



林思齊東西學術交流研究所
David C. Lam Institute for East-West Studies (LEWI)

Working Paper Series 研究報告系列

Paper Number: 36
April 2005

**Globalization and Hybridization in
Cultural Production: A Tale of Two Films**

Georgette Wang and Emilie Yueh-yu Yeh
School of Communication
Hong Kong Baptist University

The authors welcome comments from readers.
Contact details:

**Georgette Wang, School of Communication, Hong Kong Baptist University, Kowloon Tong, Hong Kong.
Tel: 3411-7481; Fax: 3411-7375; Email: telgw@hkbu.edu.hk**

**Emilie Yueh-yu Yeh, School of Communication, Department of Cinema and Television, Hong Kong
Baptist University, Kowloon Tong, Hong Kong. Email: yveyh@hkbu.edu.hk**

**David C. Lam Institute for East-West Studies (LEWI)
Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU)**

LEWI Working Paper Series is an endeavour of David C. Lam Institute for East-West Studies (LEWI), a consortium with 28 member universities, to foster dialogue among scholars in the field of East-West studies. Globalisation has multiplied and accelerated inter-cultural, inter-ethnic, and inter-religious encounters, intentionally or not. In a world where time and place are increasingly compressed and interaction between East and West grows in density, numbers, and spread, East-West studies has gained a renewed mandate. LEWI's Working Paper Series provides a forum for the speedy and informal exchange of ideas, as scholars and academic institutions attempt to grapple with issues of an inter-cultural and global nature.

Circulation of this series is free of charge. Comments should be addressed directly to authors. Abstracts of papers can be downloaded from the LEWI web page at <http://www.hkbu.edu.hk/~lewi/publications.html>.

Manuscript Submission: Scholars in East-West studies at member universities who are interested in submitting a paper for publication should send an article manuscript, preferably in a Word file via e-mail, as well as a submission form (available online) to the Series Secretary at the address below. The preferred type is Times New Roman, not less than 11 point. The Editorial Committee will review all submissions. The Institute reserves the right not to publish particular manuscripts submitted. Authors should hear from the Series Secretary about the review results normally within one month after submission.

Copyright: Unless otherwise stated, copyright remains with the author.

Editors: CHAN Kwok Bun, Sociology, & Director of LEWI; Emilie Yueh-yu YEH, Cinema & TV, Associate Director of LEWI.

Editorial Advisory Board: From HKBU: Richard BALME, Government and International Studies; CHEN Ling, Communication Studies; Martha CHEUNG, English Language and Literature; Vivienne LUK, Management; Eva MAN, Humanities; Wong Man Kong, History; Terry YIP, English Language and Literature. From outside HKBU: David HAYWARD, Social Economics and Housing, Swinburne University of Technology (Australia); and Jan WALLS, International Communication, Simon Fraser University (Canada).

Disclaimer: David C. Lam Institute for East-West Studies (LEWI), and its officers, representatives, and staff, expressly disclaim any and all responsibility and liability for the opinions expressed, or for any error or omission present, in any of the papers within the Working Paper Series. All opinions, errors, omissions and such are solely the responsibility of the author. Authors must conform to international standards concerning the use of non-published and published materials, citations, and bibliography, and are solely responsible for any such errors.

Further Information about the working paper series can be obtained from the **Series Secretary:**

David C. Lam Institute for East-West Studies (LEWI)
Hong Kong Baptist University
Kowloon Tong
Hong Kong
Tel: (852) 3411-5217; Fax: (852) 3411-5128
E-mail: lewi@hkbu.edu.hk
Website: www.lewi.org.hk

Globalization and Hybridization in Cultural Production: A Tale of Two Films*

Georgette Wang and Emilie Yueh-yu Yeh
School of Communication
Hong Kong Baptist University

Abstract

Hybridization has become part of an ongoing trend in cultural production with both the globalization and localization of the culture industry, as is evidenced by the business strategies of some cultural producers. This study looks at two globally popular films that were adapted from Chinese works, *Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon* and *Mulan*, as examples to illustrate the complex processes of hybridization, and the implications that these processes have on the debate on the globalization of culture. This study has found that “deculturalization”, “aculturalization”, and “reculturalization” can be used to characterize the process of the hybridization of cultural products.

However, to draw conclusions about globalization and hybridization based only on the above observations may not reveal the whole picture. Although most producers have a preconceived idea of the needs and preferences of viewers, the way in which this idea influences production decisions differs according to who the producers are—their background, aspirations and work style—and the way in which the project is organized. As a result, the end product of an attempt to hybridize may exhibit quite distinct features that represent the different types and nature of hybridization.

This variation under the same capitalist logic reminds us of the need to examine the issue within the larger context of culture. As Ulf Hannerz pointed out, cultures are by nature fluid and always in motion, as a result of the continuing interaction and discourse both within the culture itself and with the outside world. In this sense, cultures not only hybridize, but in the course of hybridization may also generate new characteristics and distinctions and make new connections with one another. Globalization may have stepped up the process and scale of the hybridization of cultural production and added or promoted certain new dimensions, but it has not changed the nature of the process.

Keywords: globalization, hybridization, *Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon*, *Mulan*, aculturalization, deculturalization, reculturalization.

* This paper will soon be published in *International Journal of Cultural Studies*.

Hybridity, Hybridization, and Global Culture

Globalization has been seen as a process, but also a project; a reality, but also a belief (Mattelart, 2002). There is continuing debate over its onset, definition, and end result. Many believe that a global culture will emerge with the rise of globalization. Yet opinions are divided over what the nature of this culture will be—whether it will be a single, homogeneous system that is characterized by convergence and the presence of the “universal” in the “particular” (Wallerstein, 1990), or whether it will be an ensemble of “particulars” that features long-distance interconnectedness (Hannerz, 1996). With the rise of post-colonialism, the concept of hybridity (Bhabha, 1994) has become a new facet of the debate about global culture in the social sciences.

Hybridity, according to Bhabha, opens up what he calls “a third space” within which elements encounter and transform each other (Young, 1995; Papastergiadis, 2000: 170). It is, at the same time, the site of struggle and resistance against imperialist powers (Kraidy, 2002: 316). With the goal of abolishing the distinctions between center and periphery, and other forms of binarism, this post-colonial interpretation of cultural change is a significant departure from the linear diffusion model of “the West to the rest”. It directly challenges the idea of essentialism, according to Pieterse (1995: 64), because it unsettles the introverted concept of culture, a concept that underlies ideologies such as romantic nationalism, racism, and cultural essentialism. It helps to release us from the boundaries of nation, community, ethnicity, or class, while presenting a “kaleidoscope of collective experience in motion.”

In the globalization debate, hybridization presents yet another scenario for the outcome of cultural globalization besides hegemonic Westernization and postmodern diversity. The concept of hybridization, however, falls short of acknowledging structural inequalities, and has allegedly become a neocolonial discourse that is complicit with transnational capitalism (Dirlik, 1997; Kraidy, 2002, Friedman, 2000: 3). Another, perhaps more fundamental, weakness of the concept of hybridity lies with its intellectual power. The histories of the hybridization of metropolitan cultures, as Pieterse (1995: 64) indicated, show that hybridization, with its downturns and upswings, its go slows and its turns of speed, has been

taking place all along. Moreover, hybridization is not a feature that is unique only to certain societies; the creolizing spectrum, as Hannerz pointed out, extends from the First World metropolis to the Third World village (Hannerz, 1987: 555). Hybridity, therefore, is the “ongoing condition of all human cultures, which contain no zones of purity because they undergo continuous processes of transculturation,” as Rosaldo (1995, p. xv) concluded. In this sense, hybridization is a tautology, and globalization has brought about nothing more than the hybridization of hybrid cultures.

