2019

On the Banality of Transnational Film

Ian Reyes
University of Rhode Island

Justin Wyatt
University of Rhode Island

On the Banality of Transnational Film

Abstract

"Breakthrough" global blockbusters like *Black Panther* (2018) and *Crazy Rich Asians* (2018) create disturbances among critics and firms forced to wonder if such ripples of diversity will become waves of new cinema wiping out the hegemony of Hollywood and the global West. In this essay, we establish the context for this phenomenon in terms of film's historical relationship to marketing. Through this context, we theorize a transnational aesthetic for global blockbusters, one that may serve to limit ripples of diversity, breaking waves of change against the rocks of a banal cinema of Americanized nothingness.

Keywords

Hollywood, West, Cinema, Film, Hegemony, Asia

Creative Commons License

On the Banality of Transnational Film

"Breakthrough" global blockbusters like *Black Panther* (2018) and *Crazy Rich Asians* (2018) create ripples of representational diversity. Will such small ripples coalesce into giant waves of new cinema, wiping out the hegemony of Hollywood and the global West? In this essay, we establish the context for this phenomenon in terms of film's historical relationship to marketing. Through this context, we theorize the banality of transnational film, which may limit ripples of diversity, breaking and dispersing the waves of change against the rocks of Americanized nothingness.

Hollywood's Global Dominance and the Possibility for Change

Globally successful films like Black Panther (2018) and Crazy Rich Asians (2018) demand attention due to their big box office numbers and diverse casting (see Bowles 2018, Eckhardt 2018, for reviews of 'Black Panther' in this journal).To understand the significance of these global, breakthrough blockbusters more critically, one should consider the historically and materially specific emergence of film technology amidst other "new media" of the late 19th/early 20th century.

These media – including radio, television, and sound recording – were identifiably new because they were "mass" media, part of the creation of mass societies, cultures, and economies. As Kellner (2009) recounts, the Frankfurt School theorists identified one of the crucial aspects of mass media: "the commodities of the culture industries exhibited the same features as other products of mass production: commodification, standardization, and massification" (p. 96). Horkheimer and Adorno (2002) famously critiqued this "culture industry," which turned something that should be an organic outgrowth of people's lived experience — culture — into an alienating commercial product subject to the demands of industrial production and consumption. In this way, mass culture was, from its conception, an alienating, centralized, imperial force even within the bounds of a single nation.

Today, much of media and marketing theory concerns the decay of the technological and institutional infrastructures from the mass era. Revised methods of connecting with audiences are now evident, including social media and non-traditional advertising techniques (Bartholomew 2017). The industry's adaptations to globalization, however, are not only technological, they can also be found in film production itself — writing, casting, directing, etc. — and the role of marketing in this creative

process. In that regard, one area of great interest is the diversification of actors, characters, and stories in this digitally networked era. This is because racial, ethnic, and national homogeneity is a problem that is baked-in and embedded in the original market strategies and structures that made film a mass medium.

From a technological standpoint, film is unlike other prototypical mass media, particularly broadcast television and radio. Film is more like print or sound recording, which reach masses despite, not because of, ingrained capabilities of the medium itself. Film, in a purely technical sense, is highly local, even personal or private. It is only due to the exhibition and distribution schemes of marketing that one can consider this a mass medium with global reach. In that sense, any question about film and globalization is inevitably a question about the role of marketing in the evolution of this medium.

Using a framework from industrial analysis, Kindem (2000) has demonstrated how Hollywood developed its leading economic position in the world market. Even the drastically scaled-down, post-Paramount Decree studio system was sufficient to sustain the mass-market for film as a global industry. Designed to create a more competitive marketplace for the film industry, the 1948 Paramount Consent Decree required the five defendants (Paramount Pictures, Twentieth Century-Fox, Loew's/MGM, Radio-Keith-Orpheum, Warner Bros.), who owned their movie theaters, to divest either their distribution arm or their movie theaters. The goal was to break the anti-competitive nature in which the defendants controlled all aspects (production, distribution and exhibition) of the film industry.

After this decision, Hollywood was unable to pursue the classical vertical integration strategy — in which a media company controls all the aspects of a single product. The post-Paramount-Decree media industry shifted to horizontal integration in which a company controls several different media assets (e.g., film, television, radio, theme parks, publishing etc.) rather than one asset through all stages from conception to entering the marketplace. Centralizing production and innovating organization strategies, the American film industry blazed the trail for distribution systems that could take its movies around the emerging, modern world.

