

Cambridge University Press

0521776023 - The Cinema of Hong Kong: History, Arts, Identity

Edited by Poshek Fu and David Desser

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## INTRODUCTION

Since its inception in the 1900s, the cinema of Hong Kong has been a significant part of Chinese film, which encompasses a multiplicity of cinematic sites and traditions. This connection was marked as much by artistic and financial interactions as by business rivalries. Movie producers, directors, actors, and technicians constantly traveled between Hong Kong and Shanghai, then the “Hollywood of the East,” to make films. For example, the giant Lianhua (United China) Productions, cofounded in Shanghai in 1931 by Luo Mingyou and Hong Kong filmmaker Li Minwei, and financed by such Hong Kong business tycoons as Sir Robert Ho Tung, had production studios and distribution offices in both cities. Tianyi (First) Film Company, on the other hand, moved its production arm to the colony in 1932 in the wake of the Japanese attack on Shanghai. After the outbreak of World War II in China in 1937, the whole company relocated to Hong Kong under the name of Nanyang (South Sea) Studio, which was to develop into the Asian media empire of the Shaw Brothers Studio.

At the same time, reflecting the city’s position as a British colony situated at the periphery of the mainland, Hong Kong cinema is rooted in its local cultural tradition. Contrary to the stereotype that equates Hong Kong films to “making for money,” the industry has a complex history of contestation among various political and ideological–linguistic positions and aesthetic orientations. For example, a city of mainly Cantonese speakers, Hong Kong has since the 1920s been a major center for dialect filmmaking. Until the 1970s, the city itself was too small to sustain a film industry; it was almost exclusively export oriented, but its products appealed mainly to the Cantonese-speaking communities along the southern coast of China and in Vietnam, the Philippines, Singapore, and the Americas. This market structure imposed a host of material constraints on local film productions.

Since the 1930s, Mandarin-language films have also been made in Hong Kong by Shanghai émigrés, but these filmmakers aimed – particularly after the founding of the People’s Republic of China, which effectively closed the

Cambridge University Press

0521776023 - The Cinema of Hong Kong: History, Arts, Identity

Edited by Poshek Fu and David Desser

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## 2 POSHEK FU AND DAVID DESSER

Chinese film market – to appeal to diasporic Chinese throughout the world (including, especially, Taiwan). The often cut-throat business competition, cultural conflicts, and artistic interflow between Cantonese-speaking and Mandarin-speaking filmmaking created an especially rich and complex tradition in Hong Kong cinema. Because of its deep local roots and linguistic affinity with the colonial audience, Cantonese cinema has lent itself since the 1930s to the exploration, articulation, and projection of a Hong Kong identity vis-à-vis the mainland mentality.

The cinema of Hong Kong has until recently been a neglected area of scholarly attention in the West. Except for pioneering works by Leo Lee and Rey Chow, Hong Kong cinema had long been marginal to the research agenda of China scholars.<sup>1</sup> In the first wave of Hong Kong film appreciation in the 1970s, scholarly attention was minimal.<sup>2</sup> When Hong Kong cinema returned to international attention in the late 1980s, scholarship still lagged. Perhaps it was the splash made by the Fifth Generation of Chinese filmmakers of the People's Republic of China (PRC) that diverted scholarly attention from Hong Kong. The films of Chen Kaige, Zhang Yimou, Huang Jianxin, and others could be assimilated into the existing scholarly discourse on art cinema and political cinema. The greater attention focused on films of the PRC compared to Hong Kong seems in keeping with a traditional lack of scholarly attention devoted to Hong Kong.<sup>3</sup> Always marginalized both within and without China, the Hong Kong cinema, like Hong Kong itself, seemed to suffer from the same malaise, what Poshek Fu has termed “the Central Plains syndrome.” Only recently has scholarly attention been more focused on Hong Kong. The 1997 handover and the transnational appeal of filmmakers like Jackie Chan, John Woo, and Wong Kar-wai have combined to propel Hong Kong cinema into a significant field of research. But, like the studies of Leo Lee and Rey Chow, much of the recent research focuses on the periods that were directly related to the cultural–political crisis of handover and the rise of the New Wave cinema – the 1980s and 1990s.<sup>4</sup> It was not until 1997, when Stephen Teo (represented in this volume) published his *Hong Kong Cinema: The Extra Dimension*, that there was finally a reasonable survey of the Hong Kong cinema in English. But as Teo himself admits, it will take more than one book to fill in the gaps of historical and critical perspective that will lead to a greater appreciation of Hong Kong cinema.<sup>5</sup> This volume attempts to address this temporal/chronological imbalance.