The paucity of communications research on this topic indicates the ontological and political quandaries that are inherent in using the concept as an analytical device (Kraidy, 2002: 317). Nowhere can we find more convincing and abundant evidence for the hybridization of the hybrid than in cultural products, as imitation, borrowing, appropriation, mutual learning, and representation erode all possibilities for authentic cultural production. In an interview with the *New York Times*, Baz Luhrmann, director of the Hollywood film *Moulin Rouge*, admitted that the idea to combine high comedy, high tragedy, and song and dance in that film was deeply influenced by popular Hindi, or Bollywood, films (Shome and Hegde, 2002: 184). Bollywood films, in turn, draw on mythological epics, classical, folk, and modern theatre, and MTV and Hollywood for inspiration, and thus are hybrids in themselves (Ciecko, 2001: 125). To those in the business of cultural production, boundaries and restrictions serve to stifle, rather than enhance, creativity.

The issue here is not one of finding evidence for hybridization in cultural products, but, given the globalized production practices in the cultural industries, of discovering the terms and conditions under which it takes place, the way in which hybridization has been achieved, and the cultural features that the end products exhibit. As pointed out by Chan (2001: 4), we are experiencing a “give and take” among cultures that encounter each other, a multifaceted and complex working of forces. However, nagging questions remain about who has given and taken what, what has been the result of such give and take within the existing industrial framework, and what the implications of the answers to these questions are for the cultural globalization debate.

Deculturalization, Aculturalization, and Reculturalization

As cable and satellite television mushroomed in the 1990s, the demand for films and television programs grew twenty-fold and more. This demand has led to the localization of global products and the globalization of local products on an unprecedented scale. This phenomenon allows producers to borrow ideas to enlighten an established story model or to make content adjustments to cater to the needs of a different audience, but it also creates a need to adapt, repackage, or transform an existing product to make it more appealing to different viewer groups.

In meeting the needs and tastes of different viewer groups—or simply as a reflection of the way production is organized today—a set of content design strategies has emerged that removes, incorporates, transforms, or redefines elements that relate either to a specific geographical location, time, social, political, and economic setting, or to cultural values and practices.

Lee (2003) used the term “de-localization” to describe the minimization of local elements to create content that is “least objectionable” to a larger, more diversified audience both in form (e.g., dubbing) and content, and the term “re-localization” to describe the incorporation of local elements into transnational products. The same concepts can be utilized to describe the globalization of local products, and the localization of global products.

For films such as *Mulan*, the meaning of “local” is expanded from covering the spatial to encompassing a combination of the spatial *and* the temporal, or more precisely, it takes on a cultural denotation. Through a process of deculturalization, all of the elements that are culture specific, including those that are ethnic, historical, or religious, that create barriers to intercultural reception or are deemed unfit for a new presentation style, may be contained in a familiar narrative pattern that not only plays down cultural differences but also guarantees comprehension across viewer groups. The result is the emergence of a new breed of films and television programs—the “aculturalized” cultural product.

In analyzing the presence of Japanese cultural products in Asia, Iwabuchi (2002, p. 257; 2000) noted that one of the major reasons for their popularity is a lack of “Japaneseness,” the

fact that “they do not invoke images of Japan, and thus of Japanese cultural presence . . .” *Mu-kokuseki*, a Japanese term that is the equivalent of “acultural”, refers to something or someone that lacks any nationality, and the “erasure of racial or ethnic characteristics and any context which would embed the characters in a particular culture or country”. This feature not only characterizes Japanese animation, but also other Japanese products such as karaoke, computer games, comics, or televised singing contests. In place of traditional icons such as the kimono dress, bon dance, and sumo wrestling, Japanese cultural products now feature cute cartoon characters with big round eyes and girls with knee-high socks. This “cultural odorlessness”, which now gives Japanese cultural exports an effective competitive edge, is itself a product of American domination in the 1950s and the early part of 1960s, according to Iwabuchi (2002: 260).

American television programs and most Hollywood blockbusters have long been accused of following a universal formula that enables them to cross cultural barriers and capture a transnational market—the same cultural facelessness as is found in Japanese products. They typically present a fantasy world of romance and adventure (Wang, 2001a). Constructed with dazzling visual and audio effects and easily comprehensible story lines, these fantasy worlds are full of dangers that rarely fail to hold the undivided attention of viewers regardless of age, gender, ethnic, religious, social, and cultural differences.

Although deculturalization may be the key to entering the global market, its “acultural” outlook may in fact be deceptive, as storytelling cannot be accomplished without touching on beliefs, attitudes, values, and behavioral patterns. When characters are pushed into action and decisions are made, the underlying beliefs and values emerge. It does not take a careful viewer to notice that in the cultural blender of Hollywood blockbusters, superheroes, space fighters, young adventurers, and even the charming princes of the animal kingdom are depicted as high achievers who, rising from below, play the role of guardians of freedom, equality, and peace. Reculturalization, therefore, is often as symbiotic with deculturalization as it is with aculturalization.

A Tale of Two Films

In 2001, a Chinese-language martial arts film became the highest grossing foreign-language film ever made (Lahr, 2003: 72) in the history of Hollywood.¹ The film, *Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon* (*CTHD*), has almost every ingredient needed to make it “authentically” Chinese. Adapted from a novel published in China in the early 1930s, it features a romantic martial arts story that is set in ancient China. The “Chineseness” of the film is also characterized by dazzling sword-fighting scenes, period costumes, an iconic Chinese setting, and an all-Chinese cast who speak Mandarin throughout the film. However, one aspect of the film production sets it apart from other Chinese martial arts films: it was made with an eye on the market beyond Greater China, was financed through international presale², bonds, and bank loans, and was distributed by a transnational distributor. Despite the attacks that the film has received from critics, its market success in repackaging an ethnic story for a global audience manifests two closely linked characteristics of cultural production today, namely, the indispensable role of the capitalist mechanism in financing, marketing, and distribution, and the emergence of cultural fusion and hybridization as a prevailing strategy for transnational content design.

Strictly speaking, *CTHD* is not the first film of its kind to feature a specific Chinese location, characters, actions, and narrative motifs. Chinese stories or historical backgrounds are nothing new in Hollywood. Hollywood’s interest in Chinese themes or motifs began in the second decade of the twentieth century. Many of the films that employ such themes have been criticized either for enhancing the stereotypes of China under Western imperialism, or for recreating what Edward Said calls “an Oriental fantasy.” However, this has not stopped Hollywood from appropriating Chinese stories or from utilizing a Chinese setting. *Mulan* is the most prominent example in recent history of Hollywood borrowing Oriental narratives and repackaging them as global blockbusters. In contrast to *CTHD*, which is a Chinese-

¹ This record has recently been broken by yet another high grossing foreign language film, *The Passion of the Christ* (2004).

