



## CIEE Prague, Czech Republic

<b>Course Title:</b>	Hollywood & Europe
<b>Course Code:</b>	FILM 3003 PRAG
<b>Programs offering course:</b>	CES, CNMJ
<b>Language of instruction:</b>	English
<b>U.S. Semester Credits:</b>	3
<b>Contact Hours:</b>	45
<b>Term:</b>	Summer 2019

### Course Description

This course rethinks the relationships between Hollywood and Europe by challenging four key ideas that have structured understandings of the relations between the two. The course begins by questioning the notion that Hollywood is strictly speaking an American institution, and therefore separate from Europe. Students will then ask if Hollywood output and that of European cinema are really the binary oppositions they tend to be imagined as. From there, we consider whether Hollywood's twentieth-century engagement with Eastern Europe actually supports its reputation as a staunchly anti-communist institution. The course then focuses on whether Americanization is the most useful explanatory framework for understanding Hollywood's engagement with Europe as subject matter and target audience, first by considering the concessions Hollywood has made when tailoring output for this powerful profit center, and then by how Hollywood has used European subject matter to provoke introspection in American audiences. Students will work through these topics by employing historical analysis and examining representative films such as *Ninotchka* (1939), *Roman Holiday* (1953), *Rocky IV* (1984), *Inglourious Basterds* (2009), and *The Grand Budapest Hotel* (2014). In so doing, they will develop new, critically informed, understandings of the degree to which our perceptions of the relations between the most powerful cinematic institution on the planet and this continent are quite different than we might think.

### Learning Objectives

This course aims to facilitate students' critical understanding of the relationships between Hollywood and Europe. The revisionist nature of the course requires students develop deep understandings of the ways the relations between the two have been conceptualized inside and outside the academy, so they may interrogate these assumptions. This approach demands students appreciate the cultural politics, logics, and shortcomings of existing positions. It also requires they develop historical understandings of the economic, political, social dynamics of Hollywood's relationships to Europe, and a capacity to engage textually, stylistically, and thematically with example films.

In a broader sense, this course furnishes students with transferable critical tools, frameworks, approaches, and skills that will serve to deepen their capacity to engage with, and to read,



media texts critically both on, and hopefully outside of, the course. It will also furnish them with the capacity critically to engage with such discourses as the national, the transnational, Americanization, cultural imperialism, and globalization.

By the end of the course, students will be expected to possess the critical abilities to produce insightful analysis of film texts; the skills necessary to conduct sound contextual analysis; the demonstrable capacity to synthesize original ideas in a lucid and coherent manner, both verbally and in writing; a solid understanding of the complex social, cultural, historical, and political relationships that have shaped important aspects of Hollywood and Europe's relationships, and solid understanding of debates circulating the case-studies that comprise the course.

By the end of this course the students should also be able to:

- Demonstrate a solid understanding of the dynamic and complex relationships that have existed, and which continue to exist, between Hollywood and Europe;
- Demonstrate a solid understanding of how the interaction of Hollywood and Europe can be conceptualized or theorized;
- Demonstrate a solid understanding of the ways in which deep-rooted contrasts between Hollywood and European Cinema have elided complex exchanges between the two;
- Demonstrate a solid understanding of the ways in which European-based companies and European-based individuals have contributed to Hollywood and its output;
- Demonstrate a solid understanding of the ambivalent relationships that characterized Hollywood's engagement with Communist Eastern Europe as both a partner and subject matter;
- Demonstrate a solid understanding of the historically specific content-tailoring strategies that Hollywood has employed to make some of its output marketable and attractive to key European audiences, and to market its films to those audiences;
- Demonstrate a solid understanding of how Hollywood has used images of Europe and Europeans to invite Americans to think about themselves and their nation.

