From Global to Local: Global Hollywood as an Approach to Post-1997 Thai Cinema

*Jiratorn Sakulwattana**

Faculty of Liberal Arts, Thammasat University, Thailand

Article Info

Abstract

This paper focuses on the cinema of post-1997 Thailand, which in the existing literature is contextualised by the economic crash of Asian countries in 1997 and technological changes in the following decade—the rise of multiplexes in cinema-going culture and the popularised combustion of films onto other visual media, such as video and television. The scholarship on Thai cinema of the period primarily approaches the subject through a conceptualisation of two specific qualities—*sakon* (universal) and Thainess—and their conflicted relationship, which emerges on the films' narrative level and at the industry level. Grounded in the context of a post-economic crisis, this conflicted relationship between *sakon* and Thainess (represented on the Thai screen) is interpreted as a cultural response to an abrupt economic change. To provide an extra layer to approach the cinema of this period, in this paper, I draw on the concept of Global Hollywood introduced by Miller (2001). Global Hollywood is a term applied to define the changing nature of Hollywood as a film industry where internationalization of production, exhibition, and reception has become the industry's dominant aspect. In relation to Hollywood cinema since the 1990s, the term Global Hollywood is also employed to define the contemporary film culture in countries outside the US, where Hollywood historically originated.

1. Introduction

The economic crash across the Asian continent in 1997, also known as the *Tom Yum Kung* crisis, has been regarded as an important factor that shaped the direction and characteristics of Thai cinema after 1997. In the scholarship of Thai cinema, this socio-economic context is also employed as a ground where characteristics of Thai films and the Thai film industry at large are defined; the period saw dramatic changes in two specific areas of the film industry: production and reception. In the area of film production, in the first half of the decade, teen films produced by two of Thailand's major media conglomerates—R.S. Promotion (1992-present) and GMM Grammy (1983–present)—was a popular genre, and had served as a marketing platform for pop singers affiliated with the conglomerates. Examples of these films include *The Magic Shoes / Rong thao ta laep plaep* [รองเท้าตะแล่บแปล๊บ] (dir. Prachya Pinkaew, 1992), *Romantic Blue / Lok thangbai hai nai khon diao* [โลกทั้งใบให้นายคนเดียว] (dir. Rashane Limtrakul, 1995), and *Dangerous Years / Dek se-phle* [เด็กเสเพล] (dir. Nopporn Watin, 1996). However, the late 1990s saw the rise of historical films; from a biography of youth gangsters in late-1950s Thailand in *Dang Bireley's and Young Gangsters / Song si kao kao anthapan khrong mueang* [2499 อันธพาลครองเมือง] (dir. Nonzee Nimibutr, 1997) to a film adaptation of the well-known tale of *Nang Nak* [นางนาก] (dir. Nonzee Nimibutr, 1999), and also a 16th-century war epic in *Legend of Suriyothai* [สุริโยไท] (dir. Chatrichalerm Yukol, 2001). This category of films are referred to with different names by scholars of Thai film: for instance, Amporn (2003) calls them "nostalgic films", while Ingawanij (2007) uses the term "Thai heritage cinema" with reference to an existing genre in British cinema. In the area of reception, films of this genre render a nationalist sentiment with their domestic audience, where the nostalgic experience is steered by the employment of advanced filming technology to authenticate the Thai past depicted on screen. In this article, I will adopt May Adadol's term of Thai heritage cinema when referring to the genre, since its coinage is grounded on an existing film category (heritage cinema) where visualising a nation's cultural heritage is a key characteristic. With its emergence in the context of British cinema in the 1940s, film historian Charles Barr introduced the term to classify British films that delivered "national heritage" in a film's visual aesthetic through a historical setting deployed in the narrative (Monk, 2012, p. 11).

Using this definition of heritage, Thai heritage cinema as a film genre of post-1997 Thai cinema is therefore adopted herein.