² International presale is a method for filmmakers to raise funds through the sale of the showing rights before shooting begins. It was introduced to the U.S. in the 1980s by the Italian producer De Laurentis (Wasser, 1995: 430).

owned, Chinese-made art film with similar objectives, *Mulan* is a distinctly Hollywood film with a clear corporate product differentiation for global consumption. Despite the Chinese origin of its story, as a Disney animation picture, *Mulan* is a global product *par excellence*.³ Its transformation of a Chinese folktale into a global box office success testifies to the spiral process of hybridization. *CTHD* and *Mulan* thus represent two different kinds of hybridization in the current mediascape of global cultural flow. One employs a “glocal” strategy of incorporating transnational financing models and the aesthetics of art house cinema into the making of a seemingly local story; the other usurps a story of foreign origin and adds it to the gigantic Disney pantheon. Both are hybridized entertainment products, but they display different approaches to the process of mixing and matching distinct cultural and social elements. In the following, we employ the terms deculturalization, aculturalization, and reculturalization to describe and analyze the many faces of hybridization. In telling the stories of two hybrids, we tease out a detailed description of the compound conditions of globalization. We argue that globalization and hybridization, as is illustrated by our case studies, have become ever more intertwined and multivalent, and are far from being a one-way flow of capital, talent, and ideas.

The Chinese Heroine and American Multiculturalism: Deculturalization, Reculturalization, and Aculturalization

The *Mulan* story is based on a popular ballad that was written during the Northern Wei Dynasty (386 A.D. to 534 A.D.) about a legendary fourteen-year-old girl, Mulan, who joins the army in place of her aging father to fight invaders from the north. There are several renditions of the story, although they all share the similar premise of the incredibility of

³ Although its revenues are dwarfed by the dazzling global successes of blockbuster series such as *The Lord of Rings*, *Harry Potter*, or *Star Wars*, *Mulan* grossed US\$303,500,000, and was ranked 66th (<http://www.geocities.com/Hollywood/Theater/3540/topworld.htm>) in the top-100 list of all-time worldwide box office successes, only a few places behind *Schindler's List* and *Air Force One*. It is also one of Disney's ten most profitable films. *CTHD*, with a box-office total of US\$213,200,000 and numerous international awards, including the Oscar for Best Foreign Language Film Award, was the most successful “non-American film” ever made. Judging from the box office returns, both *CTHD* and *Mulan* achieved a success that went well beyond cultural boundaries, an accomplishment that is especially significant given that *CTHD* was originally targeted at art theaters outside of the Greater China region.

Mulan's ability to pass as a man and a fighter. Mulan's father is suffering from various ills when the draft arrives. The draft requires at least one man from each household to join the army to defend the country. Mulan, as a filial daughter, volunteers to join the army—hiding her gender—in her father's place. Mulan miraculously survives the ten-year war against the invaders, and fights so well that she is decorated by the emperor. However, she declines the emperor's offer of a high appointment in order to return home to her parents. The story, which features Mulan as a role model, is one of the ten most popular folk tales in China, and exemplifies both filial piety and patriotism. It has been adapted into operas, television series, and at least two films in China prior to the Disney production. The Chinese star Michelle Yeoh adapted it again into a martial arts picture called *Hua Mulan* (forthcoming) with special effects and location shooting in China.

Compared with the Chinese story in its various forms, significant changes have been introduced to the Disney rendition, whereas the previous Chinese film adaptations are relatively unadulterated. What should be noted here are the strategies employed by Disney to transform a Chinese legend into a modern, entertaining product with a cultural distinction or flavor. The entertainment commodity, true to the Disney brand, contains a kernel of American-style individualism in the context of ethnic and gender assertion. This is in contradiction to the ideology of the Chinese source material.

Mulan is introduced in the Disney film by a series of comic gags that are built on misunderstandings and bickering, which are typical of early Disney cartoons such as *Silly Symphonies* (1927). This is contrary to the way in which Mulan is introduced in the original Chinese story. The Chinese ballad begins with Mulan retiring to the traditional women's place of the loom, and contemplating ways in which to help her family. Whereas the Chinese story characterizes Mulan as a quiet and thoughtful girl in the domestic sphere who attends to duties such as weaving, the Disney Mulan is sprightly, tomboyish, and unfit to be an ideal wife. This major difference represents the familiar dichotomy between old China and the modern West. Whereas the Chinese story immediately proceeds to Mulan's course of action as a filial daughter, the Disney's Mulan spectacularly fails her bridal test. Dejected, she

begins to have doubts about herself. The opportunity for redemption comes when the war breaks out. She wants to prove to her family and herself that she can bring the family honor, not by marriage, but by taking on the male duty of fighting a war. Therefore, we have a major shift from the Chinese cultural trait of filial piety to the pursuit of a sense of selfhood.

Another significant change in the Disney version of the story of *Mulan* relates to the issues of cross-dressing and sexual ambiguity. In the Chinese ballad they are handled with subtlety and a wry understanding of the (im)plausibility of a woman serving in the army as a man. In the original story, Mulan is not discovered to be a woman until she decides to return home. Accompanied by her fellow soldiers, Mulan arrives home and immediately changes back into her old dress. Seeing a great warrior in a woman's dress, her companions are shocked: for ten years, they had no idea that she was a woman! The Chinese commentary concludes by drawing an analogy to explain the ambiguity of sexual identity and how it can easily fool the eye of the beholder. Perhaps Mulan does look like a man, which in turn questions the assumptions of sexual stereotyping. This subversive coda was considered too threatening for Disney's popular image and they neutralized it by having Mulan's identity disclosed in the middle of the story, a typical narrative development in which obstacles have to be created for the heroine to overcome to achieve final victory. In the film, Mulan is expelled from her military duties when her identity is revealed, but soon after she proves that girls can fight and fight even better than men. The necessity of cross-dressing becomes, in the end, a shrewd military tactic.

To animate a Chinese story that was unfamiliar to the rest of the world, at least two processes of cultural hybridization were involved. The first has to do with the blending of cultural iconography and the sounds of ancient China, complete with pagodas, willow trees and flowing robes, and classical Chinese music. These Chinese cultural icons may simply be used instrumentally to ensure a façade of otherness. In the second process, the Disney's *Mulan* signifies Hollywood's packaging of multiculturalism that glorifies the multiplicity of culture, ethnicity, nation, gender, and race. Consider the various voices that dub the main characters of the film: African American Eddie Murphy for the mini dragon, Mushu; Chinese

American Ming-na Wen for Mulan; B. D. Wong for Mulan's commanding officer General Li Shang; and James Hong for Mulan's fellow soldier, Chi Fu.

It is apparent that the Disney version of *Mulan* wishes to present itself as a multicultural film for a wider demographic that is inclusive of white, Jewish, African, and Asian Americans. To do this, Disney plays with several extant stereotypes of Asian Americans and their culture. The name "Mushu" immediately brings to mind ethnic food, "Mushu pork" being a popular Chinese takeout food in America. Hence, Mushu is a highly recognizable ethnic-comic type that calls to mind various generic conventions, just as his name conjures up a delicious and cheap stir-fried pork dish with vegetables. What is more interesting in Disney's typecasting of Mushu is the choice of voice artist for the mini-dragon—Eddie Murphy. Murphy is a big star who is known for playing swaggering wisecracking characters in mainstream American comedy action films. In the successful *Beverly Hills Cop* movies, Murphy plays not a loser, but a fish out of water who nevertheless beats the uptight Caucasians on their own turf. Similarly, in *Mulan*, nobody eats Mushu, but he is a runt and an underdog, a good-for-nothing dragon who is trying to earn his stripes. At the beginning he is craven, stupid, and driven by status. This makes him a good parallel to Mulan herself, as at the beginning of the film she also is a good-for-nothing daughter: the "you'll bring honor to us all" song is highly ironic, given her tomboy inclinations.