Fan appreciation, as often happens, preceded scholarly attention.<sup>6</sup> In March 1973, mainstream American audiences caught a glimpse of a cinema at once familiar yet strangely and wonderfully new when Warner Brothers released the Shaw Brothers' production *Five Fingers of Death*. Fans of action cinema were treated to some of the most stylish and fantastic fight scenes they had ever seen. Though perhaps familiar from many an American Western, here was something that was also different. Dubbed into English for widespread

Cambridge University Press

0521776023 - The Cinema of Hong Kong: History, Arts, Identity

Edited by Poshek Fu and David Desser

Excerpt

[More information](#)

American theatrical distribution, *Five Fingers of Death* was not only a substantial box-office hit, it unleashed a veritable tidal wave of films from Hong Kong. Exotic yet accessible, Hong Kong cinema created a stir throughout the rest of that year and for many years to come on America's theatrical and living-room screens.

Though before the wide release of *Five Fingers* Hong King films had routinely played in Chinatown theaters in New York, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Vancouver, and Honolulu, they were strictly the province of Chinese- (mostly Cantonese-) speaking audiences. Following the commercial success of *Five Fingers*, Hong Kong producers and American distributors scrambled to get their hands on Hong Kong imports for wide release. Bruce Lee's Hong Kong films, *The Big Boss* (a.k.a. *Fists of Fury*) and *Fist of Fury* (a.k.a. *The Chinese Connection*), both made before *Five Fingers of Death*, soon made their American debuts, and before long a steady stream of dubbed kung fu films began showing on American movie screens. But these films arrived without context, so to speak. To Chinese audiences, *Five Fingers of Death* would have seemed a competent, perhaps better-than-average film, but it was hardly unique. Films featuring Chinese martial arts had been a staple of the Hong Kong cinema for at least two decades before *Five Fingers* was produced; and for half a decade already, graphic violence, stylized fight scenes, and gravity-defying feats of acrobatic derring-do were *de rigueur* for the genre that had come to dominate the commercial screens of Hong Kong. American audiences had little basis to understand the generic components of the genre, much less its significance for Hong Kong and for Chinese cinema more generally. Unfortunately, the often hurried and inexpert dubbing of the films into English and the crassly commercial way they were marketed tainted the genre, contributing to its undervaluing, both as cinema and as cultural artifact. Even today, the martial arts genre seems mired in a critical and scholarly backwater. Certainly, in its box-office heyday, it was largely ignored or denigrated by scholars and critics alike.

Whatever its critical reception, the kung fu craze of the 1970s brought the Hong Kong cinema to international attention and created, however tenuously, an interested overseas audience of non-Chinese-speaking film fans. Bruce Lee became a Hollywood superstar, the first man of Chinese descent to achieve that status. Lee's untimely death hurt not only the martial arts craze he helped create in the United States but adversely affected the Hong Kong film industry as well. When Jackie Chan emerged as a superstar in Hong Kong and the rest of Asia in the late 1970s, American producers tried to make him into a Hollywood star with films like *The Big Brawl* and *Cannonball Run* in the early 1980s. Fortunately, their attempt failed, as Chan made some of his finest films in Hong Kong in the late 1980s, carrying on the kung fu tradition made famous by Lee. The art-house success of King Hu's *Touch of Zen* in the late 1970s showcased the cinematic artistry the genre was capable of producing

Cambridge University Press

0521776023 - The Cinema of Hong Kong: History, Arts, Identity

Edited by Poshek Fu and David Desser

Excerpt

[More information](#)

and helped prepare overseas audiences for a renaissance of martial arts films in the late 1980s and early 1990s.