While academic and popular attention generally falls on production and consumption, distribution is the unsung hero of film's story (Perren 2013). The successful, worldwide distribution of films from Hollywood and the global West is the core of critiques of the mainstream film industry as a form of cultural and economic imperialism. The digital age holds the promise to disrupt Western bias and business practice through globally successful (i.e., profitable) films produced outside of the old centers of

power; transcending the terms set by Hollywood, however, may be yet another hurdle.

Even as the technical infrastructure for film production, distribution, promotion, and consumption becomes ever more streamlined, the "post-classical" Hollywood style (cf. Thompson, 1999) remains the norm for globally successful films, no matter where in the world they originate. While digital distribution systems have undoubtedly flattened the world for distribution and promotion, movies are still rather slow and costly to bring to market compared to other media products. This makes film production financially risky, especially so for global enterprises. Even with a major studio like Warner Bros. behind *Crazy Rich Asians*, several other production companies were involved: SK Global, Starlight Cultural Entertainment, Color Force and Ivanhoe Pictures. *Black Panther*, produced and distributed by Marvel Studios and Walt Disney Pictures, was far more centralized, though the aesthetic outcome — spectacle — was largely the same.

The Hollywood dependence on blockbuster spectacles is one of the dominant strategies for managing the risk of protracted production cycles. Although a full articulation of the "post-classical" Hollywood style is beyond the scope of our current considerations, let it suffice to say that, like the judge once said of pornography, one knows it when one sees it. Whether defined as "high concept" (cf. Wyatt, 1994), blockbuster, or "post-classical" Hollywood style, movies are still built around connecting the viewer to the characters and their ensuing drama through a particular unity of elements including narrative structure, cinematography, sound design, editing, and other cinematic techniques. High concept movies often depend on a pre-sold property with built-in appeal to specific audiences. Both *Crazy Rich Asians* (best-selling book) and *Black Panther* (transmedia franchise) follow this model. Films with the production values and negative cost like these are simply infeasible for independent producers from local/national centers.

In what follows, we will continue this historical orientation with a brief synopsis of key issues concerning globalization and transnationalism vis-à-vis the film industry. Next, we will situate some of the popular discourse around what is said to be groundbreaking about *Black Panther* and *Crazy Rich Asians*, and situate that in the context of other, similarly lauded, groundbreaking films like *El Mariachi* (1993), *Brokeback Mountain* (2005), and *Slumdog Millionaire* (2008).

Into the 'Woods', and Out Again: Transnationalism in the Context of Globalization and "Hollywood" Imperialism

The history of film's globalization begins with the development of local and national cinemas outside the hegemonic systems and styles of Hollywood and Western Europe. This is the standard account of history that film scholars and critics share as their understanding of globalization (Elsaesser 2005; Walsh 1996). In such, the tension between "Hollywood" — as a metonym for mainstream cinema writ large — and other, developing industries and cultures, takes center stage (e.g., Bollywood, Nollywood, Hmollywood, Indiewood). The other 'Woods' typically gain access to mainstream success through Hollywood licensing and distribution deals.

Independent cinema was sometimes the route to explore alternative social and cultural issues, but that space has diminished considerably since the mid-1990s. Even during the burst of "indie cinema" in the 1990s, the films tended toward a centrist position. "Groundbreaking" films like *The Wedding Banquet* (1993), for example, could be seen as reinforcing cultural stereotypes (Wyatt 2001). "Indie cinema" was a mark used to distinguish the product vis-à-vis studio movies. With several of these indie distributors purchased by studios (e.g., Miramax bought by Disney, USA Films/Gramercy/October Films combined into Focus Features by Universal – now part of Comcast), the opportunity to offer diverse voices within cinema faded by the new century.

Hollywood, as an aesthetic and as a mode of production, however global in its present scope, remains haunted by the socio-economics and cultural power dynamics of its historical origins. Through this problematic of representation and identity in globally successful films, the accolades and popularity of *Black Panther* and *Crazy Rich Asians* are, indeed, notable. Here is a sampling:

> Disney/Marvel's *Black Panther* hit tracking this morning, and of course, the numbers are so high no one can get an accurate read on it. Some tracking services have it as high as $150M over four days, but a $100M-plus opening is guaranteed (D'Allesandro 2018).

