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On 14 April 2016, Paramount Pictures released the first image of actress Scarlett Johansson in the lead role of the science-fiction film *Ghost in the Shell* (2017). This promotional image generated a great deal of controversy online, with much of the attention focused upon the decision to cast a white actress in the central role of cyborg Major Motoko Kusanagi. This criticism was part of a wider critique of ‘whitewashing’ within Hollywood where white actors are cast in non-white roles – other notable examples include Mickey Rooney in *Breakfast at Tiffany’s* (1961) and Emma Stone in *Aloha* (2015) – yet this particular instance was especially controversial as *Ghost in the Shell* is a Hollywood remake of a 1995 Japanese anime (and manga) and therefore raised further issues surrounding planned changes to the source text. In fact, many of the initial reports on the controversy (Abad-Santos 2016; Child 2016; Loughrey 2016) cited a series of tweets by comic-book writer Jon Tsuei in which he expressed concern that the Hollywood remake would lose the cultural resonance that the source text’s themes have with Japan’s post-World War II history. Central to Tsuei’s argument was the notion that *Ghost in the Shell* is a text deeply rooted in a specific era of Japanese technological development, and that it should therefore be understood as ‘inherently a Japanese story, not a universal one’ (Tsuei 2016a). Consequently, Tsuei’s objection was not only to the casting of a white actress in the lead role but also to the very decision to produce a Hollywood remake, arguing that ‘You can “Westernize” the story if you want, but at that point it is no longer Ghost in The Shell because the story is simply not Western’ (Tsuei 2016b). This intervention generated a substantial
amount of online debate, and was soon followed by an influential article on *Nerds of Color* that argued that ‘the relevance *Ghost in the Shell* has to Japanese culture is something that should be honoured in any live-action production’ and that, by producing this kind of remake, ‘Hollywood is destroying what makes properties like these special and valuable’ (Jones 2016).

There were a number of commentators, however, who felt that the notion of an inherently Japanese text as posited by Tsuei and Jones was itself problematic and somewhat essentialist. Ryu Spaeth in *New Republic*, for example, drew attention to the lengthy history of transnational influences and exchanges that helped shape the development of Japanese anime and manga, and he argued that this process complicates ideas of a ‘quintessentially Japanese story’ (Spaeth 2016). Similarly, producer Steven Paul responded to the controversy by defending the choices of the Hollywood studio, stating, ‘I don’t think [the source text] was just a Japanese story. *Ghost in the Shell* was a very international story’ (quoted in Cheng 2016). Indeed, it is notable that Masamune Shirow’s original manga and Mamoru Oshii’s 1995 anime adaptation exhibit the influence of numerous globally circulating intertexts including Arthur Koestler’s *The Ghost in the Machine* (1967), Ridley Scott’s *Blade Runner* (1982) and William Gibson’s *Neuromancer* (1984). It may be a Japanese text that is embedded in local anxieties regarding post-war Japanese society, yet it is also a multivalent cultural text that incorporates numerous cross-cultural influences from around the world. Furthermore, it is evident that *Ghost in the Shell* has had a considerable transnational influence beyond Japan, with Hollywood films such as the Wachowski’s *The Matrix* (1999) and James Cameron’s *Avatar* (2009) owing a significant debt to Oshii’s film. This tension, between an understanding of *Ghost in the Shell* as an ‘inherently’ Japanese text that needs to be situated and understood primarily within its Japanese context and a reading that points to its place within a global history of cultural exchange, is indicative of the complexity of the transnational film remake and the broader cultural issues that are raised by this form of cinematic repetition. Remakes are often dismissed within critical discourse as unoriginal, derivative and inferior to their source texts, yet this mode of critique takes on additional layers of meaning when films are remade transnationally as this process raises further issues surrounding national and/or ethnic identity and questions of cultural power.