Mulan is unsuited to her feminine destiny by respectable patriarchal standards. Similarly, Mushu lacks the stature and mystical powers that are appropriate to a Chinese dragon, yet both prove themselves in the end. Mulan successfully passes herself off as a soldier and a leader of men, which takes place under cover of gender when her band of brothers infiltrates the palace and defeats the Huns by going in drag. Mushu gets the assignment to help Mulan by pretending to be the great stone dragon. He fools the chief ancestor, and tries to fool Mulan in the next scene (her horse stomps all over him), but he proves himself useful to her despite his diminutive size.

Both Mulan and Mushu prevail through imposture and guile, while managing to hold on to their real characters. The "message" of the film implies, and the song at the end "Be True

to Your Heart” explicitly states, that proof of authenticity does not come from one’s social role but from who one is inside and the need to stick to that. In the end, Mulan manages to meet her father’s expectations and restores the family honor and, as is typical of Disney heroines (Wasko, 2001, p. 116), finds her prince charming. Such have-it-all endings can only be possible in the popular imagination, but not in practice, as in Chinese feudal societies family honor has never been the business of daughters. The values that the film endorses are not simply those of family love or even individual freedom, but specifically the true value of authenticity, of the recognition of one’s identity, and the celebration of the triumph of the will and the victory of the underdog. These values are all too familiar in Hollywood blockbusters (Wang, 2001).

Thus the story, although set in ancient China, is resolutely modern and American, in which the dark past of the “other” is represented by two minor but annoying characters, the matchmaker and the prime minister. One is a fussy gatekeeper of traditional femininity, and the other is an officious, mean-spirited bureaucrat who cares only about the rules. Through the obese, meticulous, and rigid caricature of the matchmaker, the film criticizes the view that the role of women is limited only to that of the virtuous wife. The prime minister is characterized as a tiny, physically unfit meddler, whose only priority is to make sure that the rules will be followed. Together, they encapsulate the old, outmoded traditions and practices of feudal China, and everything that the modern Disney Mulan is up against.

With the Confucian doctrines of loyalty, filial piety, and ideal femininity represented as ancient, if not primitive, ideologies, the introduction of gender equality and contemporary concepts of femininity, and the erasure of the gender bending that is specific to Chinese theatre⁴, the Mulan story was remade into a timeless legend aimed at Disney’s family audience that celebrates universal, acultural values of love, courage, and independence. Even the history of conflicts between the Chinese and the so-called barbarians of the north is

⁴ It is important to note that Hua Mulan’s persistent presence in Chinese popular memory is largely to its endless renditions in operas. By gender bending, we refer to standard practices in Chinese opera such as cross-dressing in all-male troupes in Peking opera, and women’s troupes in regional opera. The Hua Mulan story conveniently casts the woman warrior at the center of stage, as us required by both the story and the institution of Chinese opera.

depicted as a type of medieval warfare that could occur at any time and in any place in human history.

Pathways to the Crossover Market: Cultural Negotiations in Global Cultural Production

What the Disney producers have done to the Chinese ballad of Mulan is far from unprecedented. Similar to the disappearance of filial piety and loyalty from the Disney film *Mulan*, the issue of social hierarchy, which is central to the novel of *Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon*, was sidestepped in the film version. Like *Mulan*, *CTHD* is a romantic martial arts story that centers on a young girl's struggle toward self-discovery. The hidden dragon of the title refers to the sensational martial arts of Jiaolong (or Jen), which remain under wraps due to her proper background as the daughter of an imperial official. Jen's secret passion is the *jianghu*, or outlaw demimonde of banditry and bodyguards. Like *Mulan*, she has a double life; her martial arts are practiced to serve dark, anarchic purposes. Unlike her mentor Jade Fox, she is not a villain, but a supremely gifted prodigy in need of guidance. Her martial arts need to be honed, turned into the virtues of justice and benevolence that are represented by her good mentors, Yu Xiulian and Li Mubai. Here we find the central problem of the deculturalization process, because Jen's domestication in a properly arranged marriage is sidelined in favor of the struggle for control of her martial arts.

Compatibility of rank and social hierarchy was probably the main consideration for all marriages in feudal China. Given the supreme importance of social hierarchies, the sexual encounters between Jen, the high-born mistress of a noble family, and her bandit lover Lo (Tiger) would have been unthinkable, and they were therefore very carefully staged in Wang Dulu's novel. First there is the removal of hostility when Lo, the charismatic bandit leader, rescues Jen from imminent death in the desert while dutifully keeping a physical distance from her, as is required of a gentleman. Second, there is the removal of hierarchical distance when Lo confides his family tragedy to her, implying that he was not low-born, and had possibly had quite a respectable background that was compatible with hers. Finally, there is the removal of personal distance when Jen, in an act of self-defense, unintentionally

aggravates Lo's injuries. His pain and agony triggers her sympathy and she turns to help, an act that eventually triggers love and passion. In the film's treatment of their romantic encounter, however, subtlety and decorum are replaced by libido and passion. When James Schamus was asked to rewrite one love scene between Jen and Lo in a romantic way with a modern sensibility, he added starry skies, falling stars, a desert, and solitude to the screenplay (Zhang and Lee, 2002: 298-9). With solitude setting the two free from their social bondage, this backdrop prompts the disappearance of personal distance and justifies the explosion of passion. This sequence leaves out crucial information about Lo's background, which is the key to Jen's change of attitude toward Lo from animosity to sympathy. Instead, Ang Lee emphasizes Jen's willful and intuitive propensity that leads her to live through impetuous emotion, rather than rationality.

In the novel, the issue of social compatibility continuously haunts Jen. Wang Dulu repeatedly describes Jen's inner deliberations on this problem, and emphasizes the contradictions between her choices and her true feelings. In the film, however, Jen is depicted as a relatively flat character who is devoid of any psychological dimension. This major difference may explain the change of emphasis that Lee makes at the end of the film. The ending of the novel begins with a mysterious plan that Jen has carefully set up. The plan turns out to be the staging of her own suicide so that she can be reunited with her lover, Lo. However, the story does not end with their elopement, as might be expected by readers. Instead, Jen disappears by herself after a romantic night with Lo (Wang, Vol. 2: 756-774).

The stark contrast of social strata is the key to the suspension of a love relationship between Jen and Lo in the novel. Because of the irreversible hierarchical boundary between the two ill-fated lovers, Jen decides in the end to leave Lo. However, this essential obstacle that prevents a happy ending is greatly played down in the film. The film ends with the death of Jen's two masters, which is not indicated in the novel. The good master Li Mubai dies to save Jen's life, but the evil master Jade Fox is also killed to set Jen free to go back to the desert with Lo. However, Jen does not choose the path to the ultimate happy ending. Instead, she falls by flying off a cliff into roaring falls. Therefore, Jen's difficulty in trying to

reconcile love and class is displaced by a sense of redemption and regret for her willful personality.

Social strata was not the only factor that caused Ang Lee and his writers to make adjustments to the ending of the film in contrast to the source material. The alternation was also due to the perception that popular Chinese fiction is old fashioned, and the film attempts to revive it with the forms and patterns of international art cinema. According to Ang Lee, several features of Chinese martial art fiction and films are considered incomprehensible and antiquated. One is the authors' compulsive discussion and exposition of the motivations of the characters and cause-effect relationships. For instance, Wang Dulu adds an expository coda that is addressed directly to readers, which explains how and why Jen must choose to leave Lo in the end (Yeh and Davis, 2005). To readers who are unfamiliar with this crude convention in Chinese martial arts fiction, this is problematic, because it assumes that readers lack the ability to surmise the story and must be told explicitly of the twists and turns in the plot arrangement. This type of literary trope also featured heavily in the popular films that are derived from the martial arts tradition, including many both low-budget and major films of the 1960s and the 1970s. It might have been an acceptable practice in the past with a predominantly Chinese audience, but it probably would not work for a transcultural film that is intended for a contemporary niche audience across cultural and national boundaries.