### **Course Prerequisites**

Students from any academic background are welcomed on this course. Having an open mind to the ways cinema and audiovisual culture can be studied and understood are significantly more important determinants to getting the most out of this course than a background in Film Studies or related disciplines like Media Studies, Cultural Studies, and Communications. Because this course is open to students new to the topic, great efforts are made to familiarize newcomers to the study of motion pictures and their relevant contexts. Generally speaking, the course attempts to strike a balance between challenging non-Film Studies students and enabling Film Studies students to broaden their conceptual and historical understandings of the field; however, for obvious reasons, priority is given to the former.

### **Methods of Instruction**

This course is built around extended weekly sessions comprising a film screening, structured discussions, micro-lectures, and sometimes exercises. Students will consider the screened films



in relation to specific series of questions and using specific analytical methods (see below). The films will provide a concrete reference points intended to facilitate critical understandings of the topics introduced in the readings and developed by the instructor. Discussions will be accompanied by detailed PowerPoint slides, which will be emailed to students after the session. By the end of each session, students should be able to demonstrate a solid understanding of the topic generally, of the principal arguments, insights and shortcomings of the set readings; of the ways in which the example films embody, shed light on or complicate these topics; and should be in a position independently to transfer these insights to different case studies.

#### Notes on Film Analysis:

It should be stressed that this course is NOT a film appreciation seminar, nor is it – strictly speaking – a film interpretation seminar. Consequently, the course does NOT offer a platform for students to articulate their personal preferences of, or personal prejudices against, certain types of film. Similarly, it does NOT furnish students with a stage upon which they might publicly demonstrate the horizons of their interpretative imagination. Thematic analysis is a fundamental part of this course, but these analyses are structured around specific approaches and questions in an effort to marshal the ways these audiovisual texts are examined; i.e. to encourage students to treat them as examples, embodiments or iterations of the topics discussed. Broadly speaking, students are encouraged to employ an industrially and culturally sensitive poetics geared to understanding how historically situated combinations of commercial enterprise and creative engagement with public-sphere discourse underwrites film production and assembly.

#### Note on Readings:

Students new to Film Studies are sometimes surprised that writings on this well-loved entertainment form can often be quite dry and intellectually challenging. It should be stressed that film scholarship – whether theory, criticism, historiography or combinations thereof – is a very different genre of writing to film journalism. The Film Studies writings used on this course – penned by some of the most influential figures in the field – are valuable for the same reasons that any other academic texts are valuable: because they contribute to knowledge, and not because of their entertainment value. Accordingly, students should be prepared to study these writings rather than skim through them; re-reading the pieces, if necessary. A mandatory home screening is set to provide students with a concrete reference point intended to facilitate their understanding of the readings. Please note that as electronics are prohibited during class (see below), those students who – quite understandably – find it helpful to refer to readings during class should secure a hard-copy dossier of all readings from the program administrators or print off copies of individual readings as required, referring to these when necessary.

#### Note on Screenings:

One of the bigger challenges faced by students new to the academic study of cinema is to resist efforts on the parts of the filmmakers to “lose oneself in the film”. In the context of this course, the films themselves should be treated as cultural artifacts, which should in turn be analyzed with a high degree of critical distance. Accordingly, questions about the home screenings and in-class screenings will be provided to students in advance, in order to help focus and structure the analysis of these audiovisual texts. Notes should also be made during screenings.

#### Note on electronics in class:

Except during breaks or unless otherwise stated, electronic devices may NOT be used at any



time during this class, not even as a means of referring to the assigned readings (which may be brought in printed form). It needs to be stressed that there is no valid reason to have phones, tablets, or laptops either turned on or on display in this class, as all slides are made available to students after each session. Any notes that do need to be taken can be made with pen and paper.

### **Course Requirements**

Guidelines on each prompt will be issued when students are expected to turn their attention to the assessment in question. Students are also advised to reach out to the instructor to discuss issues related thereto. A twenty-four-hour emailed response is guaranteed, although usually responses will be much swifter than this. Face-to-face meetings can also be arranged upon request.

### **Paper I – Hollywood ≠ Europe (?)**

Students are to submit a 1500-to-1700-word essay in response to a prompt derived from sessions 2 to 4.