The first section of this article deals with the emergence of Thai heritage films in the context of the post-economic crisis of 1997 Thailand, where *sakon* (universal) and Thainess qualities, and their contradictory relationship to each other, have been treated as key aesthetic features of the genre by scholars of Thai cinema. As a suggestion for an alternative approach to Thai cinema of the post-1997 period, in the following section, I draw on Miller's (2001) concept of Global Hollywood, which has been the industrial condition of Hollywood cinema since the 1990s. This defines the global film culture in which Hollywood cinema has established its dominance in a comparable way to local film industries.

2. Visualising ambivalence on the Thai screen: dichotomous conceptualisation of *sakon* and Thainess in the scholarship of post-1997 Thai cinema

The rise in production number and commercial success of Thai heritage films is understood in relation to the emerging nationalist discourse in the aftermath of the economic crisis. While modernity and globalisation were glorified in the pre-crisis decades, the two values were reinterpreted as intimidating foreign cultural concepts after the crisis. Akaraseranee (2002) views the cinema practice of post-1997 Thailand corporations with the anti-globalisation discourse in the country. Before the crisis, the state set a goal for the country's economy to become a member of the Newly Industrialised Countries (NICs). Then, the economy crashed, and the government consequently announced the devaluation of the local currency in July 1997. This led to dissolution and bankruptcies of a number of companies and layoffs of employees; particularly, those in the financial sector. To cope with such an abrupt economic decline, which had swept away Thailand's dream of becoming a modern industrialised country, a discourse of Thailand as an agriculture-based society has been promoted and popularised through the concept of Sufficiency Economy (*Sethakit pho phiang*). This is seen as a more relevant socio-economic guideline through which the country should develop. And in the realm of cinema, as Anchalee addresses, such a response towards economic failure is reflected through the increasing number and popularity of Thai historical films; films

which visualise the constructed value of traditional Thai identity associated with an imagined Thai past. A similar view is echoed by Harrison (2005), who describes post-1997 Thai films as a display of "anxieties with regard to the corrosive external cultural effects of modernity and globalization" (p. 325). These anxieties, which are grounded on the socio-economic condition of the late 1990s, are reflected in the thematic spatial conflict in the Thai films of the period—the conflict between the urban and country space. Examples include *6ixtynin9 / Rueang talok hok kao* [เรื่องตลก69] (dir. Pen-ek Ratanaruang, 1999), *Transistor Love Story / Monrak thransittoe* [มนต์รักทรานซิสเตอร์] (dir. Pen-ek Ratanaruang, 2001), and *The Letter / Chotmai rak* [จดหมายรัก] (dir. Pa-oon Chantornsiri, 2004). All of which depict modernity and city life in modern-day Bangkok as the cause of the protagonist's main conflict in the storyline, and such a conflict is resolved by their decision to return or to move to the countryside.

Apart from Thai films with this particular theme, Thai heritage cinema also serves as a vehicle visualising this conflicted relationship between modernity (or Westernisation) and Thai cultural identity referred to as Thainess. Defined in relation to a concept of a glorified Thai past, Thainess plays a central role in the study of post-1997 Thai cinema. Ingawanij (2007) addresses a contradictory relationship between *sakon* [สากล] – literally translated as universal – and Thainess as a key characteristic of historical Thai films (or what she calls the Thai heritage cinema of post-1997 Thailand). Similarly, this contradictory relationship between *sakon* and Thainess is characterised as "ambivalent" by Harrison (2005):

> An uncomfortable ambivalence can therefore be argued to exist between contemporary Thai filmmakers' desires on the one hand to appeal to an international audience and their wishes on the other hand to adopt a defined cultural stance that eulogizes the untainted, traditions of an introverted, isolated Thailand. (p. 324-325)

Like Ingawanij (2007), Harrison's (2005) conceptualisation of this ambivalence primarily lies in the area of film production and reception. In the area of production, modern cinematic technologies have been applied to the production of historical films. Examples include *Nang Nak* [นางนาก] (dir. Nonzee Nimibutr, 1999) – the filmic adaptation of a

well-known tale of female ghost Mae Nak, and *The Legend of Suriyothai* [สุริโยไท] (dir. Chatrichalerm Yukol, 2001), which is based on a historical war in Ayutthaya in the 16th century. After their domestic theatrical release, both films became a commercial success, and rendered the aforementioned ambivalence through a conflicted *sakon*-Thainess relationship displayed at two levels.

