When *Heimat* Meets Hollywood

Christine Haase

When *Heimat* Meets Hollywood

When *Heimat* Meets Hollywood

German Filmmakers and America, 1985–2005

Christine Haase

Für meine Eltern und Geschwister für Nestwärme und Flügel.
And to Peter . . . if not for you . . .

"Filme müssen in Garmisch-Partenkirchen, in Okinawa und in Chicago ankommen — und überleg dir, was für alle diese Leute der gemeinsame Nenner sein könnte."

[Films must resonate in Garmisch-Partenkirchen, in Okinawa, and in Chicago — now think about what could be the common denominator for all these people.]
— Rainer Werner Fassbinder

Contents

Acknowledgments

MANY PEOPLE HAVE CONTRIBUTED to the completion of this book. Unfortunately, I cannot include all of them here, but I think they know who they are, even if their names are not mentioned individually. Special thanks, however, are due a number of people. I would like to thank my colleagues and the staff, especially Betty Hill, at the Department of Germanic and Slavic Studies at the University of Georgia in Athens for their continued support, and in particular Dr. Brigitte Rossbacher for helping me straighten out my introduction. I want to thank the Provost's Office and the President's Venture Fund at UGA for funding some of my international travel, and especially the University of Georgia Research Foundation for the generous grant I received in support of this project. Further thanks goes to my students at UGA, undergraduate and graduate, who over the past years have helped clarify and challenge my ideas, and who have offered invaluable insights into the issues pondered in this book. I would also like to express my gratitude to the many colleagues at various institutions who have discussed aspects of this study with me, especially the organizers and participants of the European Cinema Research Forum and its inspiring conferences. I want to thank director Percy Adlon for letting me use an image from *Out of Rosenheim* for the cover illustration of this book. Extra thanks goes to my best friend and colleague at the University of Georgia, cinema studies professor Dr. Antje Ascheid, for her friendship and support, and for her valiant efforts at making sense of the manuscript. Without her speedy and insightful comments this book would be a shadow of its current self. Thanks also goes to the production team at Camden House, production editor Jane Best and production manager Sue Smith, for bearing with me and doing a great job. Major thanks and a lifetime achievement award are due my editor, Jim Walker, without whose patience, understanding, and thorough editing this book would never have seen the inside of two covers. More thanks than I have room for here are due my family in Germany, who have made it hard to live so far away, but easy to come home. And lastly, I want to thank Peter for being in my life. I did not know what I was missing.

<div align="right">

C. H.
August, 2007

</div>

Introduction

Setting the Scene

Fʀᴏᴍ ɪᴛꜱ ɪɴᴄᴇᴘᴛɪᴏɴ ɪɴ ᴛʜᴇ ɴɪɴᴇᴛᴇᴇɴᴛʜ ᴄᴇɴᴛᴜʀʏ, film has been a medium with transcultural and transnational appeal. The history of the cinema has always been a story of complex connections and collaborations between different national and cultural traditions as well as between people of different countries, ethnicities, genders, religions, and classes. Before the advent of synchronized sound, film — resting on the notion of images as a form of visual lingua franca — could cross borders with relative ease, requiring only the translation and substitution of intertitles. With the development of sound, this transnational aspect of motion pictures became more problematic, and a more nationally oriented cinema began to thrive. The category of the national in regard to film — contested and complicated as it may be — hence provides a strong counterpoint to that of the transnational. As film scholar Sabine Hake points out: "The cinema . . . has from the beginning provided an important forum for debates about culture, politics, and society, and it continues to serve as an instrument of innovation, provocation, and critical reflection. This function has been especially pronounced in relation to questions of national culture and identity."[1] Moreover, according to media studies scholar Martin Conboy, film in Germany has not only "always provided a useful means of articulating national aspirations and mood of the country," the cinema also, "as a popular cultural form . . . became an important means of expressing a specifically German identity."[2] Films hence are both global products — made, traded, and consumed across national borders — and important vehicles for projects of the national. As aesthetic object, cultural product, and capitalist commodity, the cinema therefore encompasses elements pivotal to both localism and internationalism. Given this fluctuation between national significance and transnational production and reception, investigations into film often oscillate between the national and the international, with the latter frequently represented by Hollywood in its global reach. In fact, Hake wonders "whether the renewed attention to national cinema marks the return of the national as a category of difference in, if not resistance to, the leveling effect of a global cinema culture ruled by Hollywood."[3]