In order to investigate these kinds of complexities, this collection of original essays focuses its attention on the phenomenon of transnational film remakes and the wider social and cultural issues that they raise. What happens when a film is remade in another national context? To what extent can a film embedded within one cultural context be adapted for another? How might a transnational perspective offer us a deeper understanding of a specific socio-political context, and of the politics underpinning film remaking more generally? Given
the increasing emphasis on reworking existing material within global film (and screen) culture, there is a pressing need for scholarship to address this phenomenon in a rigorous and systematic way. While there have been a number of recent monographs and edited collections that have studied film remakes (for example, Mazdon 2000; Verevis 2006; Zanger 2007; Loock and Verevis 2012), this is the first book to focus specifically on transnational film remakes and to engage with case studies drawn from across the globe. Of course, this is not to say that scholars have been ignoring transnational film remakes – indeed, there is already a growing body of literature on the topic – but that these interventions have tended to be within publications devoted to individual national cinemas or to the phenomenon of film remakes more generally. With much contemporary scholarship shifting away from considerations of the national in order to investigate the transnational dimensions of cinema, this book is therefore designed to bring together these myriad perspectives in order to provide a more inclusive account of transnational film remaking across the globe.

Before outlining the various ways in which the chapters in this collection make an intervention, it is important that we first address the existing scholarship and the debates that have been taking place over the last couple of decades. Given the Hollywood-centrism of film remake scholarship, and film studies more broadly, it is perhaps no surprise that the majority of publications dealing with transnational film remakes have focused on Hollywood remakes of films from other national contexts. Indeed, given the ways in which the relationship between Hollywood and Europe has traditionally been framed, it should also come as no surprise that the cinematic exchanges that have attracted the most critical attention have been Hollywood remakes of European cinema, and especially those derived from French source texts. In European Cinema: Face to Face with Hollywood, Thomas Elsaesser discusses the oppositions that often structure comparisons between Europe and America, in which ‘Europe stands for art, and the US for pop; Europe for high culture, America for mass entertainment; Europe for artisanal craft, America for industrial mass production’ (2005: 300), and it is clear that much of the initial wave of scholarship on remakes was designed to challenge exactly these kinds of simplistic binaries. Lucy Mazdon’s Encore Hollywood: Remaking French Cinema, for example, proposes a decisive shift away from criticism that frames Hollywood remakes as a ‘one-way, vertical trajectory from the high art of the French “original” to the popular commercialism of the American “copy”’ (2000: 5), and replaces this instead with a model based around ‘intertextuality and hybridity’ (27). Mazdon’s work, alongside Carolyn A. Durham’s Double Takes: Culture and Gender in French Films and Their American Remakes (1998) and David I. Grossvogel’s Didn’t You Used to Be Depardieu?: Film as Cultural Marker in France and Hollywood (2002), also helped establish many of the key case
studies used to explore cross-cultural relationships, including such examples as *À bout de souffle* (1960) / *Breathless* (1983), *La Cage aux folles* (1978) / *The Birdcage* (1996), *Trois Hommes et un couffin* (1985) / *Three Men and a Baby* (1987), and *La Femme Nikita* (1990) / *The Assassin* (1993). *Breathless* is perhaps the most discussed example (see also Gripsrud 1992; Wills 1998; and Evans 2014a), although there has been further scholarship on the remake of *La Femme Nikita* (Grindstaff 2002) and *La Cage aux folles* (Hanet 2012) in addition to more recent case studies such as *L’Appartement* (1996) / *Wicker Park* (2004) (Hanet, 2010). A broad range of methodological approaches have also been used in order to interrogate the topic of Hollywood remakes of French cinema. For example, Harney (2002) discusses the relationship between economics and aesthetics in the critical dismissal of such films; Welsch (2000) focuses upon the different uses of film sound in Jean Renoir’s *La Chienne* (1931) and Fritz Lang’s *Scarlett Street* (1945); Park (2009) emphasises the role that copyright plays within remakes of French and Japanese cinema; Williams (2002) uses the remakes of *Le voile bleu* (1942) and *Le Corbeau* (1943) to discuss the ‘benefits and pitfalls of transcultural bricolage’ (2002: 152); and Verevis (2012) employs the self-reflexive, faux-documentary strategy of *H Story* (2000) – a film about a (failed) Japanese remake of *Hiroshima mon amour* (1959) – to make an ontological point about the potential multiplicity of remakes and cinema in general. Despite the diversity of these approaches, however, there has nevertheless been a consistent attempt within the academic scholarship on Hollywood remakes of French cinema to challenge the ways in which such texts have traditionally been maligned and dismissed within critical discourse.