> *Black Panther* is the first mega-budget fictional superhero movie with a predominantly black cast, causing it to fill a lacuna in international cinema — the absence or stereotyped

portrayal of Africans and their continent in international cinema (Aiyesimoju 2018: 96).

Commercially and artistically, [Black] *Panther* can be seen as the final liberation of the African American movie from marginal status (Cooper 2018).

We still have a long way to go to elevate the diverse stories coming from Southeast Asia, across cultures, countries and races. But to see familiar faces, places, phrases and even recipes depicted with the warm tenderness underneath *Crazy Rich Asians*' glittering exterior is a start (Haynes 2018).

[*Crazy Rich Asians*] has been hailed for promoting racial diversity in Hollywood by having an all-Asian cast. It is the first film by a major Hollywood studio to feature an all Asian cast in a modern setting since 'The Joy Luck Club' in 1993 (Sio 2018: 394).

While the diversity in casting and production personnel is remarkable, so too is the estrangement from the means, modes, and sensibilities of local and national industries. These films have little to do with those other [blank]woods, so the vector of globalization at issue here is primarily that of a mainstream inexorably engulfing (trans)national markets rather than that of any smaller tributary growing to become an essential contributor to world cinema. Digital media may be flattening the world, but the contours of economic and cultural imperialism are still plain to see.

In addition to the power of globally dominant Hollywood distribution companies and the pursuit of a high concept aesthetic, a reliance on licensing is also now commonplace. *Crazy Rich Asians*, based on a best-selling novel, is an instance of classic, cross-media synergy and licensing intending to minimize the risks of funding international distribution and promotion. But *Black Panther* is something beyond that classic model because it is not a mere re-telling of a story published in another medium. Rather, it is a unique text articulated with others in Marvel's transmedia universe. Transmediation is, undoubtedly, a powerful strategy for global media marketing. Transmediation, however, is also a trend that caters to audience and market expectations in ways that only the biggest firms can manage (Dholakia, Reyes and Kerrigan 2018). These strategies point toward what "transnational" cinema can become, and maybe already is —

not the sum of national cinemas in the same marketplace, rather the source of a cinema-without-nation (Chung 2012; Lim 2019) that is about nothing (Ritzer and Ryan 2002).

"Globalization" suggests "that the world's increasingly interconnected media environment is the outcome of messy and complicated interactions across space" (Curtin 2009: 111). While the processes of globalization may be messy and complicated, the resulting media artifacts, likely by dint of this mess and complication, can turn out to be rather simple. Transnational cinema results from multi-faceted negotiations across borders, cultures, and economies (Chung 2012). Competition and concession between nations can, under certain circumstances, yield new forms of cinema transcending nationality (e.g., slow cinema, ecocinema, poor cinema). Other forms of "transnational" cinema, Lim (2019) finds, are so only because they are supremely national, forming because "certain national ambitions can no longer be contained within fixed geographical boundaries as they are increasingly projected onto the global stage and procured through transnational means" (p. 1). A major avenue for "developing" local and national cinemas to become "developed" enough for global markets is this transnational route paved and constrained by the production aesthetics and market strategies reified through the early prominence of the United States and the global West in film history.

A standard claim is that American films operate internationally via "cultural discount," limiting cultural specificity and "tapping into a universal popular language and accordingly floats above historical and cultural specificity" (Acland 2003: 33). Appealing to something like a lowest-common-denominator sensibility, creating global films for cultural discounting results in, or risks, banality. Aesthetically, this, in the long term, has resulted in the "globalization of nothing" (Ritzer and Ryan 2002): "By *nothing*, we mean (largely) empty forms that are centrally conceived and controlled and relatively devoid of distinctive content" (p. 51). Just as McDonaldization (see Ritzer and Miles 2019), results in globalized non-things like Big Macs, Hollywoodization results in "empty forms" with few distinctive features, no matter how globalized the operation may be. However, for Big Macs as well as blockbusters, the predictable, repetitive, bland neutrality of such products is the outcome of ideologies with distinct national origins, particularly in the United States (Dumbrava 2016). A satirical view of this bland-globalization is of course evident in the cover-page design of MGDR articles, where artist Linda Lewis, even while employing rainbow colors and exotic city names, emphasizes the crushing banality of McDonald's arches. The imperialism attendant to

Hollywoodization is as observable in declining diversity and locality in cultural products as it is in declining diversity and locality in modes of cultural production. Due to the historical saturation of American film in global markets, transnational blockbusters, almost by definition, rely on an imperial, *Americanized* nothingness, which we will address next.