This book examines such interconnections between the national and the transnational, or, to be more precise, between the German and the American (by way of Hollywood, which is often seen as representative of

the transnational) in films by four contemporary national and cultural go-betweens: German-born directors Wolfgang Petersen, Roland Emmerich, Percy Adlon, and Tom Tykwer. While the first chapter of *When* Heimat *Meets Hollywood* offers a contextualizing overview of German-American film relations during the twentieth century, the following chapters investigate the careers and oeuvres of these four directors, whose work has significance in a German as well as an international context. My study analyzes productions made in the United States between 1985 and 2005, or, as in Tykwer's case, non-US productions that engage extensively with Hollywood cinema, highlighting a time period that has seen an increased domination of the German film market by Hollywood products, but also a marked participation of Germans in U.S. film production.[4] In fact, over the last twenty years, and especially since the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, German directors have made an impressive array of films in America, running the gamut from Hollywood blockbusters to small art-house movies. Yet, while U.S. audiences are often unaware of their international provenance, Wolfgang Petersen and Roland Emmerich for instance are familiar to a great number of American moviegoers as the directors of films such as *In the Line of Fire* (1993), *Air Force One* (1997), *The Perfect Storm* (2000), and *Troy* (2004) by the former, and *Independence Day* (1996), *Godzilla* (1998), *The Patriot* (2000), and *The Day after Tomorrow* (2004) by the latter. The transnational success and impact of their movies would warrant a study of Petersen and Emmerich alone, even if their works, despite paradigmatic similarities, differ vastly in regard to their relationship with the United States and their ideological underpinnings. However, the films of both directors — having been largely categorized as box-office rather than "critical" successes — have so far received cursory attention by scholars. In an effort to redress the skewed balance between popular success and critical scrutiny, a substantial part of this study will be dedicated to a discussion of Petersen's and Emmerich's productions.

In addition to representatives of the Hollywood blockbuster paradigm, this book also analyzes the work of two German directors who, by comparison, work very differently with German/European and Hollywood cinematic traditions. The first is independent filmmaker Percy Adlon, a proponent of a distinctly individualistic art cinema that relates to Hollywood by way of rejecting its conventions, while it interacts with the United States as a location and an imaginary, as exemplified in his most famous production *Out of Rosenheim* (released in English as *Bagdad Café*, 1987). The second, as a special case of engaging with Hollywood from afar, is director Tom Tykwer, who has, unlike the other filmmakers featured in this study, never worked *in* the United States, yet always *with* American film traditions. Tykwer's productions self-consciously communicate strong U.S.- and Hollywood-influenced cultural ties without involving the United States territorially or as a national reality, while his works

are at the same time firmly rooted in the European-German and art-film paradigms, as demonstrated in his international success *Lola rennt* (Run Lola Run, 1998).

My study investigates the works of these directors in their relationship with America along with the shifting meanings of the concept of national cinema, because the four share a national background and a transnational reach while contrasting productively in their differing cultural and cinematic affiliations with Germany, the United States, and Hollywood, as well as in their aesthetic and ideological approaches. The directors serve as paradigmatic cases for varying models of engagement with America and with European and Hollywood film traditions and influences, oscillating between art, independent, and mainstream cinema. Their works in many ways embody both tensions and harmony between the national and the transnational aspects of cultural products today. Through close readings of key films, this study isolates the aesthetics and the politics of the four directors' specific cinematic practices. It thereby points to the diverse strategies and approaches they use to negotiate different national and transnational cultural and cinematic terrains. These practices — as I will argue — ultimately result in productions that follow one of three modes: they (1) contrast, (2) integrate, or (3) level and erase the distinctions between the locally and culturally specific and the transnationally applicable and marketable. Correspondingly, the works in each of the three modes promote the principles of heterogeneity, synthesis, or homogenization via their content and form. The films hence produce a range of vastly different aesthetic, cultural, and political effects. Taken together, however, they form a body of work that complicates traditional and entrenched notions of "the national" in film, reflecting the irreducible multiplicity of cinematic production and consumption while extending discussions about new concepts of national cinema.

The Cultural Turn in German Film Studies

Parallel to the increase of American productions in the German market during the 1980s, and the growing internationalization of the cinema, film studies in Germany witnessed a cultural turn. As Tim Bergfelder, Erica Carter, and Deniz Göktürk suggest in their introduction to *The German Cinema Book* (2002), this shift involved a change in "film-historical focus from German cinema as a cultural field organized around modernist aesthetics and major *auteurs*, to German cinema as a popular cinema with nationally specific genres, star systems, film styles and narrative forms."[5] One result of this shift has been a steady increase in scholarly attention to German cinema's international and transnational aspects. This again corresponds to international developments, as over the past decade a trend has

emerged in film scholarship to conceptualize cinema beyond the boundaries of the nation-state. Terms such as transnational cinema, accented cinema, and transvergent cinema are used to describe the emergence of a substantial body of work within international film in which questions of migration and transition are of central interest. At the same time, these terms also respond to the growing internationalization of film production itself, as directors easily cross from one national site of production to another and co-financing models across borders have begun to dominate the business, with producers increasingly depending on a patchwork of national and global companies and media conglomerates to finance their works. The emergence of this trend in scholarship has hence accompanied the ongoing dissolution of long-established and deeply ingrained national affiliations with cinematic traditions, giving way to alternative criteria for conceptualizing and discussing cultural and visual identities of films.