### **Deadline: TBC**

**Prompt:** Hollywood is typically assumed to be American. However, the work of Andrew Higson and Behlil, and Meers, show how transatlantic flows of people, capital, ideas, and products complicate the notion that Hollywood is in fact an American institution, and thus distinct from Europe. With these points in mind, consider the production, content, and circulation of a Hollywood film to support where you stand on this issue.

### **General Areas of Strength**

A direct, focused, and argument-driven response to the prompt.  
Direct, overt, and critical engagement with the full range of relevant scholarship and ideas.  
Use of concise examples from film as a means of supporting assertions of broader phenomena.

### **Specific Areas of Assessment**

An understanding of the ways culture has been conceptualized in national terms.  
An understanding of how cross-border movements complicate such approaches.  
An understanding of how the aforementioned notions relate to Hollywood.  
A demonstration of how the example film evinces transatlantic flows, and their implications.

### **Paper II – Hollywood Cinema vs. European Cinema (Midterm Paper)**

Students are to submit a 1500-to-1700-word essay in response to a prompt derived from sessions 5 and 6.

### **Deadline: TBC**

**Prompt:** Hollywood cinema and European cinema are often considered to be binarily opposed,



based on oppositions related to escapist entertainment and cerebral art. However, this notion is complicated by European-based producers supplying Hollywood with examples of “Mid-Atlantic Cinema” and “Imperso-Nation”, and Hollywood’s handling of films using the art cinema model typically associated with Europe. With this point in mind, use an example of one of these approaches to support where you stand on this issue.

### **General Areas of Strength**

A direct, focused, and argument-driven response to the prompt.

Direct, overt, and critical engagement with the full range of relevant scholarship and ideas.

Use of concise examples from film as a means of supporting assertions of broader phenomena.

### **Specific Areas of Assessment**

Understanding of how Hollywood cinema and European cinema tend to be imagined.

Understanding of the general phenomena that complicate this notion.

Demonstration of how an example Hollywood film relates to these notions.

### **Paper III – Anti-Communist Hollywood (?)**

Students are to submit a circa 1500-to-1700-word essay in response to a prompt derived from sessions 7 to 8.

### **Deadline: TBC**

**Prompt:** Discussion of Hollywood and its relations to Eastern Europe in the twentieth century has tended to spotlight Hollywood’s Anti-Communism. However, some scholars have suggested that in terms of its conduct and output Hollywood has at times been more ambivalent about – even supportive of – aspects of state socialism. With this point in mind, use one of Hollywood’s communist-themed films to explain where you stand on this issue

### **General Areas of Strength**

A direct, focused, and argument-driven response to the prompt.

Direct, overt, and critical engagement with the relevant scholarship and ideas.

Use of concise examples from film as a means of supporting assertions of broader phenomena.

### **Specific Areas of Assessment**

Understanding of how Hollywood has been framed as supremely anti-communist.

Understanding of how this claim is complicated by some of Hollywood’s actions and films.

Demonstration of how an example Hollywood film relates to these notions.

### **Paper IV Americanization (?)**

Students are to submit a circa 1500-to-1700-word essay in response to a prompt derived from sessions 9 to 11.



**Deadline: TBC**

**Prompt A: Concession-making**

Hollywood's relationships to Europe as a market and as subject matter have usually been understood in terms of Americanization – as a powerful overseas US institution imposing an outside culture onto a sovereign territory. However, some scholars have suggested that the voluntary nature of movie-going and the reliance on international revenue has demanded Hollywood make concessions to the perceived tastes of audiences in Europe. With this point in mind, use a Euro-tailored Hollywood film to support where you stand on this issue.

**General Areas of Strength**

A direct, focused, and argument-driven response to the prompt.

Direct, overt, and critical engagement with the relevant scholarship and ideas.

Use of concise examples from film as a means of supporting assertions of broader phenomena.