Banal Ripples or Transformative Waves?

One assumption made by much of the critical reception around these films seems to be that big box office will lead to change in future film production, distribution, marketing, and messaging. All too often, these successes tend to be isolated events despite the promise of a shift in cultural representations. There are plenty of examples. Robert Rodriguez was heralded as the savior of Latino cinema with the no-budget *El Mariachi* (1992), yet his subsequent career has been mixed commercially (with the important exception of *Spy Kids* (2001) and its sequels). A burst in "New Queer Cinema" in mid-1990s independent cinema seemingly had almost no impact on studio production until, a decade later, *Brokeback Mountain* (2005) garnered large box office ($178 million domestic) and critical acclaim, but failed to produce any wave of LGBTQ films from major studios. *Slumdog Millionaire* was a huge commercial and critical success (including winning eight Academy Awards). Rather than inspire more tales of those from Mumbai or similar settings, Danny Boyle's film proved to be an outlier. We could go on.

As far as film marketing is concerned, what is equally — perhaps even more — significant than the representation of marginalized people in these movies is the development of a global mode of production intended to serve a placeless, "transnational" sensibility, echoing the ideas of Appadurai (1990). It is plain to see that *Black Panther* and *Crazy Rich Asians* operate through filters both aesthetic and ideological.

Black Panther's dazzling CGI action sequences overwhelm and minimize whatever social commentary may be behind the story, which itself serves as one product among many in the sprawling transmedia Marvel Universe. *Crazy Rich Asians*, which has essentially the same structure as *Pretty Woman* (1990) is primarily about conspicuous consumption [*Editorial Note: of course, in crazy-rich Asia, an NYU professor substitutes for the guileless-hooker trope*]. Otherness is negotiated through money and power rather than through breaking ethnic and cultural stereotypes. These are examples of Americanized "nothing." The global success of this nothingness leaves open the question of how much, or little, the diverse casting is worth, and whether these successes will be interpreted as a directive for casting in the future.

As Benshoff and Griffin (2009) note, despite the occasional Hollywood blockbuster with an Asian theme or cast, films about Asian-American experiences are still struggling for acceptance. In a similar vein, Buckley (2018) cautions that the success of *Black Panther* does not necessarily mean more room for minority stars in globally distributed films. Buckley notes that global distribution and promotion for films with diverse casts, thus far, has been driven mostly by individuals championing the cause within specific firms, which otherwise see minority-led films as appealing mostly to minority markets.

Though it is far from certain, in the most optimistic of prognostications, these films *might* show that, under the right circumstances, there is a mass audience for diverse *casts*, but that says nothing about the mass appeal for diverse stories, structures, looks, and so on. In that respect, however, there may be something decidedly counter-hegemonic in *Black Panther* and *Crazy Rich Asians*. As different as the genres are, each plot presents a crucial ideological inversion: USA as "other." This kind of representational inversion could well be part of a new global imaginary. However, by virtue of its Hollywood filtering— its Americanized nothingness — it is a world that does not address the historical or present-day issues of cultural and economic imperialism.

Douthat (2018) observes, "*Crazy Rich Asians* is to romantic comedies what *Black Panther* was to politically themed superhero movies. It's a chance for enlightened audiences to revel in all kinds of things that they would feel uncomfortable about appreciating in a story about old-money WASPs or blueblood Europeans." For example, empire building is key to the success of both films. Family, tradition, legacy, values and the appeal of dynasties are at the heart of each narrative. Though these are counter-hegemonic empires, in many ways, the social structure within each film merely replicates the inequities and prejudices within past empires, but without depicting the lived, daily experience of people subject to empire. Regarding the question of whether *Black Panther* is proof of the global marketability of pan-Africanism, Sanders (2019) skeptically reads it as "profiting from Black Power in a neoliberal world" (147). Similarly, Sio (2018) notes of *Crazy Rich Asians*, "Much of the racial buzz could just be an American-internal discourse. One wonders whether the perceptions of Asians in the film reflect the Asians' self perceptions, or just Asians through the gaze of foreigners" (p. 394). The fact that this movie flopped in China points to the presence — and limited appeal — of this foreign gaze (Li 2018).