This book, partaking of these developments, seeks to expand on recent scholarship on Germany's cinematic internationalism, which has been part of these paradigm shifts. Much of the research done on German cinema over the past two decades indicates the rising interest in issues of transnationality. Illustrative of this new focus of attention is, for instance, the proliferation of studies about Weimar and Nazi cinema that consider the influences and traditions infusing these cinemas as well as their relationship to American consumer and popular culture and models of mass entertainment. Examples of such work include Thomas Saunders's analysis of American cinema in Weimar Germany, *Hollywood in Berlin* (1994), Markus Spieker's book *Hollywood unterm Hakenkreuz* (1999), which investigates American films in the Third Reich, Thomas Elsaesser's *Weimar Cinema and after: Germany's Historical Imaginary* (2000), and *M wie Nebenzahl: Nero — Filmproduktion zwischen Europa und Hollywood* (2002), a history of the influential Weimar production company Nebenzahl.[6] New studies on exile and émigré films (including their cinematic legacies of the forties, fifties, and beyond) have emerged, exemplified by Jan-Christopher Horak's work on expatriate filmmaking in the 1990s, Christian Cargnelli and Michael Omasta's book on Austrian émigrés, *Aufbruch ins Ungewisse: österreichische Filmschaffende in der Emigration vor 1945* (1993), Barbara Steinbauer-Grötsch's study *Die lange Nacht der Schatten: Film Noir und Filmexil* (2000), and Lutz Koepnick's *The Dark Mirror: German Cinema between Hitler and Hollywood* (2002).[7]

These works on Weimar and Nazi cinema and its aftermath are complemented by further research on German-European and German-Hollywood film connections, such as several volumes from CineGraph, investigating early German cinematic links with Britain, Denmark, Russia, and France. Similarly, Tim Bergfelder's account of popular German film and European co-productions *International Adventures* (2005) discusses transnational European contexts and connections of German cinema in the

sixties. On a more international scale, Andrew Higson and Richard Maltby's 1999 collection *"Film Europe" and "Film America"* examines the foundations and implications of these conceptualizations of national cinemas as well as their interrelations, while James Morrison's *Passport to Hollywood* (1998) analyzes the engagement of European, including German, directors with U.S. film and their impact on it from the 1920s to the 1980s. Many of Thomas Elsaesser's prolific writings explore relations between German and American cinema, and Joseph Garncarz did important work in the 1990s on the reception and success of Hollywood films in Germany.[8] This body of research has broadened our understanding of national cinemas in general (and German cinema in particular) as phenomena that are not discrete and monolithic, but a site of confluence of diverse and often irreconcilable national, political, cultural, and aesthetic tendencies. The scholars mentioned above have helped to displace German film history's traditional master narratives of auteurs, art films, and ideology, or, as Hake puts it, its "symptomatic readings of a few canonical films and film directors."[9] My book is therefore heavily indebted to much of the scholarly work done over the past two decades in German film studies and beyond, and it draws on many of its questions, concerns, and methodologies.

Yet, as is evident from the works discussed above, most analyses that address the interrelations between the national cinemas of Germany and the United States have scrutinized earlier periods of the two countries' connected histories, mainly up to the 1970s and the New German Cinema. My book aims to expand that discussion by exploring German-American film connections during the last two decades of the twentieth century, a period not previously addressed in systematic fashion, and also by centering on an analysis of the interrelations between German and American culture and cinema in (mostly) U.S.-made productions. My work hence picks up where many of the scholars mentioned above leave off, in the 1980s, and pursues a neglected avenue of inquiry by focusing on recent films shot in (or referring to) Hollywood and America by German directors.[10] Furthermore, in response to the work of scholars such as sociologists Roland Robertson, Mike Featherstone, and others who have theorized how globalizing processes produce transnational or "third cultures" oriented beyond national boundaries, this study asks to what extent these films can be seen as manifestations of such "third cultures."[11] Another key critical concept for my analysis that has also gained currency in postcolonial studies is the related idea of "hybridity" as used for instance by Homi Bhabha in his concept of the "third space."[12] This "third space" combines aspects of leading and marginalized cultures in a given society and thus disrupts power relations between the dominated and the dominant.[13] Yet, my study also draws on Fredric Jameson's pessimistic assessments of postmodernism as the cultural representation of globalized capitalism, which is marked by the virtually complete commodification of human existence. Jameson argues that