While much of the initial work on the phenomenon of the transnational film remake has centred on French cinema, there has also been a substantial amount of scholarship on Hollywood remakes derived from other European cinemas, although it should be noted that the coverage has tended to be less comprehensive. For example, despite provision of the source texts for a considerable number of Hollywood remakes, there has been relatively little written about Hollywood remakes of German cinema. There are some exceptions, such as Jones (2005) on *Der Himmel über Berlin* (1987) / *City of Angels* (1998) and a number of articles discussing Michael Haneke’s auto-remake of *Funny Games* (1997) / *Funny Games* (2007) (see Monk 2010, Hantke 2010, and Messier 2014), yet there has been relatively little to date on further examples such as *Viktor und Viktoria* (1933) / *Victor Victoria* (1982), *Bella Martha* (2001) / *No Reservations* (2007) and Das *Experiment* (2001) / *The Experiment* (2010). Coverage of remakes from other major European countries has also been rather sparse, with Carolan (2014) on Hollywood remakes of Italian cinema being one of the few works to deal with that process, while the scholarship on remakes of Spanish cinema tends to focus on *Abre los ojos*
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Before the recent trend for Nordic remakes, however, it was East Asian cinema that was to provide the source for numerous Hollywood remakes, and this has been the subject of an already substantial body of scholarship. Much of the attention has been on Japanese cinema, with Ringu (1998) / The Ring (2002) acting as the primary case study for numerous articles discussing this trend (see Balmain 2004, Hills 2005, Stringer 2007, Rawle 2010 and Wee 2011). The most comprehensive study of this phenomenon is Wee’s subsequent book on Japanese Horror Films and Their American Remakes (2014), which supplemented her analysis of The Ring with further case studies such as those on Dark Water (2002) / Dark Water (2005), Ju-On: The Grudge (2002) / The Grudge (2004), and Kairo (2001) / Pulse (2006). Meanwhile, Wierzbicki has been examining the sonic content of Hollywood remakes of Japanese horror in order to demonstrate that while the remakes may look quite similar they often sound remarkably different (2010, 2015), and Crawford has used a philosophical framework in order to highlight the ‘valuable cultural overlapping’ (2016: 113) that these remakes represent. The focus within this body of work has tended to be on the late 1990s and early 2000s crop of J-Horror remakes, although David Desser’s (2008) chapter on remakes of Seven Samurai (1954) puts this phenomenon into a historical perspective, tracing the transnational influence of the Japanese classic within American texts such as The Magnificent Seven (1960) and Battle Beyond the Stars (1980), and also within other national contexts such as Hong Kong (Seven Swords, 2005) and India (China Gate, 1998). Similarly, Rachael Hutchinson’s work on Kurosawa remakes complicates the model of a unidirectional transnational film remake, framing Yojimbo (1961) / A Fistful of Dollars (1964) in relation to the
American Western genre and providing a model for rethinking these kinds of remakes as part of a ‘dialogue within a wider film genre’ (2007: 172).