**Specific Areas of Assessment**

Understanding of how Americanization has been used to explain the notion that Hollywood imposes quintessentially American fare onto “vulnerable” European subjects.

Understanding of how (and why) Hollywood has needed to pander to key European markets.

Demonstration of how an example film relates to these notions.

Or

**Prompt B: US Introspection**

**Deadline: TBC**

**Prompt:** Central to the discussion of Americanization has been the notion that Hollywood promotes "American values" to international audiences such as those in Europe. However, some scholars have shown that Hollywood sometimes uses images of Europe and Europeans primarily to invite Americans to think critically about themselves and their nation. Use a European-centered Hollywood tourist film to support where you stand on this issue.

**General Areas of Strength**

A direct, focused, and argument-driven response to the prompt.

Direct, overt, and critical engagement with the relevant scholarship and ideas.

Use of concise examples from film as a means of supporting assertions of broader phenomena.

**Specific Areas of Assessment**

Understanding of how notions of Hollywood's use of European subject matter has been seen to speak to European audiences.



Understanding of how this material can also be directed at American audiences, through an understanding of the tourist film model.

Understanding of how an example Hollywood tourist film aims to speak to Americans, and the implications of this vis-à-vis the issue housed in the prompt.

NB: Films screened on this course may not be used for any of the prompts.

1. Paper I	20%
2. Paper II	20%
3. Paper III	20%
4. Paper IV	20%
6. Class participation:	20%

### **Penalties for Late Submission of Work**

Up to 24 hours after the due date - 5 marks out of 100 deducted

Between 24 and 48 after the due to date - 10 marks out of 100 deducted

Between 48 and 72 hours after the due date - 15 marks out of 100 deducted

Between 72 and 96 hours after the due date - 20 marks out of 100 deducted

More than 96 hours after due date - all marks deducted

### **Feedback**

Each student will be sent detailed personal feedback on each of their papers. This feedback is designed to be constructive so will spotlight strengths, shortcomings, and approaches that may have generated stronger papers.

### **CIEE Prague Class Participation Policy**

Assessment of students' participation in class is an inherent component of the course grade.

Participation is valued as **meaningful contribution in the digital and tangible classroom**, utilizing the resources and materials presented to students as part of the course. Students are required to actively, meaningfully and thoughtfully contribute to class discussions and all types of in-class activities throughout the duration of the class. Meaningful contribution requires students to be prepared, as directed, in advance of each class session. This includes valued or informed engagement in, for example, small group discussions, online discussion boards, peer-to-peer feedback (after presentations), interaction with guest speakers, and attentiveness on co-curricular and outside-of-classroom activities.

Students are responsible for following the course content and are expected to ask clarification questions if they cannot follow the instructor's or other students' line of thought or argumentation.

The use of electronic devices is only allowed for computer-based in-class tests, assignments and other tasks specifically assigned by the course instructor. Students are expected to take notes by hand unless the student is entitled to the use of computer due to his/her academic



accommodations. In such cases the student is required to submit an official letter issued by his/her home institution specifying the extent of academic accommodations.

Class participation also includes students’ active participation in Canvas discussions and other additional tasks related to the course content as specified by the instructor.

Students will receive a partial participation grade every three weeks.

**CIEE Prague Attendance Policy**

**Regular class attendance is required throughout the program, and all unexcused absences will result in a lower participation grade for any affected CIEE course.** Attendance policies also apply to any required co-curricular class excursions or events, as well as Internship.

Excessively tardy (over 15 minutes late) students will be marked absent.

Persistent absenteeism (students with unexcused absences exceeding 10% of the total course hours, or violations of the attendance policy in more than one class) will result in a written warning and a possible notification to the student’s home school.