the victory of the "logic of late capitalism" leads to the erasure of modernity's divisions between social spheres, "collapsing the cultural into the economic — and the economic into the cultural."[14] This effacement of borders, as it manifests itself also for instance in the blurring of boundaries between high and popular culture, is, according to Jameson, one of the foremost markers of postmodernity, and it clearly resonates with the politically and socially optimistic concepts of hybridity and "third cultures." These theoretical approaches are useful in analyzing the works of the directors under scrutiny in this book in an international context and in their relationship to Hollywood, in that they have significant implications for the transnational in-between positions of these filmmakers as well as for the study of the type of productions they choose to make, that is, their preference for blockbuster cinema, art films, or a hybrid form in the middle.

Planet Hollywood?

The specter of Hollywood as the most powerful global force in the world of film today, against which many countries define their national cinemas, has been conjured up frequently in this introduction as one of the focal points of this study. The following brief economic overview serves to substantiate Hollywood's undeniable appeal and impact on national cinemas around the world.

Entertainment is, after aerospace technology, the largest U.S. export. In 2006, global revenues of the seven largest U.S. film and television companies alone came in at around $35 billion.[15] These companies are represented nationally and internationally by the lobbying arm of the U.S. film industry, the Motion Picture Association of America (MPAA) and the Motion Picture Association (MPA). From the founding of the association in 1922 up to the 1970s, its companies were primarily involved in a domestic operation centering on theatrical movies and TV programming. Over the past two decades, however, the film and television business has undergone a considerable shift. In 1967, the worldwide revenues of Hollywood's major studios totaled about $1.26 billion. Roughly thirty-three percent of that sum, circa $418 million, was made in international markets. Since then, there has been as the group itself put it in the 2005 version of its website "exponential growth and upheaval, with the MPAA/MPA organization asserting itself as a global entertainment, cultural and economic phenomenon."[16] Of the $35 billion global box-office revenues taken in by the member companies in 2006, the international share that year came in at over seventy percent, or $25.8 billion. As the organization's website confidently stated in 2005, "American creative works today are received hospitably in just about every country in the world on all the continents."[17] Indeed, the profits of U.S. movies in foreign

markets more than doubled in just five years — from $740 million in 1985 to $1.65 billion in 1990. At the same time, the share of foreign films in American theaters fell from seven percent to one percent between 1970 and 1990.[18] U.S. box-office returns abroad rose even more dramatically between 1990 and 2004, by over 1,400 percent to more than $25 billion. As far back as 1968, Jack Valenti, then head of the MPAA/MPA, boasted that "the motion picture industry is the only U.S. enterprise that negotiates on its own with foreign governments."[19] In 2007, the MPAA/MPA stated just as proudly, "Today, U.S. films are shown in more than 150 countries worldwide and American television programs are broadcast in over 125 international markets. The U.S. film industry provides the majority of home entertainment products seen in millions of homes throughout the world."[20] While we may live in the age of cinematic internationalism, the global influence of American film productions seems unchallenged.

Yet, cultural critic and philosopher Michel Foucault's notion of power rests on the assumption that power is never mono-directional, that it can always be deflected and re-appropriated: "We're never trapped by power: it's always possible to modify its hold."[21] In a similar vein, the local and the global, the national and the transnational are all linked to each other in a complex web of dynamic influences and exchanges. Hollywood, as a part of this web, is not the impenetrable monolith it is often portrayed to be, though one should not underestimate its obvious economic and cultural dominance and transnational impact. Clearly, Hollywood, just like every other film culture in this shrinking world and just as it was throughout the twentieth century, is exposed and susceptible to the effects of internationalization, and the influx of alternative cinematic and cultural codes and paradigms that comes with it. One of the goals of this book, then, is to investigate how the aesthetics and politics of the directors' artistic practices interact with Hollywood relative to their own national backgrounds, and how these filmmakers interpret, adapt to, or change the American cinematic context in and with which they work.