While Hollywood remakes of Japanese cinema have received more attention, the rise of China’s film industry and its increasing interactions with Hollywood are the subject of a number of recent publications. Kenneth Chan’s Remade in Hollywood: The Global Chinese Presence in Transnational Cinemas (2009), for example, discusses Hollywood remakes of Chinese cinemas in relation to the broader post-1997 surge in Chinese visibility in Hollywood. Similarly, Jinhua Li’s Transnational Remakes: Gender and Politics in Chinese Cinemas and Hollywood (2011) and Yiman Wang’s Remaking Chinese Cinema: Through the Prism of Shanghai, Hong Kong, and Hollywood (2013) use the subject of transnational film remakes in order to interrogate the larger political dynamics underpinning these processes. In addition, there have been a number of articles interrogating specific remakes of Chinese-language films such as Infernal Affairs (2002) / The Departed (2006) (Li 2014, Lüthe 2015) and Eat Drink Man Woman (1994) / Tortilla Soup (2001) (Li 2016). It is important to note, however, that the scholarship on East Asian remakes has not been limited to case studies drawn from Japan and China. Leung (2013), for example, discusses the South Korean case study A Tale of Two Sisters (2003) / The Uninvited (2009), while Lim (2007), Xu (2008), Wang (2010) and Klein (2010) discuss the broader phenomenon of Hollywood remakes of East Asian cinema across a range of national contexts. Moreover, while France and Japan, and by extension Europe and East Asia, have been the focus of the majority of remake scholarship, there has been some limited work on Hollywood remakes from other regions such as Russia in Solaris (1972) / Solaris (2002) (Verevis 2009) and Brazil in Doña Flor and Her Two Husbands (1966) / Kiss Me Goodbye (1982) (Edinger 1991). The body of work on Hollywood remakes of world cinema is continuing to grow and develop although, as this account indicates, there has been a tendency for the phenomenon to be discussed in relation to specific national or regional cinemas. One of the few scholars to attempt a more comprehensive account of Hollywood remakes of world cinema has been Daniel Herbert in his Ph.D. dissertation Transnational Film Remakes: Time, Space, Identity (2008) and his published articles derived from that research (2006, 2009, 2010). In addition to theorising the transnational film remake, Herbert provides a detailed historical account of Hollywood remakes of European and East Asian cinemas, and one of his key interventions is in investigating the struggle for power that these texts represent. In his own words, ‘As privileged articulations of globalization, transnational film remakes speak to vast interconnections among cultural spheres, yet simultaneously efface alternate paths and disavow those connections that do not serve dominant interests’ (2008: 455). Interrogating the politics of these globalising processes, Herbert’s work helps draw attention to the dominant position of Hollywood in shaping
these practices of transnational film remaking and teases out the implications that this has in terms of global power dynamics.

When we turn our attention to remakes produced in the opposite trajectory, where Hollywood functions as the source text for films produced in other national industries, these political issues become even more acute. Given the ways in which Hollywood’s influence throughout the globe is often framed as a form of cultural imperialism and/or Americanisation, scholars have been exploring the diverse ways in which these globally circulating Hollywood texts have been adapted and transformed in other national contexts. Smith (2016), for example, proposes the metaphor of the ‘Hollywood meme’ as a way to investigate the global spread of Hollywood and focuses on remakes produced within the film industries of Turkey, India and the Philippines. This is one of the few attempts at a comparative transnational account of the phenomenon, however, as the majority of the scholarship in this area focuses on reworkings of Hollywood within a single national context. The most complete account of the remakes produced in Turkey, for example, appears in Savas Arslan’s *Cinema in Turkey* (2011), while individual articles have focused on specific case studies such as *Dünyayı Kurtaran Adam* (1982) / *Star Wars* (1977) (Erdoğan 2003), *Turist Ömer Uzay Yolunda* (1973) / *Star Trek* (1966–) (Smith 2008a), and *Şeytan* (1974) / *The Exorcist* (1973) (Özkaracalar 2003, Smith 2008b). There have also been overview articles discussing the broader phenomenon of Turkish remakes from Gürata (2006) and Raw (2016) that help situate these examples in relation to the traditions of Yeşilçam, the popular cinema of Turkey.