Unexcused absences will lead to the following penalties:

<i>Percentage of the Total Course Hours Missed</i>	<i>Equivalent Number of 90-minute / 180-minute Semester Classes</i>	<i>Minimum Penalty</i>
up to 10%	<b>two</b> 90-minute classes <b>one</b> 180-minute class	participation grade affected as per class requirements
10–20%	<b>three to four</b> 90-minute classes <b>two</b> 180-minute class	participation grade affected as per class requirements; <b>written warning</b>
more than 20%	<b>five</b> 90-minute classes <b>three</b> 180-minute classes	automatic <b>course failure</b> and possible expulsion

**IMPORTANT NOTICE: Missing more than 20% of the TOTAL class hours (excused and unexcused combined) will lead to a **course failure**, and **potential program dismissal**.**

Students who transfer from one CIEE class to another during the add/drop period will not be considered absent from the first session(s) of their new class, provided they were marked present for the first session(s) of their original class. Otherwise, the absence(s) from the original class carry over to the new class and count against the grade in that class.

If missing a class,

- students are responsible for any material covered in class during their absence.



- students will only be entitled to a make-up assignment, test, exam or delivering his/her presentation if the absence is excused by the Student Services Coordinator (SSC).

An absence in a CIEE course will only be excused provided the two below conditions have been met:

- The reason for missing a class is of a serious medical nature that could not be treated outside of the student’s course hours,  
AND
- the student submitted a local doctor’s note within 24 hours from the class missed. Doctor’s notes may be submitted via e-mail or phone (a scan or photograph are acceptable), however, the student must ensure that the note is delivered to the SSC.

Should a **truly extraordinary situation** arise, the student must contact the SSC immediately. The SSC decides the course of action for all absence cases that are not straightforward. **Always contact the SSC with any inquiry about potential absence(s) and the nature thereof.**

**Personal travel (including flight delays and cancelled flights), handling passport and other document replacements, interviews, volunteering and other similar situations are not considered justifiable reasons for missing class and absences incurred in this way will not be excused.**

Course attendance is recorded on individual Canvas Course Sites. Students are responsible for checking their attendance on a weekly basis to ensure the correctness of the records. In case of discrepancies, students are required to contact the SSC within **one week of the discrepancy date** to have it corrected. Later claims **will not** be considered.

CIEE staff does not directly manage absences at FAMU and ECES, but they have similar attendance policies and attendance is monitored there. Grade penalties may result from excessive absences.

**CIEE Academic Honesty Statement**

Presenting work of another person as one’s own, failure to acknowledge all sources used, using unauthorized assistance on exams, submitting the same paper in two classes, or submitting work one has already received credit for at another institution in order to fulfill CIEE course requirements is not tolerated. The penalty ranges from failure in the course to dismissal from the program. The Academic Director should be consulted and involved in decision making in every case of a possible violation of academic honesty.

**Daily Schedule**

<b>Day 1</b>	<p><b>Introduction</b></p> <p>This session offers an outline the course, its methods, and its modes of assessment. We will also begin to consider – from the perspective</p>
--------------	--

	<p>of the regular moviegoer – the topic examined fully in session two: why we think of Hollywood as American. Helping us to complement this crucial consumer standpoint with a more theoretically informed one will be the film <i>The Artist</i> (2011), which will provide a principal reference point in the following session when we think more systematically about how members of audiovisual cultures tend to assign national status to cultural products like films.</p> <p>Screening: <i>The Artist</i> (2011)</p>
<p><b>Day 2</b></p>	<p><b>Part 1: Hollywood ≠ Europe (?)</b> Sessions 2, 3, and 4 challenge the notion that Hollywood is a solely American institution, and is thus distinct from Europe.</p> <p><b>Hollywood ≠ Europe (?) I: The Logics of Nation &amp; Culture – or why Hollywood is seen as an American Institution</b></p> <p>This session starts to lay a foundation for the remainder of the course, by considering how people have assigned national status to cultural artifacts like films. In so doing, students will begin to think about the types of logic that have led Hollywood – somewhat reductively – to be considered a supremely American institution, and thus as separate from Europe.</p> <p>Required readings: Higson 1989, 36–46.</p> <p>Home Screening: The most American film you can imagine (be prepared to justify your choice)</p> <p>Screening: <i>Inglourious Basterds</i> (2009) [First half of the film shown in the second part of the class]</p>
<p><b>Day 3</b></p>	<p><b>Hollywood ≠ Europe (?) II: Why Hollywood is more than an American Institution – People and Film Content</b></p> <p>Because the study of Hollywood and Europe involves consideration of cross-border flows, it requires an appreciation of the concept of transnational cinema – a multifaceted notion that relates to who makes movies, what those movies are about, who they address, where they circulate, who actually watches them, and how they are watched. Accordingly, this session and the next session probe how transatlantic border-crossings bring into question the very</p>