Knowledgeable audiences doubtless were a bit dismayed, however, by the image of Hong Kong cinema created by kung fu films in the 1970s. Hong Kong cinema, they might rightly have complained, consists of more than chop-socky mayhem, however stylish and entertaining it might be. Melodramas and social-problem films had also been staples of Hong Kong cinema and, in the 1970s a new generation of comic films emerged. But, like martial arts films before 1973, these were strictly the province of local audiences and the overseas Chinese circuit. Cineastes finally saw this other side of the Hong Kong cinema when the early films of Ann Hui were released on the festival circuit in the early 1980s. In particular, *The Boat People* (1982) showed the world that there was more to Hong Kong cinema than stylish mayhem and that it had a politically engaged and deeply humanistic sensibility as well. But it would be an action-oriented cinema that returned Hong Kong to the filmic forefront, this time without the sloppy dubbing and taint of kung fu. The films of Tsui Hark, and especially those of John Woo, created for the Hong Kong cinema a cult audience of cinematically sophisticated, mostly younger, filmgoers scrambling to see the films on video – often initially in pirated, hastily copied, but at least subtitled, formats. With the commercial distribution of *The Killer* (1989) in the United States and mainstream pay-TV play, Hong Kong returned to international cinematic prominence, this time with a greater critical respect to go with an enviable commercial clout. In the wake of “Woo-mania,” Jackie Chan, denied stardom in the United States in the 1980s would finally find it in the 1990s. Tsui Hark would achieve his own prominence, as well, with the monumental *Once Upon a Time in China* series, begun in 1991. Hong Kong cinema had arrived.

The cult discovery of John Woo and Tsui Hark, the festival successes of Ann Hui (who solidified her international standing with *Song of the Exile*, 1990), and the belated recognition of Jackie Chan as a genuine international superstar led, finally, to the widespread availability of a greater range of Hong Kong films. Clearly, here was a cinema that had much to offer beyond kung fu thrills, even beyond the mind-boggling gunplay of John Woo. Ann Hui, it was revealed, was not alone in tackling politically engaged and psychologically probing issues. There was more to Tsui Hark than flying warriors. There was a rich tradition of cinematic comedy, of musicals, of moving romantic and familial melodramas. In short, Hong Kong’s cinema was as rich and varied as any in the world. It is the purpose of the present volume to shed light on this varied cinema, including, as it happens, the very kung fu films that so disgraced yet were so crucial to Hong Kong’s emergence in world cinema.

One problem that has plagued scholars and fans of the Hong Kong cinema has been access to the cinematic past. Until recently there was no archive to

Cambridge University Press

0521776023 - The Cinema of Hong Kong: History, Arts, Identity

Edited by Poshek Fu and David Desser

Excerpt

[More information](#)

store and screen older films. Lack of archives and a lack of a dedicated film organization specializing in archival screenings also meant that festival and touring retrospectives were rarely if ever mounted. (It is instructive here to think of how many important Japanese directors have been “discovered” through festivals and retrospectives as compared to first-run theatrical release.) Through the tireless efforts of Yu Mo-wen, Law Kar, and Li Cheuk-to in programming the all-important Hong Kong International Film Festival (HKIFF), especially its retrospective screenings and catalogues begun in 1978, Hong Kong’s past was introduced to its fans of the present. A lack of subtitled prints of older films was a bit off-putting to Western scholars as well. Though shown in the retrospective sections of the annual festivals, such films remained the province of local audiences and specialized scholars. Also critical in this process of reconstructing and exploring Hong Kong’s cinematic past is the Hong Kong Film Archive. Founded in 1992, it promises future scholars an easier time of things. Even today, when so much is seen on video, the availability of Hong Kong’s filmic past, subtitled or not, remains fragmentary, at best. All told, Hong Kong’s cinematic past is rarely shown beyond the shores of the island, thus the importance of local critics to begin the process of expounding on the history, traditions, and specifics of the Hong Kong cinema. The lack of access to Hong Kong’s filmic past has been further complicated by the fact that most China scholars don’t know Cantonese, the main language of Hong Kong cinema. We are fortunate indeed in the present volume to be able to rely on local critics and Chinese Cantonese speakers for so many of the chapters.

