam: Retakes on Remakes. Eds. Andrew Horton and Stuart Y. McDougal. Berkeley: California UP, 1998.
- Horton, Andrew and Stuart Y. McDougal, eds. Play It Again, Sam: Retakes on Remakes. Berkeley: California UP, 1998.
- Huyssen, Andreas. After the Great Divide: Modernism, Mass Culture, Postmodernism. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986.
- James, Nick. "Dread Again." Sight and Sound. 11.11 (2001): 18-19.
- Jeancolas, Jean-Pierre. "From the Blum-Byrnes Agreement to the GATT affair." Hollywood and Europe: Economics, Culture, National Identity: 1945-95. Eds. Geoffrey Nowell-Smith and Steven Ricci. London: BFI Publishing, 1998.
- Jenkins, Henry. "Historical poetics." Approaches to Popular Film. Eds. Joanne Hollows and Mark Jancovich. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1995.
- Johnston, Sheila. "The Author as Public Institution: The 'New' Cinema in the Federal Republic of Germany." Screen Education. 32/33 (1979/80): 67-78.
- Jordan, Barry and Rikki Morgan-Tamosunas, eds. Contemporary Spanish Cinema. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1998.
- Katz, Ephraim. The Macmillan International Film Encyclopedia. 4th ed. Rev. Fred Klein and Ronald Dean Nolen. London: Macmillan, 2001.
- Keil, Charlie. "'American' Cinema in the 1990s and Beyond: Whose Country's Filmmaking Is It Anyway?" The End of Cinema As We Know It: American Film in the Nineties. Ed. Jon Lewis. New York: New York UP, 2001.

- Kellner, Douglas. "Hollywood Film and Society." American Cinema and Hollywood: Critical Approaches. Eds. John Hill and Pamela Church Gibson. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000.
- Kinder, Marsha. Blood Cinema: The Reconstruction of National Identity in Spain. Berkeley: California UP, 1993.
- , ed. Refiguring Spain: Cinema/Media/Representation. Durham: Duke UP, 1997.
- Kroes, Rob. "Americanisation: What Are We Talking About?" Cultural Transmissions and Receptions: American Mass Culture in Europe. Eds. Rob Kroes, Robert W. Rydell, and Doeko F.J. Bosscher. Amsterdam: VU UP, 1993.
- Lewis, Jon, ed. The End of Cinema As We Know It: American Film in the Nineties. New York: New York UP 2001
- MacCabe, Colin. The Eloquence of the Vulgar: Language, Cinema and the Politics of Culture. London: BFI Publishing, 1999.
- McCarthy, Todd. "Vanilla Sky." Review of *Vanilla Sky*. Variety. 10-16 Dec. 2001: 32.
- Maltby, Richard. "'D' for disgusting: American culture and English criticism." Hollywood and Europe: Economics, Culture, National Identity: 1945-95. Eds. Geoffrey Nowell-Smith and Steven Ricci. London: BFI Publishing, 1998.
- Maule, Rosanna. "De-Authorizing the Auteur: Postmodern Politics of Interpellation in Contemporary European Cinema." Postmodernism in the Cinema. Ed. Cristina Degli-Esposti. New York: Berghahn Books, 1998.
- . "Juanma Bajo Ulloa's *Airbag* and the Politics of Spanish Regional Authorship." Post Script. 21.2 (2002): 64-77.
- Mazdon, Lucy. Encore Hollywood: Remaking French Cinema. London: BFI Publishing,

- 2000.
- Miller, Toby. "Hollywood and the World." The Oxford Guide to Film Studies. Eds. John Hill and Pamela Church Gibson. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998.
- Morrison, James. Passport to Hollywood: Hollywood Films, European Directors. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998.
- Mottram, James. "Cameron Crowe: Vanilla Sky." BBC1. 24 Jan. 2002. 17 Mar. 2003.
<www.bbc.co.uk/films/2002/01/24/cameron_crowe_vanilla_sky_interview.shtml>.
- Naremore, James. "Authorship and the Cultural Politics of Film Criticism." Film Quarterly. 44.1 (1990): 14-23.
- Neale, Steve. "New Hollywood Cinema." Screen. 17.2 (1976): 117-122.
- . "Art Cinema as Institution." Screen. 22.1 (1981): 11-39.
- Nowell-Smith, Geoffrey and Steven Ricci, eds. Hollywood and Europe: Economics, Culture, National Identity: 1945-95. London: BFI Publishing, 1998.
- Olsen, Mark. "The Uncool." Film Comment. 36.5 (2000): 61-66.
- The Oxford English Dictionary. Vol. XIII. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.
- Pecora, Vincent P., ed. Nations and Identities. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2001.
- Perkins, V. F. "The Atlantic Divide." Popular European Cinema. Eds. Richard Dyer and Ginette Vincendeau. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Petrie, Duncan, ed. Screening Europe: Image and Identity in Contemporary European Cinema. London: BFI Publishing, 1992.
- Polan, Dana. "Globalism's Localisms." Global/Local: Cultural Production and the Transnational Imaginary. Eds. Rob Wilson and Wimal Dissanayake. Durham: Duke UP, 1996.

---. "Auteur Desire." Screening the Past. 12 (2001):

<www.latrobe.edu.au/screeningthepast/firstrelease/fr0301/dpfr12a.html>.

Schatz, Thomas. The Genius of the System. New York: Pantheon Books, 1988.

---. "The New Hollywood." Film Theory Goes to the Movies. Eds. Jim

Collins, Hilary Radner, and Ava Preacher Collins. New York: Routledge, 1993.