For this reason, Lee and his writers had to strip away this practice that was embedded in the source material. The film must not come to an end with a closure, either narratively or ideologically, and so Lee stages what looks like a suicide, or a redemption, by allowing Jen to throw herself off a cliff of the Mudan mountain, which is known as a Taoist pure land. Such an ending gives rise to several possible interpretations. One is that Jen finds a level of self-awareness by choosing the path to death, which in the Taoist tenet signifies a way to enlightenment, the ultimate achievements of martial arts. This line of argument, however, could be re-interpreted by feminists who might see Jen's action as a submission to cultural and social authorities. Conversely, the ending might also indicate a silent defiance of any attempt to contain the flying dragon. Jen leaps and flies away so that she is free from any

social (class and hierarchy), cultural (gender) and sexual (romantic relationship) bounds. With this ambiguous ending that is open to various interpretations, the film fulfills the expectations of an art film audience, who would prefer to infer the meaning on their own. In searching for the final meaning of *CTHD*, the audience is given the opportunity and space for playful hermeneutics.

Another major example of reculturalization is the language of the film. The dialogue of this film is a hybrid, and underwent various rounds of translation, retranslation, writing, and rewriting. The multi-layered writing comprises the work of Chinese-language scriptwriters Wang Hui-ling and Tsai Kuo-jong, Ang Lee's own translation, James Schamus's rewrite and overwrite, and Lee's rewrite, and colloquial expressions, literary language, classical, provincial, and Western and Chinese language (Zhang and Lee, 2002: 297). This mixed, hybrid language is not unproblematic, and has attracted criticism. For Ang Lee, the antiquity of the historical setting and the linguistic particularity of classical Chinese that is embedded in the story needed translation to contemporize an old text. Yet to critics in Taiwan and mainland China, Tiger's love talk sounds too modern, largely as a result of the period inaccuracy of his language.

Perhaps the most telling evidence of Lee's efforts to make a Chinese film that is globally accessible comes from the translation. "When we did the subtitling...we translated in a way to allow Western audiences access, finding equivalences to likely speech and syntax patterns in a Western context", according to Lee (Zhang and Lee, 2002: 304-5). This was a daunting problem, because the English titles are not the same as the spoken dialogue at all, and it was like writing a whole new script.

Doubling pairs of characters and organizing them into binaries—middle-aged versus young, reserve versus passion, traditional versus modern, reflective versus impetuous—also serve to make the theme of the film comprehensible to global audiences. These binary themes are connected with the ideologies of individualism, obligation to society and to family, and hierarchical and social norms. They point toward Lee's use of a formula (cf. Kristin Thompson) to create the clarity of value judgment that is a requirement of a global media

commodity. They also point to Lee's recreation of a modern martial art stage from old materials through the mixing of West and East, art and marketplace. The strategies of mixing, synthesizing, and hybridizing East and West may be similar in the making of both *Mulan* and *CTHD*, but they were employed for quite different aims and entailed quite different outcomes.

Terms and Conditions of Hybridization

The background of the two production teams reveals interesting common features that may explain the similarities in the measures that were adopted to achieve cultural hybridization. First, both teams had already accumulated significant experience in producing for the global market when they launched the film project. Although Ang Lee's team does not carry a transnational brand name like the Disney team, nor can it afford a production scale that is comparable to any Disney production, it does enjoy an international reputation that has helped it to acquire funding through international presale, bonds, and bank loans. Second, both teams comprise members of different cultures who ensure the multivalence of the product, and both teams went through rounds of debate and negotiation before the final product was hammered out. In the last stages, both teams managed the postproduction tasks through an international division of labor, and both films were marketed and distributed through transnational corporate networks with a global market reach.

The similarities, however, stop here. Ang Lee, being ethnic Chinese, has attempted to instill a specific cultural significance in *CTHD* that no member of the Disney team would be interested in. According to his autobiography, Lee saw *CTHD* as the embodiment of a dream—to prove to the world that martial arts stories can be made with a sense of artistic beauty. He also wanted to accomplish the mission of presenting a quality product to the world audience and to “bring glory to Chinese films” (Zhang, 2002: 421). The creation, to him, reflects who he is, what he knows about, identifies with, and the influences that he has been exposed to, including his Chinese cultural upbringing and Western film education.

CTHD represents Ang Lee's conception of ancient China and his vision of Chinese art and ethics. As a homage to earlier Chinese art directors such as King Hu, the martial arts in

the film are presented as a synthesis of Peking opera, kung-fu, and the Taoist world view. Moreover, the narrative of the story does not strictly follow that of the classical Hollywood formula. In Ang Lee's view, Chinese drama is built on the release of tension from suppression, which is contrary to Western drama, which feeds on the escalation of tension (Lahr, 2003). These features explain why Ang Lee stood firm when *CTHD* was charged with "Westernization" and of presenting a silent, Taoist image of China, a long-standing stereotype, to attract Western viewers. Lee did not deny having had foreign viewers in mind when making the film, but to him this did not mean that *CTHD* was just another Hollywood film.

It does not take many more examples to show that the mission that Ang Lee loaded onto *CTHD* is a rare exception in an industry that is ruled by capitalist logic and transnational corporations that link a global network. As critics (Dirlik, 1994: 349; Miller, et al., 2001) pointed out, these transnationals hold the key to the current imbalanced market structure by forming business alliances, achieving vertical and horizontal integration, and buying out reproduction rights from independent and local producers. Yet within this tightly controlled business world, the possibility of raising funds through pre-sale, credit insurance, and bank loans, and of film distribution through contract arrangements with transnationals, have opened up opportunities for a limited number of independent producers with good credentials and creative ideas. Ang Lee confided in his autobiography that the autonomy that he has enjoyed in filmmaking comes with the back up of overseas investment and global distribution (Zhang, 2002: 257), and it is this autonomy that has allowed him the chance to realize his childhood dreams.

This autonomy, however, does not translate into total freedom for filmmakers. Unbeknownst to Lee, both the source of investment for the film and his dream of "proving to *the world*" have made it impossible not to "deculturalize" the original *CTHD* story and the tradition of martial arts filmmaking. The clash of ideas and different practices became evident in the production process, which was a painstaking dialogue and negotiation between cultures, old and new, East and West. It reached a climax at the scriptwriting stage, when the narration

of the story unfolded. In his autobiography, Lee admitted that the Chinese social structure was one of the first obstacles that he encountered in communicating with James Schamus, his long-time partner and one of two scriptwriters for the film (Zhang and Lee, 2002: 287). “What draws viewers to a different culture is curiosity”, Lee said. Once their curiosity is aroused comes comprehensiveness. “There is not much more to mutual understanding than logic and reason, and the reference framework that is constructed on the basis of common sense.” Lee admitted, “beyond these, crossing cultural barriers would become difficult.”