Another problem plaguing scholars and critics of the Hong Kong cinema is the very place, the very situation, of Hong Kong itself. Caught between East and West, between China and Britain, a crown colony with a hybrid culture, and now once again part of China but under “one government, two systems,” Hong Kong presents a theoretical conundrum. The accepted model of a national cinema seems hardly to apply to the Hong Kong situation – a Chinese community under British rule, a cinema without a nation, a local cinema with international appeal. Perhaps a postmodern model is more appropriate – a transnational cinema, a cinema of pastiche, a commercial cinema, a genre cinema, a self-conscious, self-reflexive cinema, ungrounded in a nation, multiple in its identities. The third most active film industry in the world (behind India and the United States), Hong Kong cinema is per capita the most active in the world by far. Dependent on strong local support, it has always been heavily reliant on overseas markets as well – ethnic Chinese in Southeast Asia in particular but also the Chinatown markets in North America, Europe, and Australia. Subject to censorship by British rule and sensitive to the behemoth that is the mainland, Hong Kong cinema has always found itself in a precarious state of flux, of crisis, of being a cinema in search of an identity.

Organized around the concept of “history, arts, identity,” the chapters in

Cambridge University Press

0521776023 - The Cinema of Hong Kong: History, Arts, Identity

Edited by Poshek Fu and David Desser

Excerpt

[More information](#)

this volume attempt to account for many of the issues that have plagued both fans and scholars attempting to come to terms with the complexities and heterogeneity of the Hong Kong cinema. In the first section, the chapters take a primarily historical approach. This section begins, much as the world's interest began, with the introduction of Hong Kong cinema into mainstream overseas markets. If the late 1960s and early 1970s were crucial to the internal development of the Hong Kong industry, as we will see, this period also marked the spectacular arrival of Hong Kong cinema in the international film world. David Desser, in "The Kung Fu Craze: Hong Kong Cinema's First American Reception," details the unprecedented success of Hong Kong imports in the American market. Desser details the centrality of Warner Brothers studios to the kung fu craze: the TV series *Kung Fu*, blaxploitation films, the distribution of *Five Fingers of Death*, and the production of *Enter the Dragon*. He traces the appearance of Asian martial arts in pre-1973 American cinema and attempts to account for the increasing interest in both martial arts and Hong Kong cinema due to the Vietnam War and its aftermath. He also discusses some of the internal developments of martial arts films within both Cantonese- and Mandarin-language production in Hong Kong.

If Hong Kong films made a big splash on American screens in the early 1970s, it was not the first time Hong Kong and the United States had been in cinematic contact. Law Kar, in "The American Connection in Early Hong Kong Cinema," discusses the crucial importance of cultural "interflow" between Hong Kong and the United States during the first Golden Age of Hong Kong film: 1937–1941. The American experiences of these early filmmakers contributed to this fertile period as did the popularity of Cantonese opera. Law discusses in detail the formation of the first major film companies in Hong Kong, especially Grandview, which originated in San Francisco. He then goes on to discuss the significance of Cantonese opera to the early film style and popularity of Hong Kong cinema, and relates the careers of many of the important stars of stage and screen, including Kwan Tak-hing, the most important Hong Kong star of the 1950s.