Still, there is another assumption in the favorable reception of these and other, similar "breakthrough" movies, begging much bigger questions

about the broader implications of the industrial and aesthetic considerations we have addressed. A bigger question is this: what is the function of film as a mechanism to inspire social and cultural change, and what is the fate of that function vis-à-vis the vicissitudes of a global film industry? Johnson (2013) poses the question about global film commerce, with several answers immediately present, "Is [film] a commodity ideally subject to free trade, or a powerful agent of socialization and enculturation whose global circulation might require moderation and regulation to protect less powerful cultures from being overrun?" (p. 158). This is different from the question of whether the success of a particular kind of groundbreaking film is an anomaly or a herald of a new age of cinema.

Undoubtedly, anomalies matter to people in ways that they do not to firms. If one were to combine these questions in a way that speaks to both consumers and firms as "stakeholders" of global cinema, one might ask: How do the casting, narratives, genres, and overall production values of a film affect its ability to create social change? Does a banal aesthetic of Americanized nothingness make counter-hegemonic features like racial/ethnic diversity and the othering of America less politically and socially relevant? What are the stakes for development within a global market becoming distinguished by "placeless" transnational aesthetics and ideologies developed under Western economic and cultural imperialism? Answering these questions is, of course, well beyond the scope of what is possible here – we aim to launch a dialogue, not offer comprehensive answers. Nonetheless, the context and critiques we have presented hopefully provide a vision that might guide the next, critical steps in understanding and responding to these and future "breakthrough" blockbusters.

References

Acland, Charles R. (2003), Screen Traffic: Movies, Multiplexes and Global Culture. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Appadurai, Arjun (1990), "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy," *Theory, Culture & Society*, 7 (2-3), 295-310. https://.doi.org/10.1177/026327690007002017

Aiyesimoju, Ayodeji B. (2018), "*Black Panther* as Afro-Complementary Cinematic Intervention: Lessons for Africa South of the Sahara Movie Industries**,"** *Africology: The Journal of Pan African Studies,* 11 (9), 96-102. https://.doi.org/10.23860/MGDR-2018-03-02-06

Bartholomew, Mark (2017), Adcreep: The Case Against Modern Marketing. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford Law Books.

Benshoff, Harry and Sean Griffin (2009), America on Film: Representing Race, Class, Gender, and Sexuality at the Movies. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.

Black Panther (2018), Director: Ryan Coogler. Writers: Ryan Coogler and Joe Robert Cole. Distributed by Walt Disney Studios Motion Pictures. January 2, 2018.

Bowles, Terri P. (2018), "Diasporadical: In Ryan Coogler's 'Black Panther,' Family Secrets, Cultural Alienation and Black Love," *Markets, Globalization & Development Review*, 3 (2), Article 7. https://.doi.org/10.23860/MGDR-2018-03-02-07

Brokeback Mountain (2005), Director: Ang Lee. Writers: Larry McMurtry and Diana Ossana. Distributed by Focus Features, September 2, 2005.

Buckley, Cara (2018), "Will Black Panther Pave the Way for Minority Stars Overseas?" *New York Times*, Dec. 23. (accessed on September 10, 2019), [available at: https://https://.nytimes.com/2018/12/22/movies/black-panther-global-marketing.html]

Chung, Hye J. (2012), "Media Heterotopia and Transnational Filmmaking: Mapping Real and Virtual Worlds," *Cinema Journal, 51* (4), 87-109. https://.doi.org/10.2307/23253578

Cooper, Rand R. (2018), "Making Wakanda Great again: "Black Panther," *Commonweal,* 145 (6), (accessed on September 10, 2019), [available at: https://https://.commonwealmagazine.org/making-wakanda-great-again]

Crazy Rich Asians (2018), Director: Jon M. Chu. Writers: Peter Chiarelli, Adele Lim and Kevin Kwan. Distributed by Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc., August 15, 2018.

Curtin, Michael (2009), "Thinking Globally: From Media Imperialism to Media Capital," In J. Holt & A. Perren (eds.), *Media Industries: History, Theory and Method,* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell, 108-19.

D'Allesandro, Anthony (2018), "Black Panther Projected to Open to $120m-$150m Over Four Days," *Deadline*, January 25, (accessed on September 10, 2019).

Dholakia, Nikhilesh, Ian Reyes and Finola Kerrigan (2018), "Transmedia Perspective on Entrepreneurship," In R. Turcan & N. Fraser (eds.) *The Palgrave Handbook of Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Entrepreneurship*, Cham: Palgrave. 337-54.