To an outsider there are things about other cultures that are insensible, illogical, or unreasonable, and yet are accepted without question as habits or traditions by the members of that culture. To solve the problem, cultural elements that were deemed to be beyond common sense to Schamus were compromised. Given his cultural background and expertise, Schamus in this case did not stand for one person, but for mainstream values and a predominantly cosmopolitan worldview. In an interview, Schamus admitted that he began to understand “how central the idea of the book is to the genre, and ... to the culture as a whole” during the process of rewriting the script, and that he resolved to “preserve its function and its importance” (Teo, 2001). Yet it does not alter the fact that throughout the production process, the Chinese team relied on Schamus to sensitize its members with regard to what would be considered absurd or interesting from a Western perspective, pointing to the parts in the original work that should be omitted or elaborated, an exercise that was described by Lee as a “frustrating”, yet “useful” (Zhang and Lee, 2002: 292).

Globalization and Hybridization: A Third Space? A Third Possibility?

In his more recent work, Homi Bhabha has extended his notion of hybridity to include forms of counter-authority, a “third space” that intervenes to affect “the hybrid moment of political change. Here the transformation value of change lies in the re-articulation, or translation, of elements that are neither the One (unitary working class) nor the Other (the politics of gender), but something else besides which contests the terms and territories of both” (Young, 1995: 23). Hybridity, in this sense, involves the generation of new ways in

which to understand and to generate possible new cultures. The birth of a “third space”, therefore, requires a process of dialectic discourse and reflective interaction through which ideas, values, and meaning clash and are negotiated and regenerated. Without this element, hybridity is not much more than a simple mixing and hybridizing to include forms that blend different elements.

In practice, however, hybridity in cultural production is not always achieved through dialectic discourse among cultures, whether in an effort to globalize or to localize. Under the capitalist maxim of minimizing cost and maximizing profit, hybridization is all too frequently reduced to hasty, cosmetic, and even casual, incorporations of different nominal elements. The localization of transnational text, for example, often involves no more than using local actors and actresses in transnational advertisements, local hosts and players in licensed televised game shows, or, as is seen in some obscure soap operas, local names for cities and characters. Hybridity in these products, whether initiated by transnationals or local producers, may be common, yet has remained at the superficial level where the “mainstream,” as defined by market size, permeates and prevails. As some have warned, localized products are not local products; they are essentially global.

To go beyond this superficial level of hybridization, deculturalization and reculturalization become necessary. Deculturalization, as witnessed in *CTHD*, is key to ensuring comprehension and acceptance by a global audience, as much as Lee would like to claim the Chineseness of *CTHD*. In *CTHD*, it was necessary to remove, or play down, cultural values such as filial piety or social hierarchy, despite the autonomy of the filmmaker and his cultural background and aspirations, because the film was targeted at the global market. What causes the difference in the type of hybridity that comes out of the process of transformation is the kind of reculturalization strategy that the filmmaker seeks to adopt, and the objectives that the film is expected to achieve.

For Disney’s *Mulan*, no cultural mission or personal vision was involved in producing the film. Tony Bancroft, *Mulan*’s co-director admitted that there were limitations to how Chinese the film would be: “We knew we had to respect the material . . .”, but the bottom

line is “[W]e also knew we weren’t going to make a Chinese picture. We couldn’t . . . We are not Chinese.” In addition, Disney has already established a production model for its films, which has “a different sensibility, a different storytelling style” (Chan, 2002: 237).

Disney’s middle-of-the-road approach to *Mulan* and the occasional deviation from Disney’s favorite formula⁵ was therefore a way in which to show “respect” for the original legend, a courtesy gesture that does not alter the fact that *Mulan* represents the transculturalization of an ethnic story by a transnational giant. To Disney managers, neither cost nor cultural literacy were a real problem, yet cultural fusion that goes beyond the level of their winning formula was deemed unnecessary in terms of corporate profit. The “authentic” outlook of the film gave the repackaging of the formula a fresh and exotic appearance, but it was important not to overkill the original context within which the story takes place, given the importance of the Chinese market. The level of hybridity achieved in these products, therefore, is instrumental in nature, and is no different from the hybridity that is found in most transnational advertisements or localized television serial dramas.

Looking at the way in which Disney has built its animation kingdom through the adaptation of popular fairy tales and folk stories such as *Aladdin* and the *Hunchback of Notre Dame*, it can be seen that Tony Bancroft was merely following a Disney tradition that was established by Walt Disney himself. After deconstructing the process of cross-cultural refiguration in *The Three Caballeros*, a Disney cartoon released in 1945, Burton-Carvajal (1994: 147) noted sincerity in Disney’s quest for ethnic originality. Yet to him, all these good intentions served but one purpose—to mask the evidence hidden behind the comic frenzy and the “authentic” cultural appearance that “no cultural reciprocities are created equal” .

The difference between Ang Lee and Tony Bancroft is therefore not just that of a brand-name independent producer/director versus a generic transnational executive, but is the difference in aim—of the realization of a cultural mission and the production of another box

⁵ The Disney formula, according to Chan (2002), includes the following: good prevailing over evil, emotional catchy songs, cute animal sidekicks for comic relief, young romance, funny in-jokes, an assorted supporting cast with a grumpy-to-dopey personality range, and character voices performed by film stars.

office hit. *Mulan* and *CTHD* are both hybridized products, yet the aim and outcome of their reculturalization operations are distinctly different.

CTHD is a rare case in which a reflective dialectic process was attempted. The paradox lies in the fact that the process was not intended to achieve cultural fusion. Rather, the purpose was to present a contemporary rendition of a classical Chinese work in a way that was acceptable to the West, and to change the stereotype of martial arts films. In making *CTHD* as a modern Chinese film, Lee attempts to deconstruct the stereotypes of Chinese culture, cinema, and language. What critics noticed in *CTHD* was the removal of traditional values, such as social hierarchy, from the story, the change in presentation style, and hence the lack of Chineseness. To its production team, however, Chineseness and authenticity did not exclude creativity and innovation.

In response to the question of *CTHD*'s cultural "authenticity", Schamus suggested a different interpretation of Orientalism that suggests that Orientalism lies as much in the perception of what one *is* from the perspective of the colonizers as in the perception of what one *is not* from the perspective of the colonizers. Schamus claimed that *CTHD* was criticized for failing to be authentically Chinese or Asian because the idea that one can attain expertise in different cultural realms and feed it back into one's own culture is essentially a Western idea and prerogative (Teo, 2001). Others—non-Westeners—are expected to stay faithful to their genres and to cultivate authenticity, much like "a panda in a zoo", as Ang Lee put it. A Chinese product that has excluded certain Chinese cultural attributes and incorporated Western elements, from this perspective, is considered a "fake" and the result of "cultural bastardization".

This point touches on an important issue that has largely been overlooked in the literature, namely, the nature and characteristics of hybridized products other than their exhibition of features of the parent cultures. Many, including Schamus himself (Teo, 2001; Pong 2002; Wei, 2003), attributed the success of *CTHD* in the Western market to that which is identified as being Eastern in the film, and the success (or failure) in Asia to that which is identified as being Western in the film. The focus of attention was readily put on the question

of the film's "Chineseness" or "easterness", yet there was less interest in seeing, if not a reluctance to see, the film in its own right. What can a cultural product be if it is "neither here nor there"? To label a cultural product "fake", "in disguise", or "authentic" presumes the existence of a standard prototype that simply does not exist.

The case of *CTHD* implies that modern cinema should not, and perhaps cannot, be restricted to national and aesthetic boundaries, because filmmaking appropriates "anything that is fun" and anything that the producers are able to create. It is no longer a secret that a great majority of the historical films and soap operas that fill movie theaters and television channels in Greater China have also been "deculturalized". Female characters no longer subject themselves to the tyranny of patriarchal rules, commoners casually play jokes on emperors, and children fight with their parents. The Chineseness of these cultural products lies in their ability to identify with, and attract, viewers in contemporary Chinese societies, rather than in a faithful reflection of stereotypical images of feudal China.