	<p>Americanness of Hollywood, suggesting instead this institution might be better approached as international. This session will place an accent on this issue in terms of production and content.</p> <p>Required readings: Behlil, 27–38.</p> <p>Home Screening: The most European Hollywood movie you can imagine.</p> <p>In-Class Screening: <i>Inglourious Basterds</i> (2009) [Second half of the Film in the first part of the class]</p>
<p><b>Day 4</b></p>	<p><b>Hollywood ≠ Europe (?) III: Why Hollywood is more than an American Institution - Distribution and Reception</b></p> <p>Because the transatlantic dimensions of most of Hollywood films – and thus of Hollywood itself – are so multifaceted and sometimes obscured, our examination of this topic is spread across two sessions. Speaking broadly, this session will shift focus from considerations of production and content toward issues of dissemination and circulation. In this sense, we will think about how Hollywood films are intended to speak to Europeans, the extent to which they are part of European film culture, and the memories and perceptions European citizens hold about Hollywood.</p> <p>Required Reading: Meers 2004, 158–174.</p> <p>Homework: Conduct a short interview with a European citizen on his or her memories and perceptions of Hollywood, bringing a transcript of the interview to this session.</p> <p>Home Screening: <i>Mamma Mia!</i> (2008)</p> <p>In-Class Screening: N/A</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Paper I Deadline:</b></p>
<p><b>Day 5</b></p>	<p><b>Part 2: Hollywood Cinema vs. European Cinema</b></p>

	<p>Sessions 5 and 6 challenge the notion that Hollywood's output and that associated with European nations is profoundly different; a notion that rests on the invocation on the one hand of mindless entertainment, and on the other enlightening art.</p> <p><b>Hollywood vs. European Cinema I: Hollywood's "European" Cinema</b></p> <p>Thus, where Hollywood tends to be characterized as a money-grabbing purveyor of formulaic, stupefying trash, European cinema is usually elevated as an authentic, autonomous, alternative to Hollywood: in short as art. This session, challenges this problematic distinction by considering the institutionalization within Hollywood of Art(y) cinema. By this is meant output heavily indebted to celebrated European productions that came to be seen in American film culture as "European Art Cinema".</p> <p>Required reading: Bordwell 2002, 94–102.</p> <p>Home Screening: <i>Before Sunset</i> (2004)</p> <p>In-Class Screening: <i>The Grand Budapest Hotel</i> (2014)</p>
<p><b>Day 6</b></p>	<p><b>Hollywood vs. European Cinema II: Europe's "Hollywood Cinema"</b></p> <p>This session tackles the Hollywood vs. European cinema problematic from a different angle than that taken in the previous session. It considers those European-based companies that have specialized in the production of commercially viable transatlantic fare that is intended as much for Hollywood distributors and US theaters as for European eyes. The session focuses on two European firms that are behind some of the most talismanic Hollywood fare of the last twenty years: the UK-based Working Title Films and France's EuropaCorp.</p> <p>Required readings: Hochsherf and Ligott 2010, 8–20. Vanderschelden, 2008, 91–104.</p> <p>Home Screening: <i>Taken</i> (2008))</p> <p>In-Class Screening: <i>Paul</i> (2011)</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>Paper II Deadline:</b></p>