Douthat, R. (2018), Guiltless Escapism. *National Review*, September 13, (accessed on September 10, 2019), [available at: https://https://.nationalreview.com/magazine/2018/10/01/crazy-rich-asians-movie-review/]

Dumbrava, Gabriela (2016), "Cultural Consequences of Globalization: Major Contemporary Theories on the Global-Local Interference," *Annals of the University of Petrosani, Economics*, 16 (1), 95-102.

Eckhardt, Giana M. (2018), "Black Panther: Thrills, Postcolonial Discourse, and Blacktopia," *Markets, Globalization & Development Review*, 3 (2), https://.doi.org/10.23860/MGDR-2018-03-02-06

El Mariachi (1992), Director: Robert Rodriguez. Writer: Robert Rodriguez. Distributed by Columbia Pictures, September 15, 1992.

Elsaesser, Thomas (2005), "European Cinema: Face to Face with Hollywood," Amsterdam University Press.

Haynes, Suyin (2018), "Crazy Rich Asians is More than Glitz and Glamour. It's Groundbreaking for People Like Me," *Time*, August 18, (accessed on September 10, 2019), [available at: https://time.com/5363724/crazy-rich-asians-representation-meaning/].

Horkheimer, Max, and Theodor Adorno (2002), Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments. G.S. Noerr (ed.). E. Jephcott (trans.). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Johnson, Derek (2013), Media Franchising: Creative License and Collaboration in the Culture Industries. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Kellner, Douglas (2009), "Media Industries, Political Economy, and Media/Cultural Studies: An Articulation," In J. Holt & A. Perren

(eds.), *Media Industries: History, Theory and Method.* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell. 95-107.

Kindem, Gorham (2000), The International Movie Industry. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Li, Shan (2018), "China Isn't Crazy About Crazy Rich Asians," *Wall Street Journal*, December 5, (accessed on October 7, 2019), [available at: https://https://.wsj.com/articles/china-isnt-crazy-at-all-about-crazy-rich-asians-1544031975]

Lim, Song H. (2019), "Concepts of Transnational Cinema Revisited," *Transnational Screens*, 10 (1), 1-12. https://.doi.org/10.1080/25785273.2019.1602334

Perren, Alisa (2013), "Rethinking Distribution for the Future of Media Industry Studies," *Cinema Journal*, *52* (3), 165-71. https://.doi.org/10.1353/cj.2013.0017

Pretty Woman (1990), Director: Garry Marshal. Writer: G. F. Lawton. Distributed by Buena Vista Pictures, March 23, 1990.

Ritzer, George and Steven Miles (2019), "The Changing Nature of Consumption and the Intensification of McDonaldization in the Digital Age," *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 19 (1), 3-20. https://.doi.org{10.1177/1469540518818628

Ritzer, George and Michael Ryan (2002), "The Globalization of Nothing," *Social Thought & Research*, *25,* (1-2), 51-81. https://.doi.org/10.1353/sais.2003.0053

Sanders, Robert A. (2019), "Profitable Imaginaries of Black Power," *Political Geography,* *69*, 139-49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2018.12.010

Sio, Seong J. (2018), "*Crazy Rich Asians," Asian Ethnicity, 20* (3), 393-95. https://doi.org/10.1080/14631369.2018.1559035

Slumdog Millionaire (2008), Director: Danny Boyle. Writer: Simon Beaufoy. Distributed by Pathe Distribution, August 30, 2008.

Spy Kids (2001), Director: Robert Rodriguez. Writer: Robert Rodriguez. Distributed by Dimension Films, March 30, 2001.

The Wedding Banquet (1993), Director: Ang Lee Writers: Ang Lee, Neil Peng and James Schamus. Distributed by The Samuel Goldwyn Company, August 4, 1993.

Thompson, Kristin (1999), Storytelling in the New Hollywood: Understanding Classical Narrative Technique, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walsh, Michael (1996), "National Cinema, National Imaginary," *Film History, 8* (1), 5-17.

Wyatt, Justin (1994), High Concept: Movies and Marketing in Hollywood. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

--------- (2001), "Marketing Marginalized Cultures: The Wedding Banquet, Cultural Identities, and Independent Cinema of the 1990s," In Lewis, J. (ed) *The End of Cinema as We Know It: American Film in the Nineties*. New York, NY: New York University Press, 61-71.