We are reminded by Ulf Hannerz that cultures are by nature fluid and are always in motion as the result of continuing interaction and discourse both from within the culture itself and with the outside world. Both Bakhtin and Levi-Strauss noted, each from their own perspective, that all cultures are hybrids (Werbner, 1997). However, it is important to also note that the constant motion and incorporation of different elements brings with it new characteristics, new distinctions, and new similarities. From this perspective, perhaps hybridization and globalization do lead to the loss of cultural distinctiveness in cultural products—and in cultures as well. However by losing what was there, we are presented with something new, something fresh, something that represents yet another hybrid. It is only when we lose sight of the dynamic nature of culture and lock ourselves into a quest for cultural essentialism that the hybridization of cultural products will necessarily lead to stale homogeneity.

Globalization may have stepped up the process and scale of the hybridization of cultural production, and may favor certain elements over others, but it has hardly changed the nature of the process.

References

- Bhabha, H. (1994) *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Burton-Carvajal, J. (1994) "'Surprise Package': Looking Southward with Disney" in E. Smoodin (ed.) *Disney Discourse*. New York: Routledge.
- Chan, J. M. (2002) "Disneyfying and Globalizing the Chinese Legend *Mulan*: A Study of Transculturation" pp. 225-248 in Joseph Man Chan and Bryce T. McIntyre (eds.) *In Search of Boundaries: Communication, Nation-states and Cultural Identities*. Westport, Connecticut, London: Ablex Publishing.
- Ciecko, A. (2001) "Superhit Hunk Heroes for Sale: Globalization and Bollywood's Gender Politics". *Asian Journal of Communication* 11 (2): 121-143.
- Dirlik, A. (1994) "The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism". *Critical Inquiry* 20, 328-56.
- Dirlik, A. (1997) *Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism*. Durham, Duke University Press.
- Friedman, T. (2000) *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Hannerz, U. (1987) "The World in Creolisation". *Africa* 57 (4): 546-560.
- Hannerz, U. (1996, reprinted 1998, 2000) *Transnational Connections*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Iwabuchi, K. (2002) *Recentering Globalization: Popular culture and Japanese Transnationalism*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Iwabuchi, K. (2000) "To Globalize, Regionalize, or Localize Us, That is the Question: Japan's Response to Media Globalization" pp. 142-159 in Wang, G., Servaes, J. and Goonasekera, A. (eds.) *The New Communication Landscape: Demystifying Media Globalization*. London: Routledge.
- Kraidy, M.M. (2002) "Hybridity in Cultural Globalization". *Communication Theory* 12 (3): 316-339.
- Lahr, J. (June 30, 2003) "Becoming the Hulk". *The New Yorker*, pp. 72-81.

- Lee, C.C. (2003) "Media Business Strategies in the Global Era: From a 'Connectivity' Perspective". *Mass Communication Research* 75: 1-36.
- Mattelart, A. (2002) "An Archaeology of the Global Era: Constructing a Belief". *Media Culture and Society* 24: 591-612.
- Miller, T., Govil, N., McMurria, J. and Maxwell, R. (2001) *Global Hollywood*. London: British Film Institute.
- Papastergiadis, N. (2000) *The Turbulence of Migration: Globalization, Deterritorialization, and Hybridity*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press; Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Pieterse, J.N. (1995) "Globalization as Hybridization" pp. 45-68 in M. Featherstone, S. Lash, and R. Robertson (eds.) *Global Modernities*. London, Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Pong, Jixiang. (2002) "Chinese Visual Arts under the Globalization discourse" pp. 1-12 in Zhang F., Huang Z and Hu Z. (eds.) *Globalization and the Destiny of the Chinese Film and Television*. Beijing: Beijing Broadcasting Academy.
- Rosaldo, R. (1995) "Foreword" pp. xiv-xxi in N.G. Calclini, *Hybrid Cultures: Strategies for Entering and Leaving Modernity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Shome, R. and Hegde, R.S. (2002) "Culture, Communication, and the Challenge of Globalization". *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 19 (2): 172-189.
- Teo, S. (April-May, 2001) "Love and Swords: The Dialectics of Martial Arts Romance." *Senses of Cinema*
(<http://www.sensesofcinema.com/contents/00/11/crouching.html>).
- Teo, S. (March-April, 2001) "We Kicked Jackie Chan's Ass! An Interview with James Schamus" *Senses of Cinema*
(<http://www.sensesofcinema.com/contents/01/13/schamus.html>).
- Thompson, K. (1999) *Storytelling in the New Hollywood*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Wallerstein, I. (1990) "Culture is the World-System: A Reply to Boyne" pp. 63-66 in M. Featherstone (ed) *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*. London: Sage.
- Wang, D. L *Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon* (1985) 2 vols. Taipei: United Literature.

- Wang, G. (July 12-13, 2001a) "Hollywood the Global vs. Taiwan the Local: 'Universal Formula' and Beyond". Paper presented at the International Conference on Transculturalism, Academia Sinica, Taipei, Taiwan.
- Wang, G., L.L. Ku, and C.C. Liu (2000) "Local and National Cultural Industries: Is there Life after Globalization?" pp. 52-73 in G. Wang, J. Servaes, and A. Goonasekera (eds.) *The New Communications Landscape: Demystifying Media Globalization*. London: Routledge.
- Wasko, J. (2001) "Is It a Small World, After All?" pp. 3-30 in J. Wasko, M. Phillips, and E. R. Meechan (eds.) *Dazzled by Disney?* London: Leicester University Press.
- Wei, T. (魏均) (2003) "From Local to Global: Critique on the Globalization of Taiwan Cinema.". Paper presented at 2003 Focus on Taiwan Cinema, Nov 28-30, 2003, Taipei, Taiwan.
- Werbner, P. (1997) "Introduction: The Dialectics of Cultural Hybridity" in P. Werbner and T. Modood (eds.) *Debating Cultural Hybridity*. London: ZED Books.
- Young, R. (1995) *Colonial Desire: Hybridity, Culture, and Race*. New York: Routledge.
- Yeh, E. and D. Davis (2005) *Taiwan Film Directors: A Treasure Island*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Zhang, J. P and Ang Lee. (2002) *A Ten-Year Movie Dream*. Taipei: Times Culture.

LEWI Working Paper Series

The LEWI Working Paper Series is an endeavour of LEWI to foster dialogues among institutions and scholars in the field of East-West studies.

Circulation of this series is free of charge. Feedback should be addressed directly to authors. Abstracts of papers can be downloaded from the LEWI web page (<http://www.hkbu.edu.hk/~lewi/publications.html>); full text is available upon request.