The Directors: Global Players — Local Players

The first two directors discussed in this book, Wolfgang Petersen and Roland Emmerich, exhibit marked aesthetic and ideological differences, but are similar in their adherence to Hollywood practices. Both are prime examples of filmmakers who achieved global success after leaving Germany for Hollywood. Together, their films have grossed almost $4 billion worldwide, not including earnings from video and DVD rentals and sales, television rights, or affiliated merchandising. However, despite the international impact of their films and the enormous sums of money they generate, these directors have attracted little scholarly attention. Beyond

reviews and some isolated articles on individual productions such as *Das Boot* (Petersen, 1981) and *Independence Day* (Emmerich, 1996), there are few analyses or serious studies of their works. This seems to indicate that the intellectual bias against popular movies and directors, especially in a German context, still obtains. However, the directors' impact on cinematic culture and their global position and influence not only warrants, but in fact demands an in-depth examination and discussion of their works. Chapters 2 and 3 hence look at major productions by Emmerich and Petersen, respectively, within the context of their career developments. The analyses will be guided by questions about the national and cultural identity of their works (or the lack thereof), that is, about the German, American, and Hollywood affiliations of their films and the ideological frameworks that structure them.

Wolfgang Petersen has enjoyed a long career first in Germany, then in the United States, and his films have been both critically acclaimed and commercially successful. After modest beginnings in the Young German Cinema and public German television, Petersen eventually transformed himself into one of America's most powerful players, in charge of multi-million-dollar productions featuring Hollywood stars. Roland Emmerich, in contrast, whose graduation project from film school already bore the conceptual markings of a Hollywood production, gravitated toward America from the start. In his choice of narratives, settings, genre, cast, and language, he delineated early on the potential global market for his movies. His work, then, did not undergo drastic change as much as it developed and came into its own in the context of U.S. blockbuster productions. However, while Petersen and Emmerich both largely conform to the conventions of Hollywood cinema, they occupy opposite ends of the political and ideological spectrum. The analysis of these two filmmakers illustrates two commercially successful ways of working with Hollywood cinema and Hollywood's audiences around the globe, while pointing to the vastly different aesthetic, cultural, social, and political discourses the directors engage in with their productions. Emmerich constructs cinematic narratives that, while studiously avoiding German or indeed any reality-based national-cultural references, promote violence and nationalism and work against progressive sociopolitical developments such as multicultural-ism or feminism. Petersen's narratives, in contrast, are informed by pre-occupations, aesthetics, and ideological concerns traceable to his German roots and leftist political influences, which surface in his works and imbue them with a sense of diversity. His films therefore reveal a propensity toward sociopolitical progress that sets them visibly apart from Emmerich's reactionary brand of Hollywood cinema.

The fourth chapter examines the German-American films of Percy Adlon, who, as an independent and highly idiosyncratic director of art cinema, rep-resents a type of film that is diametrically opposed to Emmerich's and, to a

lesser degree, Petersen's productions. Adlon, perhaps more surprisingly given his often innovative and challenging cinematic style, has also been neglected by scholars. Yet his high degree of transnationalism and some of the approaches and cinematic practices he uses to bring German and American cultures and cinemas together constitute the common ground between him and the other directors featured in this study. These commonalities in combination with the aesthetic and political difference that marks his films make an analysis of Adlon's works a productively contrastive contribution to this book. Adlon's U.S.-produced pictures straddle German and American culture in an effort to be transnationally intelligible and appealing, and they illustrate a highly idiosyncratic approach to filmmaking that defies Hollywood conventions. In stark contrast to Emmerich's films, Adlon's productions are ideologically open-minded and, akin to Petersen's works, socially and politically progressive. While they are primarily interested in the interaction between Germans and German culture and the United States, and hence continuously reference "Germany" and notions of "Germanness," Adlon's films ultimately unite bi-national and bi-cultural sensibilities by engaging in a German-American dialogue that aims to respect all participating voices. His cinema thus presents an illuminating countermodel to the films of Roland Emmerich, and, to a lesser extent, Wolfgang Petersen, while aligning itself more closely with the works of the fourth and last director to be analyzed in this study, Tom Tykwer.

The concluding chapter of this book discusses Tykwer as a unique voice that synthesizes positions of Emmerich, Petersen, and Adlon. As a director, Tykwer engages with Hollywood from the outside, but from a highly informed position, inspired by appreciation of its productions as much as by a desire to differ from them. In contrast to the preceding directors, Tykwer does not relate to the United States as either a nation (as Petersen and Adlon do) or a cultural imaginary (as Emmerich and Adlon do, if both in different ways). Instead, his films appropriate and rework Hollywood paradigms by drawing on the styles of European art cinema, while also frequently referencing elements of postmodernism. The director hence creates hybrids that clearly reflect indebtedness to Hollywood traditions as well as to German cinematic and cultural practices. Tykwer's films present radically personal visions of life, informed by eclectic cinematic passions, and, while motivated by metaphysical and philosophical inquiries, his productions are also marked by a non-didactic interest in social and political questions. He offers yet another model of transnational filmmaking, namely one that fuses Hollywood cinema and its traditions with those of European and German filmmaking, and does so in German or European settings. Of the directors discussed in this study, Tykwer is the one whose productions provide the most workable solution for negotiating the difficult struggle between economic pressures and artistic integrity as well as the local-global push-and-pull of contemporary cinema.