Simpson, J. A. and E. S. C. Weiner, eds. The Oxford English Dictionary: Volume XIII

Quemadero-Roaver. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

Smart, Barry. "Europe Today and the Postmodern Paradox." The Idea of Europe:

Problems of National and Transnational Identity. Eds. Brian Nelson, David

Roberts, and Walter Veit. New York: Berg Publishers, 1992.

Smith, Paul Julian. "Open Your Eyes." Review of *Abre los ojos*. Sight and Sound. 10.3

(2000): 50.

Stam, Robert. "The Author: Introduction." Film and Theory: An Anthology. Eds. Robert

Stam and Toby Miller. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 2000.

Stephanson, Anders. "Regarding Postmodernism: A Conversation with Fredric Jameson."

Universal Abandon? The Politics of Postmodernism. Ed. Andrew Ross.

Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 1988.

Stillinger, Jack. Multiple Authorship and the Myth of Solitary Genius. Oxford: Oxford

UP, 1991.

Stoddart, Helen. "Auteurism and Film Authorship Theory." Approaches to Popular Film.

Eds. Joanne Hollows and Mark Jancovich. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1995.

Stone, Rob. Spanish Cinema. Harlow: Pearson Education, 2002.

Tasker, Yvonne. "Approaches to the New Hollywood." Cultural Studies and

- Communications. Eds. James Curran, David Morley, and Valerie Walkerdine.
London: Arnold, 1996.
- “Vanilla to Amenábar’s Taste.” Empire Online. 5 Oct. 2001. 17 Mar. 2003.
<www.empireonline.co.uk/news/news.asp?3444> .
- Vernon, Kathleen M. “Review Essay: Recent Books on Spanish Cinema in the 1990s: A
Global Perspective.” Post Script. 21.2 (2002): 90-100.
- Vincendeau, Ginette. “Hollywood Babel: The Coming of Sound and the Multiple
Language Version.” Screen. 29.2 (1988): 24-39.
- . “Hijacked.” Sight and Sound. 3.7 (1993): 23-25.
- . “Issues in European Cinema.” The Oxford Guide to Film Studies. Eds. John Hill and
Pamela Church Gibson. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998.
- Wayne, Mike. The Politics of Contemporary European Cinema: Histories, Borders,
Diasporas. Bristol: Intellect Books, 2002.
- Willemsen, Paul. “The National.” Look and Frictions: Essays in Cultural Studies and Film
Theory. Paul Willemsen. London: BFI Publishing, 1994.
- Wilson, Rob and Wimal Dissanayake, eds. Global/Local: Cultural Production and the
Transnational Imaginary. Durham: Duke UP, 1996.
- Wrathall, John. “Some Like It Sweet.” Sight and Sound. 11.1 (2001): 38-39.

Appendix A

The following chronological list, while by no means exhaustive, offers an overview of American (Hollywood) remakes of European films, remade between 1938 and 2003. It is useful to include a wider history of Euro-American remakes, in order to demonstrate this phenomena's endurance as a transnational, cross-cultural cinematic practice. Importantly, the following list illustrates a prolific increase in Euro-American remakes over the past two decades, which suggests the timeliness of a serious undertaking of the notion of post-New Hollywood recycling of popular European films, as offered in this thesis. The remake process retains an important place in the study of film, by encouraging further discussion and conceptualization, or re-conceptualization, of issues in contemporary film studies, such as notions of authorship and national cinema. It is worth noting that, although in this instance the films listed pertain to Euro-American cinematic recycling, an equally significant list could apply to Asian-American remakes, as well as films made and remade in Hollywood but in significantly different historical, socio-cultural periods.

American remakes of European films, remade between 1938 and 2003:

Algiers (Cromwell, 1938) [*Pépé le Moko* (Duvivier, 1936)]

The Last House on the Left (Craven, 1972) [*Jungfrukällan* (Bergman, 1960)]

The Sorcerer (Friedkin, 1977) [*Le Salaire de la peur* (Clouzot, 1953)]

Breathless (McBride, 1983) [*À bout de souffle* (Godard, 1960)]

Three Men and a Baby (Nimoy, 1987) [*Trois hommes et un couffin* (Serreau, 1985)]

Cousins (Schumacher, 1989) [*Cousin, Cousine* (Tacchella, 1975)]
Three Fugitives (Veber, 1989) [*Les Fugitifs* (Veber, 1986)]
Scent of a Woman (Brest, 1992) [*Profumo di donna* (Risi, 1974)]
Sommersby (Amiel, 1993) [*Le Retour de Martin Guerre* (Vigne, 1982)]
The Vanishing (Sluizer, 1993) [*Spoorloos* (Sluizer, 1988)]
Point of No Return (Badham, 1993) [*Nikita* (Besson, 1990)]
My Father the Hero (Miner, 1994) [*Mon Père ce héros* (Lauzier, 1991)]
True Lies (Cameron, 1994) [*La Totale!* (Zidi, 1991)]
The Birdcage (Nichols, 1996) [*La Cage aux folles* (Molinaro, 1978)]
Diabolique (Chechik, 1996) [*Les Diaboliques* (Clouzot, 1955)]
Nightwatch (Bornedal, 1997) [*Nattevagten* (Bornedal, 1994)]
City of Angels (Silberling, 1998) [*Der Himmel über Berlin* (Wenders, 1987)]
Vanilla Sky (Crowe, 2001) [*Abre los ojos* (Amenábar, 1997)]
Solaris (Soderbergh, 2002) [*Solyaris* (Tarkovsky, 1972)]
Insomnia (Nolan, 2002) [*Insomnia* (Skjoldbjærg, 1997)]
The Italian Job (Gray, 2003) [*The Italian Job* (Collinson, 1969)]