1. CHAN Kwok Bun (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Both Sides, Now: A Sociologist Meditates on Culture Contact, Hybridization, and Cosmopolitanism*, English/38 pages, April 2002.
2. Mary Ann GILLIES (Simon Fraser University), *East Meets West in the Poetry of T. S. Eliot*, English/30 pages, April 2002.
3. 湯一介 (北京大學), 文化的互動及其雙向選擇: 以印度佛教和西方哲學傳入中國為例, 共 14 頁, 2002 年 7 月。
TANG Yijie (Peking University), *Cultural Interaction and the Bidirectional Option: The Introduction of Indian Buddhism and Western Philosophy into China as Examples*, Chinese/14 pages, July 2002.
4. Werner MEISSNER (Hong Kong Baptist University), *China's Response to September 11 and its Changing Position in International Relations*, English/15 pages, September 2002.
5. Janet Lee SCOTT (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Eastern Variations of Western Apprenticeship: The Paper Offerings Industry of Hong Kong*, English/30 pages, October 2002.
6. Alexius A. PEREIRA (National University of Singapore), *Sino-Singaporean Joint Ventures: The Case of the Suzhou Industrial Park Project*, English/32 pages, November 2002.
7. HO Wai Chung (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Between Globalization and Localization: A Study of Hong Kong Popular Music*, English/27 pages, January 2003.
8. 樂黛雲 (北京大學), 多元文化與比較文學的發展, 共 11 頁, 2003 年 2 月。
YUE Daiyun (Peking University), *Plurality of Cultures in the Context of Globalization: Toward a New Perspective on Comparative Literature*, Chinese/11 pages, February 2003.
9. XIAO Xiaosui (Hong Kong Baptist University), *The New-Old Cycle Paradigm and Twentieth Century Chinese Radicalism*, English/37 pages, February 2003.
10. George Xun WANG (University of Wisconsin Parkside), CHAN Kwok Bun (Hong Kong Baptist University), and Vivienne LUK (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Conflict and its Management in Sino-Foreign Joint Ventures: A Review*, English/34 pages, March 2003.
11. Charles MORRISON (East-West Center, University of Hawaii), *Globalization, Terrorism and the Future of East-West Studies*, English/20 pages, April 2003.
12. Ien ANG (University of Western Sydney), *Representing Social Life in a Conflictive Global World: From Diaspora to Hybridity*, English/13 pages, June 2003.

13. Renate KRIEG (University of Applied Sciences, Werderstr), *The Aspect of Gender in Cross-Cultural Management – Women’s Careers in Sino-German Joint Ventures*, English/23 Pages, June 2003.
14. Martha P. Y. CHEUNG (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Representation, Mediation and Intervention: A Translation Anthologist’s Preliminary Reflections on Three Key Issues in Cross-cultural Understanding*, English/29 pages, October 2003.
15. Yingjin ZHANG (University of California, San Diego), *Transregional Imagination in Hong Kong Cinema: Questions of Culture, Identity, and Industry*, English/14 pages, November 2003.
16. Emilie Yueh-yu YEH (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Elvis, Allow Me to Introduce Myself: American Music and Neocolonialism in Taiwan Cinema*, English/29 pages, November 2003.
17. Tiziana LIOI (La Sapienza University, Rome), *T.S. Eliot in China: A Cultural and Linguistic Study on the Translation of The Waste Land in Chinese*, English/29 pages, November 2003.
18. Jayne RODGERS (University of Leeds), *New Politics? Activism and Communication in Post-Colonial Hong Kong*, English/17 pages, December 2003.
19. 鄭宏泰 (香港大學亞洲研究中心), 黃紹倫 (香港大學亞洲研究中心), *移民與本土：回歸前後香港華人身份認同問題的探討*, 共 35 頁, 2003 年 12 月。
Victor ZHENG (Centre of Asian Studies, The University of Hong Kong) and WONG Siu-lun (Centre of Asian Studies, The University of Hong Kong), *Immigrant or Local: A Study on Hong Kong Chinese Identity after Handover*, Chinese/35 pages, December 2003.
20. ZHANG Longxi (City University of Hong Kong), *Marco Polo, Chinese Cultural Identity, and an Alternative Model of East-West Encounter*, English/23 pages, March 2004.
21. CHUNG Ling (Hong Kong Baptist University), *The Pacific Rim Consciousness of American Writers in the West Coast*, English/18 pages, March 2004.
22. Dorothy Wai-sim LAU (Chu Hai College), *Between Personal Signature and Industrial Standards: John Woo as a Hong Kong Auteur in Hollywood*, English/27 pages, March 2004.
23. LO Kwai Cheung (Hong Kong Baptist University), *The Myth of “Chinese” Literature: Ha Jin and the Globalization of “National” Literary Writing*, English/21 pages, April 2004.
24. Bradley R. BARNES (University of Leeds) and Qionglei YU (Zhejiang University of Technology and Business), *Investigating the Impact of International Cosmetic Advertising in China*, English/11 pages, May 2004.
25. Timothy Man-kong WONG (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Local Voluntarism: The Medical Mission of the London Missionary Society in Hong Kong, 1842–1923*, English/36 pages, June 2004.
26. Ramona CURRY (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign), *Bridging the Pacific with Love Eterne: Issues in Early Crossover Marketing of Hong Kong Cinema*, English/36 pages, June 2004.

27. Leo DOUW (University of Amsterdam), *Embedding Transnational Enterprises in China during the Twentieth Century: Who's in Control?* English/32 pages, July 2004.
28. WANG Wen (Lanzhou University) and TING Wai (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Beyond Identity? Theoretical Dilemma and Historical Reflection of Constructivism in International Relations*, English/32 pages, August 2004.
29. CHAN Kwok Bun (Hong Kong Baptist University), *The Stranger's Plight, and Gift*, English/17 pages, September 2004.
30. Darrell William DAVIS (University of New South Wales), *Saving Face: Spectator and Spectacle in Japanese Theatre and Film*, English/26 pages, October 2004.
31. CHAN Kwok Bun (Hong Kong Baptist University) and Vivienne LUK (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Conflict Management Strategies and Change in Sino-Japanese, Sino-Korean, and Sino-Taiwanese Joint Ventures in China*, English/38 pages, November 2004.
32. Yingjin ZHANG (University of California, San Diego), *Styles, Subjects, and Special Points of View: A Study of Contemporary Chinese Independent Documentary*, English/31 pages, December 2004.
33. Ashley TELLIS (Eastern Illinois University), *Cyberpatriarchy: Chat Rooms and the Construction of 'Man-to-Man' Relations in Urban India*, English/14 pages, January 2005.
34. Koon-kwai WONG (Hong Kong Baptist University), *The Greening of the Chinese Mind: Environmental Awareness and China's Environmental Movement*, English/21 pages, February 2005.
35. Jonathan E. ADLER (City University of New York), *Cross-Cultural Education, Open-mindedness, and Time*, English/17 pages, March 2005.
36. Georgette WANG (Hong Kong Baptist University) and Emilie Yueh-yu YEH (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Globalization and Hybridization in Cultural Production: A Tale of Two Films*, English/25 pages, April 2005.
37. Timothy Man-kong WONG (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Printing, Evangelism, and Sinology: A Historical Appraisal of the Sinological Publications by Protestant Missionaries in South China*, English/28 pages, May 2005.
38. Hanneke TEEKENS (Netherlands Organization for International Cooperation in Higher Education, NUFFIC), *East West: at Home the Best?* English/19 pages, June 2005.
39. Yinbing LEUNG (Hong Kong Baptist University) *The "Action Plan to Raise Language Standards": A Response to the Economic Restructuring in Post-colonial Hong Kong*,

Submission of Papers

Scholars in East-West studies who are interested in submitting a paper for publication should send article manuscript, preferably in a WORD file via e-mail, to the Series Secretary's email address at lewi@hkbu.edu.hk or by post to 9/F., David C. Lam Building, Hong Kong Baptist University, Kowloon Tong, Hong Kong. Preferred type is Times New Romans, not less than 11 point. The Editorial Committee will review all submissions and the Institute reserves the right not to publish particular manuscripts submitted. Authors should hear from the Series Secretary about the review normally within one month after submission.