When Heimat *Meets Hollywood* thus attempts to isolate specific patterns and models of transnational filmmaking and national engagement by looking through the kaleidoscopic lens of diverse works and directors who are tied together in their dissimilarity by common denominators: their German backgrounds, their bi-cultural relationship to the United States and Germany, their interaction with American and European cinematic traditions and conventions, and their transnational directorial aspirations. Most of the productions of these four filmmakers must therefore be considered part of a cinema that shares in cultural trends greatly impacting contemporary societies, a cinema that, while clearly informed by paradigms of the national, needs to be conceptualized beyond the conventional boundaries of nation-states. Petersen, Emmerich, Adlon, Tykwer and their films, it seems to me, present ideal case studies for the investigation of the changes in national cinematic boundaries, and for the analysis of directorial responses to the increasing internationalization of the film industry and the simultaneous dissolution of longstanding ideas about national cultural and cinematic identities today.

Notes

[1] Sabine Hake, *German National Cinema* (London/New York: Routledge, 2002), 5.

[2] Martin Conboy, "The Discourse of Location: Realigning the Popular in German Cinema," *European Journal of Communication*, 14:3 (1999): 353–77, here 355.

[3] Hake, *German Cinema*, 4.

[4] For developments in the annual German movie charts between 1925 and 1990 see Joseph Garncarz, "Hollywood in Germany. Die Rolle des amerikanischen Films in Deutschland: 1925–1990," in *Der deutsche Film: Aspekte seiner Geschichte von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*, ed. Uli Jung (Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1993), 167–213, esp. 198–213; for chart information after 1990 see *Film-Jahrbuch*, published yearly by Heyne in Munich, and the January issues of *Filmecho/Filmwoche*, a weekly publication by the trade organization of the German film industry; see also Peter Krämer, "Hollywood in Germany/Germany in Hollywood," in *The German Cinema Book*, ed. Tim Bergfelder, Erica Carter, and Deniz Göktürk (London: BFI, 2002), 232–34.

[5] *The German Cinema Book*, ed. Tim Bergfelder, Erica Carter, and Deniz Göktürk (London: BFI, 2002), 9.

[6] See Thomas Saunders, *Hollywood in Berlin: American Cinema in Weimar Germany* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1994); Markus Spieker, *Hollywood unterm Hakenkreuz: Der amerikanische Spielfilm im Dritten Reich* (Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1999); Thomas Elsaesser, *Weimar Cinema and after: Germany's Historical Imaginary* (London: Routledge, 2000); *M wie Nebenzahl:*

Nero — Filmproduktion zwischen Europa und Hollywood, ed. Erika Wottrich (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik, 2002). Other recent works in this area include Mary-Elizabeth O'Brien's *Nazi Cinema as Enchantment: The Politics of Entertainment in the Third Reich* (Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2004, paperback 2006); Antje Ascheid's *Hitler's Heroines: Stardom and Womanhood in Nazi Cinema* (Philadelphia: Temple UP, 2003), and Sabine Hake's *Popular Cinema in the Third Reich* (Austin: U of Texas P, 2002). For earlier studies see Eric Rentschler, *The Ministry of Illusion: Nazi Cinema and Its Afterlife* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1996); Linda Schulte-Sasse, *Entertaining the Third Reich: Illusions of Wholeness in Nazi Cinema* (Durham: Duke UP, 1996); Karsten Witte, *Lachende Erben, toller Tag: Filmkomödie im Dritten Reich* (Berlin: Vorwerk, 1995); Thomas Elsaesser, "Moderne und Modernisierung. Der deutsche Film der dreißiger Jahre," *montage/av* 3.2 (1994): 23–40, and Leonardo Quaresima, "Der Film im Dritten Reich. Moderne, Amerikanismus, Unterhaltungsfilm," *montage/av* 3.2 (1994): 5–22.