<p><b>Day 7</b></p>	<p><b>Part 3: Anti-Communist Hollywood (?)</b></p> <p>In sessions 7 and 8, students challenge a structuring assumption of twentieth-century Hollywood’s European relations: that Hollywood was a staunchly anti-Communist institution. This notion will be examined critically, with reference to the two periods in which Hollywood’s relations to Eastern Europe were most pronounced: the 1940s and 1950s, and the 1980s.</p> <p><b>Anti-Communist Hollywood (?) I: Classical Hollywood and the Eastern Bloc.</b></p> <p>In this session, students will consider the ways Hollywood demonized and reached out to Eastern Europe during the tumultuous period of the late 1930s to the early 1950s. In so doing, they will develop a more nuanced picture of Hollywood’s relationships to this part of the world, than the relevant albeit limiting notion that Hollywood went to the ends of the earth to promote itself as anti-communist.</p> <p>Required readings: Doherty 1988, 15–27.</p> <p>Home Screening: <i>Mission to Moscow</i> (1943)</p> <p>In-Class Screening: <i>Ninotchka</i> (1939)</p>
<p><b>Day 8</b></p>	<p><b>Anti-Communist Hollywood (?) II: New Cold War Cinema</b></p> <p>Hollywood’s engagement with important geopolitical issues is perhaps nowhere more apparent in the last thirty years than in a high-profile strand of mid-to-late 1980s-output known as New Cold War Cinema. This production trend is typically seen as jingoistic and hawkish on the grounds that it supposedly showcased American patriotism and military might in the face of dangerous, in-human enemy from the Eastern Bloc. In this session, we will consider whether these films were really quite as reactionary as they are suggested to have been or whether some of them used depictions of Eastern Europe(ans) to critique American political, economic, and social systems, and the very act of politicizing entertainment.</p> <p>Required Reading: Prince 1992, 49-80.</p> <p>Home Screening: <i>Moscow on the Hudson</i> (1984)</p>

	<p>In-Class Screening: <i>Rocky IV</i> (1985)</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Paper III Deadline: Midnight CET Friday 17 November</b></p>
<p><b>Day 9</b></p>	<p><b>Part 4 Americanization (?):</b>          Histories of Hollywood’s European relations are often explained with resource to charges of Americanization, cultural imperialism, and globalization. However, the notion of imposing “American” values for cultural and economic reasons, only goes so far in accounting for the dynamics of this relationship. Accordingly, Sessions 9 and 10 develop our understandings of this topic, by shifting attention towards the concessions Hollywood has made to the Europeans’ whose voluntary consumption it has needed to survive. In sessions 11, students reconsider Hollywood’s use of European subject matter from a different perspective, considering the degree to which Hollywood has used this material less for exportation than primarily to address American audiences about their lives, nation, and views.</p> <p><b>Concession-Making I: Hollywood’s Postwar Euro-Romances</b></p> <p>At specific historical junctures, Hollywood has tailored the content of many of its movies to make them specifically marketable and appealing to certain the European audiences upon whom it has relied to remain solvent. Although one might be forgiven for thinking that Hollywood’s aggressive courting of major European markets is a new thing – as a product of a recent acceleration in globalizing tendencies – nothing could be further from the truth. This session considers a spate of postwar pictures that courted much-needed European audiences with a timely combination of transatlantic romance and cultural (tact and) diplomacy.</p> <p>Required reading:          Kramer 2000, 195–206.</p> <p>Home Screening: <i>Roman Holiday</i> (1953)</p> <p>In-Class Screening: <i>It Started in Naples</i> (1960)</p>
<p><b>Day 10</b></p>	<p><b>Concession-Making II: Recent Euro-Friendly Blockbusters</b></p> <p>The strategies with which Hollywood courted European audiences in the postwar years also underwrite the production of almost all of the flagship products of today’s Conglomerate Hollywood: the cross-media, international, mass-audience phenomenon known simply as</p>