First, on the narrative level, the qualities of *sakon* and Thainess are part of the characterisation of the protagonist, Queen Suriyothai. In this respect, Amporn (2003) studies the success of the film *The Legend of Suriyothai* in relation to the depiction of these two qualities through the character Queen Suriyothai. Based on the 16th-century historical war in Ayutthaya, thematic nationalism is rendered through the female protagonist's sacrifice of her life during the war. Despite its historical setting, Queen Suriyothai is an embodiment of the modern-day gender role of a good married woman as she is not portrayed as a national heroine but, rather, a good, intelligent wife who provides support to her husband, the king. Amporn interprets this attribute as equivalent to that in modern Thailand where a good married woman is determined by a balance between modern and traditional quality: she needs to be educated but, at the same time, she remains traditional by serving a supportive role to her husband. In other words, the intelligent trait of Queen Suriyothai associates her with a supportive rather than lead role in the film. Such a characterisation of Queen Suriyothai with modern-day gender values represent the conflicted *sakon*-Thainess relationship, which is the ambivalence accorded by Harrison (2005). Considering the context of the economic crisis in the late 1990s, historical films can be understood in relation to how a society copes with the abrupt economic crash and its effects on the society; Amporn (2003), for insance, describes Queen Suriyothai as "the 'imagined woman' the nation longs at a critical time" (p. 304). Similar to Amporn, Fuhrmann's (2016) analysis of the film *Nang Nak* highlights the role of *sakon*-Thainess sensibility in relation to how the female protagonist is represented in Thai heritage cinema. The film's aesthetic largely relies on the deployment of *sakon* production quality in authenticating the widely-known tale of Nak the ghost wife. Despite being known as a ghost tale, in this 1999 adaptation, the story is depicted in a realistic fashion of a period drama. Unlike the previous versions of the tale, where the horror aspect and supernatural power of Nak plays a central role

in the narrative, in *Nang Nak*, the relationship between the ghost wife and her living husband and Nak's pain of being separated from her husband are the focus. In short, the *sakon*-Thainess sensibility is visualised on screen through Nak. As a character from a well-known tale, she represents the collective cultural memory of Thailand. However, modern cinematic technology, or a *sakon* production, is essentially employed to render such a memory of the traditional culture to its audience. Recognised as a character from a tale, Nak and her story are authenticated by the application of filmmaking technology, such as the undersaturated sepia colour scheme that is applied to resemble the image of old photographs. The tale's authentication also relies on the deployment of historical references, including a re-enactment of the King of Siam's eclipse in 1868 in the film's opening scene to indicate the time where Nak's story occurred, for instance.

Second, this conflicted *sakon*-Thainess relationship as a quality of post-1997 Thai cinema emerged at the industry level. Thematic nationalism is central not only to the production of a Thai heritage film, but also to publicising the films in the area of exhibition. While thematic nationalism is highlighted in film marketing, in the area of film reception, *sakon* and Thainess are recognised as criteria for a local film audience when determining the merit of a Thai heritage film. Moreover, a good Thai heritage film should be able to render nationalist sentiment through a production where the quality is equivalent to that of a Hollywood production. However, a contradiction emerges. While visual fetishism of national heritage and nationalist sentiment are encouraged in a film's narrative, when a film is marketed for a domestic audience, a yearning for international recognition—at film festivals or from film awarding bodies—is expressed through the cultural discourse of *ko intoe* [โกอินเตอร์]. As the expression derives from the English words "go" and "international", it is directly translated to "go internationally", which connotes the idea of "receiving international recognition" or "becoming internationally successful". To relate the term to *sakon* in post-1997 Thai cinema, the expression *ko intoe* is treated as a goal for producers of Thai films, as they should not only expect distribution within the country, but also internationally. In an interview, Thai filmmaker and producer Yongyoot Thongkongtoon, who was the director of the Thai Film Director Association in 2008, used the phrase *ko intoe* when discussing the potential of Thai films as cultural exports, and how local producers should be encouraged to aim for