[7] Jan-Christopher Horak began his work on émigré cinema in the 1970s, but for more recent examples see, for instance, his chapter "Exilfilm, 1933–1945," in *Geschichte des deutschen Films*, ed. Wolfgang Jacobsen, Anton Kaes, and Hans-Helmut Prinzler (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1993), 101–18, and "German Exile Cinema, 1933–1950," *Film History* 8 (1996): 373–89; Christian Cargnelli and Michael Omasta, *Aufbruch ins Ungewisse: Österreichische Filmschaffende in der Emigration vor 1945* (Vienna: Wespennest, 1993); Barbara Steinbauer-Grötsch, *Die lange Nacht der Schatten: Film noir und Filmexil* (Berlin: Dieter Bertz Verlag, 2000); Lutz Koepnick, *The Dark Mirror: German Cinema between Hitler and Hollywood* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 2002). For earlier examples see Maria Hilchenbach, *Kino im Exil: Die Emigration deutscher Filmkünstler 1933–1945* (Munich/New York: Saur, 1982); John Russell Taylor, *Strangers in Paradise: The Hollywood Emigrés, 1933–1950* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1983); *The Muses Flee Hitler: Cultural Transfer and Adaptation, 1930–1945*, ed. Jarrell C. Jackman and Carla M. Borden (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1983); Jan-Christopher Horak, *Fluchtpunkt Hollywood: Eine Dokumentation zur Filmemigration nach 1933* (Münster: MakS, 1984); *Theatre and Film in Exile: German Artists in Britain, 1933–1945*, ed. Günter Berghaus (Oxford/New York: Berg, 1989).

[8] See *Hallo? Berlin? Ici Paris!: Deutsch-französische Filmbeziehungen, 1918–1939*, ed. Sibylle M. Sturm and Arthur Wohlgemuth (Munich: Text + Kritik, 1996); *Fantaisies russes: Russische Filmemacher in Berlin und Paris 1920–1930*, ed. Jörg Schöning (Munich: Text + Kritik, 1995); *Schwarzer Traum und weiße Sklavin: Deutsch-dänische Filmbeziehungen 1910–1930*, ed. Manfred Behn (Munich: Text + Kritik, 1994); *London Calling: Deutsche im britischen Film der dreißiger Jahre*, ed. Jörg Schöning (Munich: Text + Kritik, 1993); Tim Bergfelder, *International Adventures: German Popular Cinema and European Co-Productions in the 1960s* (New York/Oxford: Berghahn, 2005); *"Film Europe" and "Film America": Cinema, Commerce and Cultural Exchange 1920–1939,"* ed. Andrew Higson and Richard Maltby (Exeter: U of Exeter P, 1999); James Morrison, *Passport to Hollywood: Hollywood Films, European Directors* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1998); Thomas Elsaesser, "The German Postwar Cinema and Hollywood," in *Hollywood in Europe: Experiences of a Cultural Hegemony*, ed. Rob Kroes and David

Ellwood (Amsterdam: VU UP, 1994); Elsaesser, "A German Ancestry to Film Noir? — Film History and Its Imaginary," *Iris* 21 (1996): 129–44; Elsaesser, "Hollywood-Berlin," *Sight and Sound* (November 1997): 14–17; Elsaesser, "American Friends: Hollywood Echoes in the New German Cinema," in *Hollywood and Europe. Economics, Culture, National Identity, 1945–95*, ed. Geoffrey Nowell-Smith and Steven Ricci (London: British Film Institute, 1998), 142–55; Elsaesser "Ethnicity, Authenticity, and Exile: A Counterfeit Trade? German Filmmakers and Hollywood," in *Home, Exile, Homeland. Film, Media, and the Politics of Place*, ed. Hamid Naficy (New York: Routledge, 1999), 97–124; and Elsaesser, "German Cinema Face to Face with Hollywood: Looking into a Two-Way Mirror," in *Americanization and Anti-Americanism: The German Encounter with American Culture after 1945*, ed. Alexander Stephan (New York/Oxford: Berghahn, 2005), 166–85; Joseph Garncarz, "Hollywood in Germany," 167–213.

[9] Hake, *German Cinema*, 1.

[10] There are frequent brief acknowledgments of the phenomenon, as illustrated, for instance, by an early mention in a footnote by Eric Rentschler in "How American Is It: The U.S. as Image and Imaginary in German Film," *German Quarterly* 57.4 (1984): 602–20: "The spectrum ranges from commercial attempts to replicate the Hollywood film industry in Munich . . . to . . . features filmed in the U.S. by a host of directors: Hans Noever, Erwin Keusch, Vadim Glowna, and Wim Wenders, among others" (620). One also finds a few passing remarks, as, for instance, in Elsaesser's introduction to the *BFI Companion to German Cinema*, ed. Thomas Elsaesser and Michael Wedel (London: BFI, 1999), 3–16, esp. 4. Apart from that, however, there are only a handful of articles on contemporary Hollywood work by Germans as a phenomenon at large. See, for example, Thomas Elsaesser, "German Cinema Face to Face with Hollywood: Looking into a Two-Way Mirror," in *Americanization and Anti-Americanism: The German Encounter with American Culture after 1945*, ed. Alexander Stephan (New York/Oxford: Berghahn, 2005), 166–85; Peter Krämer, "Hollywood in Germany/Germany in Hollywood," 227–37; on the post-1970 period: 232–34.