The 1960s were a volatile time in most major industrialized nations and generated among other things, considerable excitement in world cinema. The various "new waves" in France, Japan, Britain, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Germany produced some of the most vibrant, engaged cinema the world had ever seen. Much of this political turmoil and cinematic vibrancy were spawned by the emergence of postwar youth culture. Poshek Fu, in "The 1960s: Modernity, Youth Culture, and Hong Kong Cantonese Cinema," shows how many of these same sociocultural forces led to a vibrant but heretofore overlooked period within Hong Kong cinema. Fu reconstructs the cultural and sociopolitical context of the period, which was a time of intense turmoil and dislocation accompanying the processes of industrial modernization, leading to an often-violent confrontation between traditional values and



Cambridge University Press

0521776023 - The Cinema of Hong Kong: History, Arts, Identity

Edited by Poshek Fu and David Desser

Excerpt

[More information](#)

emerging lifestyles and intense intergenerational conflicts, creating what was then known as the “youth problem.” A detailed discussion of the organization of the Hong Kong cinema shows the tremendous decline in Cantonese-language production due to competition with Shaw Brothers’ Mandarin-language output and the declining market for dialect films. In 1966–1968, however, Cantonese filmmakers reacted to the local situation, creating the genre of “youth film.” Works like *The Teddy Girls* brought fresh voices to the Hong Kong cinema and dealt with difficult sociopolitical issues and concerns confronting the colony under the pressures of rapid industrialization, such as juvenile delinquency and social inequality, in ways that the Mandarin-language films completely avoided.

The 1970s was a crucial decade for the Hong Kong cinema; it achieved an international recognition that was unknown to it before, while it experienced something like a boom, a bust, and a renaissance. Stephen Teo, in “The 1970s: Movement and Transition,” details the highs, lows, and rebirth of filmmaking in the territory. While Cantonese production, formerly the driving force of the Hong Kong industry, dwindled to virtually nothing by 1972, Mandarin-language movies opened Hong Kong to the world. These Mandarin films, of course, were mostly kung fu and martial arts spectacles, but Teo notes how dependent these films were on earlier Cantonese-language genres. Teo details how Mandarin was driven by business concerns of overseas markets and how Hong Kong/Taiwan competition and interaction spurred both industries. Teo details the overproduction of Mandarin films in the 1970s and the manner in which Cantonese staged a comeback through the help of television and a new wave of filmmakers. Along the way he discusses the career of Bruce Lee in Hong Kong, and the significance of the kung fu genre in modernizing and internationalizing Hong Kong cinema. He concludes with an overview of the Hong Kong New Wave and the importance of Cantonese-language television to its origins.

Hong Kong cinema aesthetics are often constrained by the relatively low budgets mandated for its productions, a factor influenced by the small market for its cinema: Hong Kong films are distributed only within the Cantonese-speaking community, a tiny market when compared with the Mandarin-speaking cinema. Perhaps the need to churn out films rather quickly to capitalize on the latest trend or fad, or the generic nature of Hong Kong production itself influences the particular characteristics of Hong Kong’s cinematic imagery; or perhaps it has something to do with the landscape of Hong Kong itself: resolutely urban, crowded, the constant rumble of buildings being torn down and new ones almost immediately put in their place. The picturesque seems absent both from Hong Kong and its cinema. Nevertheless, Hong Kong has produced a number of filmmakers who can hold their own with virtually anyone in cinema history. The second section of the book, “Arts,” centers on the work of some of Hong Kong’s premier filmmakers.

Cambridge University Press

0521776023 - The Cinema of Hong Kong: History, Arts, Identity

Edited by Poshek Fu and David Desser

Excerpt

[More information](#)

David Bordwell, in “Richness through Imperfection: King Hu and the Glimpse,” focuses on Hu’s visual style. By examining Hu’s work of the 1960s and 1970s, especially *Dragon Gate Inn*, *A Touch of Zen*, *The Fate of Lee Khan*, and *The Valiant Ones*, Bordwell analyzes Hu’s handling of fight scenes in an especially detailed manner. Hu inherited a reliance on tracking shots, staging in depth, and constructive editing techniques from previous martial arts cinema, but, like Akira Kurosawa, he recast these devices in distinctive, original ways. In particular, Hu seems to rely on providing mere glimpses of the action or features of the set that partially obscure our view. While later directors, especially Tsui Hark, would go to great lengths to show us the impossible, Hu seemed always concerned with making his fights, however fantastic, seem probable, if not possible.