international viewership (Panichkul, 2008, p. C7). Similarly, the term is adopted in the title of a newspaper article "หนังไทยโกอินเตอร์ ฝันที่เป็นจริงหรือภาพลวงตา" [trans. Thai films to 'go internationally': a realistic potential or just a daydream?] (Ban Mueang, May 23, 2001, p. 20). Despite referring to the expression of *ko intoe*, Harrison (2010) raises an issue of ambivalence emerging in the growing effort to distribute post-1997 Thai films abroad:

> While local filmmakers clearly desire on the one hand to court the affections of global audiences and to make their mark on the international as well as the local silver screen, they similarly strive to promote on those screens a reconstruction of what it means to be Thai. (p. 118)

What Harrison suggests is similar to the conflicted representations of *sakon* and Thainess on the Thai screen as proposed by Ingawanij (2007). On the one hand, Thai filmmakers expect their films to be well received by the audience outside their home country—an approval that the films are "*sakon*" enough. However, there is an aspiration that their filmic showcase of Thai cultural identity—the Thainess—should be recognised.

This dichotomous relation between *sakon* and Thainess and the ambivalence between the two qualities have been employed to make sense of post-1997 Thai cinema as reflected in the aforementioned literature. While the value of *sakon* in Thai cinema production and reception is defined in association with a cultural response to an abrupt economic decline in the society, I argue that Global Hollywood as a condition of the film industry can be essentially applied to the theorisation of post-1997 Thai cinema. Specifically, it is a crucial factor shaping the local film culture of the period being discussed.

3. Global Hollywood: globalising the world's film culture

Miller (2001) introduced the term Global Hollywood to define a collective film culture of different societies during the 1990s. Miller drew on stabilised conditions of global politics and economies—the unification of the Western European Market and privatised ownership of media, for instance—as significant factors that established Hollywood as a dominant and more competitive film industry. Moreover, technological

changes relating to film and media consumption—the increasing adoption of satellite television and VCRs, for instance—also contributed to the success of Hollywood cinema (Miller, 2001, p. 4). These socio-economic and technological conditions of the 1990s facilitated the exhibition of Hollywood films beyond US borders as the word "global" in Miller's coinage suggests.

Generally, Hollywood is defined as a national cinema; like other film industries, it is defined according to its country of origin as an American film industry catering mainly to popular cinema. By adding the word 'global' to the concept, the aspect of national belonging is dissociated from the definition of Hollywood cinema. In other words, the industry has been redefined as "global" instead of "national". Such a deployment of "global" also indicates the scale of distribution and reception of Hollywood films as primary earnings changed to the films' theatrical releases and distributions on other visual media platforms—video and television, for instance—outside the US's borders. As Miller further describes, on average, a bigger budget was also allocated to Hollywood production as the decade progressed: from 26.78 million USD at the outset to 53.41 million USD in the late 1990s. Conversely, the production budget in other major film industries in Western Europe started to decrease where, on average, the budget for a film production in France, Italy and the UK in 1990s ranged from 5.02 to 8.93 million USD. This budgeting difference between a Hollywood film and a film produced by other film industries reflects different scales of distribution and reception; treating films as commodities, for instance, means that higher costs of production can be representative of a film that is expected to be more widely consumed. In other words, the total earnings of films with higher cost of production are higher, which consequently leads to a bigger financial investment in the following productions. As a relevant example in this respect, Miller refers to *Titanic* (dir. James Cameron, 1997), whose majority of box office earnings were from its theatrical release overseas which made 1 billion USD (Miller, 2001, pp. 4-7).