There are, of course, a great number of articles and books on individual German films and film practitioners in a context of U.S. production and U.S. influence, but they generally center on names connected with the New German Cinema and the art-film tradition, such as Wenders or Schlöndorff, and largely neglect directors of more popular movies or of less international renown. Some exceptions include Brad Prager's analysis of Wolfgang Petersen's *Das Boot* (1981) as a "German Hollywood Film" in *Light Motives: German Popular Film in Perspective*, ed. Randall Halle and Margaret McCarthy (Detroit: Wayne State UP, 2003), 237–58, and a postcolonial reading of Roland Emmerich's *Stargate* by Floyd Cheung, "Imagining Danger, Imagining Nation: Postcolonial Discourse in *Rising Sun* and *Stargate*," *Jouvert: A Journal of Postcolonial Studies* 2:2 (1998). http://social.chass.ncsu.edu/Jouvert/ v2i2/cheung.htm. Accessed on: 17 May 2007. Another exception in this context is Emmerich's production *Independence Day* (1996), which has received a certain amount of scholarly attention, including an entire, if slim, monograph by historian and film scholar Michael Rogin published by the British Film Institute.

[11] *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*, ed. Mike Featherstone (London: Sage, 1990), 6. See also *Global Modernities*, ed. Mike Featherstone, Scott Lash, and Roland Robertson (London: Sage, 1995), and Roland Robertson, *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture* (London: Sage, 1992). The term "third culture" originated during the 1960s in the works of sociologists John and Ruth Useem and John D. Donoghue, and has over the past decades been adapted and developed further by scholars in sociology as well as anthropology, communications, and cultural studies, among others. John Useem originally defined it as "cultural patterns inherited and created, learned and shared by the members of two or more different societies who are personally involved in relating their society, or segments thereof, to each other." John Useem, "The Study of Cultures," *Sociological Focus* (1971): 14.

[12] See for instance Robert Young, *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race* (London: Routledge, 1995); *Debating Cultural Hybridity: Multi-Cultural Identities and the Politics of Anti-Racism*, ed. Pnina Werbner and Tariq Modood (London: Zed Books, 1997).

[13] See Homi Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 1994).

[14] Frederic Jameson, "Globalization and Political Strategy," *New Left Review* 4 (July–August 2000). Online at: http://newleftreview.org/?page=article&view=2255. Accessed on 18 May 2007. Also see Jameson, *Postmodernism or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (London: Verso, 1991).

[15] As quoted on the website of the Motion Picture Association of America at: http://www.mpaa.org/researchStatistics.asp. Accessed on 17 May 2007. The seven companies are: Buena Vista Pictures Distribution (The Walt Disney Company), Sony Pictures Entertainment Inc., Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios Inc., Paramount Pictures Corporation, Twentieth Century Fox Film Corporation, Universal City Studios LLLP, and Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc.

[16] http://www.mpaa.org. Accessed on 18 March 2005. The website has since been changed.

[17] http://www.mpaa.org. Accessed on 18 March 2005. However, the website has been rewritten and toned-down since then. The 2007 version reads: "Today, U.S. films are shown in more than 150 countries worldwide and American television programs are broadcast in over 125 international markets." Online at: http://www.mpaa.org/AboutUs.asp. Accessed on 17 May 2007.

[18] Reinhold Wagnleitner, "'No Commodity Is Quite So Strange as This Thing Called Cultural Exchange.' The Foreign Politics of American Pop Culture Hegemony," in *Americanization — Globalization — Education*, ed. G. Bach, S. Broeck and U. Schulenberg (Heidelberg: Winter, 2003): 153–81.

[19] As quoted in: Alexander Cockburn, "Milk Bars, Hollywood and the March of Empires" in *CounterPunch Diary*, Weekend Edition February 14/15, 2004.

[20] http://www.mpaa.org/AboutUs.asp. Accessed on 18 May 2007.

[21] Michel Foucault, "The History of Sexuality: Interview," trans. Geoff Bennington, *Oxford Literary Review* 4:2 (1980): 3–14, here 13.