This cycle of Turkish remakes was largely confined to the 1960s to 1980s, so it is notable that Indian cinema, and especially the Mumbai-based Bollywood industry, has a long tradition of remaking Hollywood cinema that continues to the present day. Much of the scholarship discussing Indian remakes has focused on the post-1990s context, unsurprising perhaps given that the trend towards remaking became so prevalent in that period that ‘ninety percent of the Hindi movies in production in August of 1993 were remakes’ (Nayar 1997: 74). As Rosie Thomas has noted, popular Indian cinema has often been perceived as ‘nightmarishly lengthy, second-rate copies of Hollywood trash’ (1985: 117), and there is a marked attempt within the scholarship on Indian remakes (for example, Nayar 1997, 2003; Alessio and Langer 2007; Wright 2009; Krämer 2015a, 2015b) to challenge these kinds of dismissals and to draw attention to the numerous ways in which texts have been adapted for the Indian cultural context. This is often framed as a process of Indianisation in which ‘the Bollywood remake becomes a simple act of translating a Hollywood film into Hindi by reconstructing its narrative to conform to Indian cultural practices’ (Richards 2011: 342). The majority of these studies are text-based and comparative, as indeed are the majority of studies of transnational film remakes.
more generally, although it is notable that the anthropologist Tejaswini Ganti offers an alternative model in her research by drawing on first-hand observations of filmmakers as they prepare and produce transnational remakes, focusing on the ways in which Hindi filmmakers ‘operate as cultural mediators, evaluating the appropriateness for their audiences of stories, characterizations and themes from certain Hollywood films’ (2002: 283). Such an approach helps complicate the model of Indianisation as it draws attention to the role of filmmakers in mediating that process, and therefore helps challenge models of transnational film remaking that see this as a straightforward practice in which a text is reworked largely to conform with a different cultural context.

The bulk of scholarship in this area has focused on the contexts of Turkey and India, but it is important to note that these are not the only national traditions to produce remakes of Hollywood cinema. There has been a growing body of work on Chinese-language remakes of Hollywood such as Cellular (2004) / Connected (2008) and Blood Simple (1984) / A Woman, a Gun and a Noodle Shop (2009) (see Aufderheide 1998; He 2010; Evans 2014b). Meanwhile, Philippine remakes of Hollywood are discussed in Capino (2006); Korean remakes of Hollywood are analysed in Diffrient (2009) and Chung and Diffrient (2015); Brazilian reworkings of High Noon (1952) and Jaws (1975) are discussed in Vieira (1995); the Japanese remake of Sideways (2004) is discussed in Griffin (2014); while the Nigerian remake of Titanic (1997) is analysed in both Behrend (2009) and Krings (2015). This process of transnational film remaking is therefore far from being a practice restricted to specific national industries, but something that has occurred in the majority of established film industries around the globe.

Nevertheless, as this survey of scholarship on transnational film remakes suggests, even if we were to put to one side the substantial body of work on Hollywood remakes of Hollywood films, it is still notable just how Hollywood-centric this scholarship has been. While there have been some exceptions (for example, Shin (2012) on Japanese remakes of Korean cinema; Bergfelder and Cargnelli (2008) on British remakes of German cinema; Smith (2013) on Bollywood remakes of Korean cinema), it is nevertheless the case that the majority of scholarship on transnational film remakes deals to some extent with Hollywood. This partly reflects Hollywood’s dominance within global processes of cultural dissemination, of course, but it may be time for scholarship to start addressing other remake trajectories. It is also evident that scholarship on the transnational film remake has tended to be published within books and journals focused on a specific national industry, and often with little discussion of parallel examples within other contexts. By investigating a variety of case studies of transnational film remakes and locating them within the current debates surrounding remake studies and cinematic transnationalism, the aim of this book is to engage with the fluid and dynamic ways in which
texts are adapted and reworked across national borders, and to help bring together insights from across these myriad different traditions.