	<p>the blockbuster. In this session, students will consider the extraordinary lengths to which Hollywood has been going to make its high-end animated, fantasy-adventure, and superhero films as Euro-friendly as possible during a period of popular Anti-Americanization on the continent. This strategy has seen these films first target key western European markets and appeared poised once again to reach out to Russia.</p> <p>Required Readings: Maltby 2003, 212–217. Kramer 2011, 171–184.</p> <p>Home Screening: <i>Cars 2</i> (2011)</p> <p>In-Class Screening: <i>Madagascar 3: Europe’s Most Wanted</i> (2012)</p>
<p><b>Day 11</b></p>	<p><b>US Introspection: Women’s Tourist Films</b></p> <p>Hollywood has often commodified the idea of Europe as a fantasy space capable of enriching or liberating Americans. This tendency is centralized in the Tourist Film, and especially in a production trend that unfolded in the second half of the 1990s and continued albeit with some important revisions in the twenty first century. This session will look closely at this type of film, and consider whether its images of a pastoral Europe were always used to offer American women fantasies of community, rootedness, and romance, or whether this format was also used to think critically about these very ideas and Hollywood’s role in disseminating them.</p> <p>Required Readings: Negra, 2002, 82–97.</p> <p>Home Screening: <i>Under the Tuscan Sun</i> (2003)</p> <p>In-Class Screening: <i>Leap Year</i> (2010)</p>
<p><b>Day 12</b></p>	<p>Final Paper Consultations</p> <p>This time is set aside for one-on-one meetings with students who would like to discuss the final papers</p> <p><b>Paper IV Deadline:</b></p>



### **Course Materials**

Required Readings (see above for pages of chapters of single-authored books):

Behlil, Meliz. *Hollywood is Everywhere: Global Directors in the Blockbuster Era*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2016. Print.

Bordwell, David. "The Art Cinema as a Mode of Film Practice." *The European Cinema Reader*. Ed. Catherine Fowler. London: Routledge, 2002: 94–102. Print.

Doherty, Thomas. "Hollywood Agit-prop: The Anti-Communist Cycle, 1948–1954", *Journal of Film and Video* 40.4 (1988):15–27. Print.

Higson, Andrew. "The Concept of National Cinema." *Screen* 30. 1 (1989): 36–46. Print.

Hochsherf, Tobias, and James Ligott. "Working Title Films: From Mid-Atlantic to the Heart of Europe." *Film International* 8. 6 (2010): 8–20. Print.

Kramer, Peter. "'Faith in Relations Between People': Audrey Hepburn, Roman Holiday and European Integration.", in *100 Years of European Cinema: Entertainment or Ideology?* Eds. Diana Holmes and Alison Smith. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000: 195–206. Print.

---. "Hollywood and its Global Audiences: A Comparative Study of the Biggest Box Office Hits in the United States and Outside the United States since the 1970s." *Explorations in New Cinema History: Approaches and Case Studies*. Eds. Richard Maltby, Daniel Biltereyst, and Philippe Meers. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011: 171–184. Print.

Maltby, Richard. *Hollywood Cinema: Second edition*. London: Blackwell, 2003. Print.

Meers, Philippe. "'It's the Language of Film!' Young Film Audiences on Hollywood and Europe." *Hollywood Abroad: Audiences and Cultural Exchange*. Eds. Melvyn Stokes and Richard Maltby. London: BFI, 2004: 158–174. Print.

Negra, Diane, "Romance and/As Tourism: Heritage Whiteness and the (Inter)National Imaginary in the New Woman's Film." *Keyframes: Popular Cinema and Cultural Studies*. Eds. Matthew Tinckom and Amy Villarejo. London: Routledge, 2002: 82–97. Print.

Prince, Stephen. *Visions of Empire: Political Imagery in Contemporary American Film*. New York: Praeger, 1992. Print.

Vanderschelden, Isabelle. "Luc Besson's Ambition: EuropaCorp as a European Major for the 21st Century." *Studies in European Cinema* 5.2 (2008): 91–104. Print.