Another of Hong Kong’s most renowned filmmakers is John Woo. Tony Williams, in “Space, Place, and Spectacle: The Crisis Cinema of John Woo,” situates Woo’s works within the context of a “crisis” – Hong Kong’s impending return to Chinese rule and the general malaise, if you will, of the postmodern condition. Williams relies on some biographical criticism, as well, accounting for Woo’s religiosity, his sense of loss, his hopes for the future. Williams, unlike most critics writing on Woo, recounts his early, pre-*A Better Tomorrow*, career, finding, if not stylistic precursors, many of the thematic concerns of his more famous films. In his post-1986 films, Woo reveals an eclectic range of references and influences from Hollywood, Japan, and France, along with many classical Chinese motifs. We might say that Woo is both emblematic and paradigmatic of the Hong Kong cinema itself.

Perhaps not a world-class filmmaker, Michael Hui is nevertheless a crucial and successful one within the complex and varied world of the Hong Kong cinema. Jenny Lau, in “Besides Fists and Blood: Michael Hui and Cantonese Comedy,” rejects the predominant focus of Western critics on Hong Kong’s kung fu and gangster films and makes the case not only for a greater range of Hong Kong films than is generally acknowledged, but for the centrality of Michael Hui to the artistic and commercial revival of Cantonese cinema in the 1970s. Situating Hui within the popular tradition of Cantonese comedy and reading his films not only within this context but in connection to Hong Kong’s relationship to the mainland, Lau provides close readings of a number of Hui’s biggest hits.

Rounding out the section, Patricia Erens discusses one of Hong Kong’s New Wave auteurs and one of the most productive and influential women filmmakers in the territory, Ann Hui. Director of fifteen feature films spanning two decades, Hui has established herself as an influential and significant filmmaker not only in Hong Kong but throughout the world. Unlike many other women filmmakers, Hui has not concentrated solely on “women’s” films, but has undertaken a wide range of subject matter across a variety of cinematic modes. We may divide her work into three main motifs: the politi-



Cambridge University Press

0521776023 - The Cinema of Hong Kong: History, Arts, Identity

Edited by Poshek Fu and David Desser

Excerpt

[More information](#)

cal works, the genre films, and the personal dramas. However, as Erens points out, Hui tends to blur the boundaries between these categories, making her cinema deceptively complex and, usually, commercially successful.

Hong Kong: East or West, Chinese or British, traditional or modern, colonial or postcolonial? Issues of identity continue to plague the territory and have been especially poignant since the announcement in 1984 of the Sino-British Joint Declaration announcing the handover of Hong Kong to China in 1997. Identity thus is the focus of the third section of this volume. This section begins with Poshek Fu's "Between Nationalism and Colonialism: Mainland Émigrés, Marginal Culture, Hong Kong Cinema 1937–1941." Fu focuses on the cultural politics of identity formation in HK film during the war, between 1937 and 1941. By reconstructing the little-known history of film production and commercial practice of Hong Kong cinema, Fu discovers the sort of hybridity and ambiguity that still plagues contemporary Hong Kong. The British colonizers saw them as racial Others and excluded them from war efforts, whereas the émigré intellectuals, through the lens of what Fu calls Central Plains syndrome, condemned the local film culture as slavish and unpatriotic. Fu discusses the ambiguity of Hong Kong identity through a close reading of major "patriotic films" made by Shanghai émigré directors and local filmmakers.

Leung Ping-kwan looks specifically at city films in "Urban Cinema and the Cultural Identity of Hong Kong." Tracing the image, use, and significance of films set in the specifically urban environs of Hong Kong, Leung notes how these city films reveal the shifting cultural relations between Hong Kong and China, Hong Kong and the West, and Hong Kong as a distinct locality with its own culture. Leung calls attention to films like *A Hymn to Mother*, *A Purple Stormy Night*, *Dangerous Encounter of the First Kind*, *Father and Son*, among others.