The chapters in this volume are organised in three parts, with the first – on ‘Genres and Traditions’ – taking a particular interest in some of the industrial and commercial questions posed by transnational film remakes. Lucy Mazdon begins with a high-profile European export, *The Girl with the Dragon Tattoo*, an example notable (in part) for the fact that Yellow Bird, the production company behind the Swedish-Danish film version (*Män som hatar kvinnor* 2009), bought the rights to Stieg Larsson’s novel shortly after its publication (in 2005) and consequently earned a main production credit in the 2011 Hollywood version. The transatlantic collaboration yielded a much-anticipated remake (or ‘re-adaptation’) directed by David Fincher and starring Daniel Craig and Rooney Mara. Although the remake performed financially below expectation, Fincher’s authorial interests – established in psycho-thrillers such as *Se7en* (1995) and *Zodiac* (2007) – transformed the conservative *mise-en-scène* of the earlier version into cutting-edge genre filmmaking. For Mazdon, what is most interesting is the way that Fincher’s authorial remake resists accusations of cultural imperialism, embracing instead the European character of its Nordic Noir sources (both novel and film) to disrupt ‘the vertical trajectories [of original and copy] which have dominated accounts of the remake [and produce] instead a far more complex and fluid reworking’. Mazdon concludes that *The Girl with the Dragon Tattoo* along with other recent film and television remakes of Nordic Noir – notably, *Let Me In* (2010) / *Låt den rätte komma in* (Let the Right One In, 2008) and *Forbrydelsen* (2009–12) / *The Killing* (2011–14), which similarly foreground rather than disguise their Scandinavian origins – challenge past hierarchies and suggest ‘a cultural landscape in which the dominance of Anglophone production has been disrupted and a new acceptance of the “other” is visible’.

In Chapter 2, R. Barton Palmer looks to an earlier period, that of American film noir, to consider two films by Fritz Lang – *Scarlet Street* (1945) and *Human Desire* (1954) – that are typically called up as transnational remakes of films directed by Jean Renoir in France: namely, *La Chienne* (*The Bitch*, 1931) and *La Bête Humaine* (*The Human Beast*, 1938). Palmer attends to the production histories of the films to argue that they were chosen for remaking not only because they perfectly suited the commercial trajectories of Lang’s work of the period but also because they were re-adaptations of novels (by Georges de la Fouchardière and Émile Zola respectively) that showed profitable affinities with American hard-boiled fiction. In the following essay (Chapter 3), Andy Willis also comments upon the economic imperatives that underpin remakes of genre films, but in this instance focuses on the cultural politics of remaking Spanish horror films in the twenty-first century. Specifically, Willis considers two cases – *Quarantine* (2008), the US remake of *REC* (2007),
and the Come Out and Play (2012) remake of ¿Quién puede matar a un niño? (Who Can Kill a Child? 1976) – to argue that these North American remakes are divested of the most urgent political aspects of their Spanish counterparts in an endeavour to create globally marketable horror films.

The final essay in Part I (Chapter 4) also focuses on horror film remakes, but in this instance Iain Robert Smith casts a much wider net to consider the unlimited cultural production of Bram Stoker’s Dracula, a figure who has appeared in various guises and settings in more than 300 feature films produced around the world: most notably, F. W. Murnau’s Nosferatu (1922) and Tod Browning’s 1931 adaptation for Universal. Given this massive body of work, Smith focuses his discussion on three films – the 1953 Turkish film Drakula İstanbul’da (Dracula in Istanbul), the 1957 Mexican film El Vampiro (The Vampire) and the 1967 Pakistani film Zinda Laash (The Living Corpse) – to set out a methodology through which to track these ‘quasi-independent’ repetitions of the Dracula story across a variety of national contexts and historical periods. Building upon an approach outlined in his recent book, The Hollywood Meme (Smith 2016), and extending existing scholarship devoted to canonical (Hollywood and Western European) versions of Dracula, Smith traces the specifically transnational afterlives of Dracula, ‘using the structuring metaphor of the “meme” [an individual unit of culture that spreads, adapts and mutates] in order to interrogate the dynamic interplay of global and local within these Dracula remakes’. As is evident from Smith’s chapter title – ‘For the Dead Travel Fast’ – the figure of the traveller not only conjures the transnational movement and afterlives of Dracula – which says something ‘unique about the sheer memetic vitality of Stoker’s tale and the myriad ways in which it has been adapted all across the globe’ – but also provides a model for case studies beyond that of the Count.

The volume’s Part II – on ‘Gender and Performance’ – continues some of the questions of industry and genre investigated in the first section, but with a more deliberate emphasis on issues of representation, and especially the politics of gender and sexuality. In the first of these (Chapter 5), Kenneth Chan focuses on a recent trend of East Asian directors and production companies for remaking American films into Asian versions, paying particular attention to Zhang Yimou’s 2009 A Woman, a Gun and a Noodle Shop remake of the Coen Brothers’ neo-noir, Blood Simple (1984). Chan makes a number of important points about the economic and cultural imperatives that inform this tendency, as well as several observations around the ‘cinematic pragmatism’ that lends Zhang’s authorial body of work (economic and cultural) currency in a global marketplace. Specifically, Chan argues that in foregrounding the ‘woman’ (of the film’s title), and her oppressed status, Zhang articulates a need to address women’s issues in contemporary Chinese society, but at the same time panders to the liberal sensibilities of a contemporary (transnational) film-
festival circuit. Like Chan, the next two contributors – Michael Lawrence and Rashna Wadia Richards – focus upon Eastern remakes of Western properties, in these cases from the Indian subcontinent, to underscore a point (also made by Chan) that major film industries, such as Hong Kong and Bollywood, have a long-standing tradition of unauthorised borrowings. In Chapter 6, Lawrence looks to the popular Hindi film Khoon Bhari Maang (Blood-Smeared Forehead, 1988), an unofficial remake of the Australian television mini-series Return to Eden (1983), to focus on how the remake fits with an ‘avenging woman’ cycle of Hindi film and – in its repurposing – challenges conventional family and gender roles. In Chapter 7, Richards turns to the example of Sanjay Gupta’s Kaante (2002), an ‘unabashed recreation’ of Quentin Tarantino’s Reservoir Dogs (1992), which itself is an uncredited remake of Ringo Lam’s City on Fire (1987). Attending in particular to the performance of ‘cool’ across the three versions, Richards argues that the triadic exchange (between Hong Kong, Hollywood and Bollywood) reveals not a simple process of imitation but rather a level of engagement and critique. In the final chapter of Part II, Constantine Verevis discusses two versions of Erich Kästner’s popular children’s novel – Das doppelte Lottchen (1950) and The Parent Trap (1961) – to argue that Disney’s teen dream of (family) togetherness is ‘simultaneously reactionary and progressive, nostalgic and challenging’ and that the exchange of twins – Susan and Sharon, in the 1961 Disney version – is more broadly symptomatic of that between originals and remakes.

The essays in Part III, ‘Auteurs and Critics’, pick up on some of the questions of authorial remaking and canonisation raised by examples such as Fincher’s version of The Girl with the Dragon Tattoo and Zhang’s A Woman, a Gun and a Noodle Shop. In the first of these (Chapter 9), David Scott Diffrient and Carl R. Burgchardt consider the case of Albert Lamorrise’s Le ballon rouge (The Red Balloon, 1956), a short, but venerated, film that has generated a number of cultural associations and personal recollections, including Taiwanese director Hou Hsiao-hsien’s Le voyage du ballon rouge (Flight of the Red Balloon, 2007). Diffrient and Burgchardt describe Hou’s minimalist film not simply as a work of homage but one that, ‘in keeping with its title, puts greater emphasis on the movement of the object, which metaphorically represents the intercultural transit of the border-crossing film itself’. While admitting that Hou’s version does not exhibit the ‘fantastical interludes’ that have made Lamorrise’s Le ballon rouge a favourite among audiences and critics alike, Diffrient and Burgchardt argue that Hou’s feature-length work is ‘no less compelling as a series of quotidian scenes concerning the interwoven themes of companionship, loneliness, memory, and the restorative power of art’. Even more pertinent, for this volume, is the way in which Le voyage du ballon rouge is figured as a point of intercultural contact and interplay, a cross-cultural remake that provides an opportunity to explore ‘the relationship
between *recollections*, *references*, and *reflections*, ultimately aiming to transnationalise (or “uproot”) nostalgia and show how twenty-first-century cinephilia performs a similar cultural function to the remaking process’.