Natalia Chan Sui Hung, in "Rewriting History: Hong Kong Nostalgia Cinema and Its Social Practice," takes up the issue of identity as seen in a series of nostalgia films produced in the 1980s and 1990s. Distinguishing the nostalgia genre from the historical film, Chan defines the former as presenting history in a stylized or allegorical form. In the nostalgia film, history is rewritten to the needs of the imagination and identity formation. Chan sees four groups of nostalgia films: films that recast Chinese history into a new sort of historical epic, such as *Once Upon a Time in China*; films that represent 1930s Hong Kong or China, such as *Rouge* and *Centre Stage*; 1980s and 1990s films that remake or rework 1950s or 1960s Hong Kong films, such as *He Ain't Heavy, He's My Father*; and films set in the 1960s, like Wong Kar-wai's *Days of Being Wild*. Chan labels most of these films "post-modern" and relates them to the postcolonial and late capitalist situation of Hong Kong itself.

Another film by Wong Kar-wai, *Happy Together*, is part of the focus of

Cambridge University Press

0521776023 - The Cinema of Hong Kong: History, Arts, Identity

Edited by Poshek Fu and David Desser

Excerpt

[More information](#)

10 POSHEK FU AND DAVID DESSER

Sheldon Lu in his essay “Filming Diaspora and Identity: Hong Kong and 1997.” This film, along with *Comrades, Almost a Love Story*, provides the opportunity for Lu to question Hong Kong identity in the wake of the 1997 handover and the ongoing sense of Hong Kong Chinese as a diasporic community. Lu sees *Comrades*, at least indirectly, as an allegory of the relationship between Hong Kong and China, while *Happy Together* ambivalently holds out the hope for a new beginning after 1997. Lu also notes that *Comrades* and *Happy Together* belong to a tradition of Hong Kong films about Chinese in diaspora, and he concludes his essay with a look at a number of films made a few years before these two, which, along with them, partake in discussions and questions revolving around “Chineseness” made poignant by 1997.

Wong Kar-wai’s films, especially *Chungking Express*, and the issue of diaspora form the basis of Gina Marchetti’s essay, “Buying American, Consuming Hong Kong: Cultural Commerce, Fantasies of Identity, and the Cinema.” The characters and situations in *Chungking Express* represent the perfect paradigm of Hong Kong’s “bricolage of American pop culture, British colonialism, and Asian commerce.” A close reading of the film reveals its focus on the commodity, on shifting identities, and a keen concern with time as allegories of 1997 and Hong Kong’s status as a kind of transnational, global site. Comparisons to Xie Jin’s Mainland film, *The Opium War*, and to other Hong Kong films like Peter Chan’s *Comrades, Almost a Love Story*, reveal that the commodity as a source of identification, especially revolving around women, is a key to understanding the situation of Hong Kong as a postcolonial, postcapitalist, postmodern environment.

The volume concludes with what we think is the most comprehensive bibliography yet compiled on English-language Hong Kong film criticism, H. C. Li’s “Hong Kong Electric Shadows: A Selected Bibliography of Studies in English.”

#### NOTES

1. These exceptions include Rey Chow, “A Souvenir of Love,” *Modern Chinese Literature* 7.2 (1993): 59–78, and Leo Ou-fan Lee, “Two Films from Hong Kong: Parody and Allegory,” in Nick Browne, et al., eds., *New Chinese Cinemas: Forms, Identities, Politics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994). See also the essays by Li Cheuk-to and Esther Yau in the same volume.
2. There was only a single scholarly book in English, Ian C. Jarvie’s *Window on Hong Kong* (Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong, 1977), whose origins lie with the University of Hong Kong press itself, perhaps because despite all the apparent interest in Hong Kong cinema, few scholars in the West were paying attention.
3. When Chris Berry’s invaluable anthology *Perspectives on Chinese Cinema* (London: BFI, 1991) was first published in 1985, no chapter was devoted to Hong Kong cinema. Even when the second expanded edition appeared, Hong Kong cinema was