The next two essays in Part III extend the focus on authorship to examine the examples of ‘self-remakes’, David Desser arguing that while directors often (directly and indirectly) remake and recycle their own works, ‘the transnational remake by the same director presents . . . the most radical shift in context and thus might be the most interesting test case for issues of remakes and remaking’. In Chapter 10, Desser looks specifically at the case of filmmaker Nakahira Ko, who made the influential and controversial *Kurutta Kajitsu* (*Crazed Fruit*, 1956) and later in his career, while under contract to the Shaw Brothers studio in Hong Kong, remade the film as *Kuang lian shi* (*Summer Heat*, 1968). Desser explains that the transformation of *Crazed Fruit* into the little-known *Summer Heat* is interesting not only because of the stature of the Japanese original, but also for its examination of post-war disaffected youth, an element of cultural engagement that finds only limited expression in the remake. In Chapter 11, Kathleen Loock examines another ‘auto-remake’ – Michael Haneke’s 2007 version of his 1997 German-language film of the same title – arguing that Haneke resists adapting *Funny Games* to an American cultural context, and instead advances his own art-cinema reputation by dropping virtually the same film – a shot-by-shot, English-language remake – into American entertainment culture.

The final chapters of Part III further the discussion of authorship, but extend more deliberately into questions of reception and film criticism. In Chapter 12, Daniel Martin examines the ways in which Spike Lee – an auteur known for his interest in African-American cultural experience and race relations – undertook to remake Park Chan-wook’s *Oldboy* (2003), the gruesomely violent tale from South Korea that had become a symbol of the East Asian ‘extreme’ cinema cycle. Martin outlines Lee’s endeavour to brand the remake as an entry in his own auteurist canon, but takes a more deliberate interest in the film’s critical reception, specifically ‘the ways critics address the spectacle of violence, notions of taste, and the assumed cultural differences between American and South Korean audiences’. More broadly, the case of Lee’s *Oldboy* provides an opportunity ‘not only to examine the transformation of material from one director to another, but to interrogate broader debates over the intersection of the *auteur* as symbol/brand and the imagined (lack of) creative freedom afforded directors of remakes’. In the final chapter of the book, Daniel Herbert pushes further in this direction to note that critics typically engage in a discourse ‘of quality, artistry, originality, and cultural specificity [which] assumes a hierarchy of critical taste that tends to nationalise and thereby simplify the transnational relations between [Hollywood films and their counterparts]’. While acknowledging that ‘transnational film remakes require rigorous analysis that illuminates [their]
complexities’, Herbert additionally calls for closer attention to be paid to the function of (journalistic) film criticism in shaping an understanding of ‘transnational film remakes’. Specifically, Herbert looks over US film reviews from the 1930s onward to demonstrate that while critics have typically denigrated Hollywood remakes, they have also created a rhetorical space for transnational cinema, associating both foreign sources and remakes with stars, auteurs, and/or genres, in lieu of (or in addition to) their nation of origin. As Herbert concludes, ‘sorting through the ways in which “the remake” and “the transnational” operate within mainstream critical discourse [helps] us reflect on how and why we construct the very corpus of “transnational film remakes”’.

In summary, in and through its range of case studies and approaches – industrial, textual, critical and discursive – Transnational Film Remakes seeks to provide an analysis of cinematic remaking that moves beyond Hollywood-centric accounts and addresses the truly global nature of this phenomenon. From Hong Kong remakes of Japanese cinema, and Bollywood remakes of Australian television, and on to Turkish, Mexican and Pakistani versions of Dracula, this book explores the diversity of remaking practices around the world to draw attention to the prominence of remakes within global film culture, and mark out new directions in the study of transnational film remakes.
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