Besides scales of production, exhibition and reception, Global Hollywood also suggests an "internationalisation" condition in film financing as Goldsmith, Ward, and O' Regan (2012) point to in *The Lord of the Rings* trilogy (dir. Peter Jackson, 2001-2003). For each film in the trilogy, the production funding came from Germany and New Zealand.

This phenomenon of international co-productions has become "a norm for international English language cinema in the mid-budget range" (Goldsmith et al., 2012, p.2). Furthermore, this condition of internationalisation is also applied to defining the filming locations as exemplified by *The Chronicles of Narnia: the Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* (dir. Andrew Adamson, 2005). In this film, shooting locations were in New Zealand, Poland, the UK, and the US. Similarly, the nature of labour in the production and post-production process, which involves a production crew of different nationalities and a post-production process frequently completed by a company based outside the US, is known in the film industry as "runaway productions" (Goldsmith et al., 2012, pp. 2–3).

4. From Global to Local: Hollywood aesthetic as a benchmark for local films

In the context of Asian cinema, Ciecko (2006) draws on the condition of Global Hollywood as a significant aspect identifying contemporary Asian cinema. Similar to Miller (2001), technological changes—the arrival of digital technology in particular—crucially defines Asian film culture at a contemporary age, since these technologies provide not only new viewing platforms for films (videos and television) but also a new channel for film publicity (the Internet). While the context of media technology in the 1990s provided an opportunity for the Asian film industry to achieve a wider audience, the growing distribution and production scales of Hollywood cinema–encapsulated by the condition of Global Hollywood–marginalised Asian cinema in both domestic and international arenas (Ciecko, 2006, p. 24). In short, irony emerges in the Global Hollywood discourse. On one hand, the condition devalues the notion of national cinema as Hollywood cinema is no longer defined as American. Yet, on the other hand, considering the production and distribution scales of Hollywood cinema, other film industries, including Asian cinema, have been positioned on the periphery, as they are less competitive in achieving such a scale of production and distribution under the condition of Global Hollywood (Ciecko, 2006, pp. 13-16). Ciecko's deployment of Global Hollywood in relation to Asian cinema suggests the manipulative aspect of Hollywood cinema. A similar take is stressed by Lau (2003), who believes that the manipulative nature of Hollywood cinema has an impact on the aesthetics of local productions, which are

heavily influenced by those of Hollywood cinema. In other words, to Lau, the narrative in contemporary Asian films is an imitation or a mutation from Hollywood films.

Considering Miller's notion of Global Hollywood in relation to contemporary global film culture, and its impact on Asian cinema addressed by Ciecko (2006) and Lau (2003), Thai cinema as a local film industry can also be understood in relation to this context. The financial crisis, and its impact on Thai society in the late 1990s, is a crucial context in which Thai cinema of the period is theorised as a response to the abrupt economic change as portrayed by the films' employment of thematic nationalism in the Thai heritage genre, and of *sakon* production quality that contributes to authenticating such a theme. As the existing literature suggests, this *sakon* quality is treated as an emergent value employed to make an aesthetic judgement of Thai films. However, I argue that such a value has not recently emerged, but has circulated in the realm of cinema in Thailand since its early days in the country.

5. *Sakon* as a long-established benchmark for cinema in Thailand

Since the screening of Lumière Brothers films at the Prince Alangkarn theatre in 1897—the event that marks the arrival of cinema in the country—cinema has been defined in relation to ideas of modernity and civilisation associated with the Western world. Barmé (2002) and Peleggi (2002) suggest that in fin-du-siècle Siam, consumption of cinema and filmmaking gadgetry play a significant role in the modernisation projects of King Chulalongkorn (r.1868–1910), as they disseminated the image of Siamese elites as a modernised, civilised subject not only to the local people, but also to the Western colonisers. In other words, the local treatment of cinema as an embodiment of civilisation and progress is not only in the realm of culture as a pastime, but also in politics, as cinemas had been deployed as an instrument of power. Similarly, Hamilton (1994) and Uabumrungjit (2012) associate cinema in Thailand—the filmmaking aspect of cinema in particular—with a leisure activity of the privileged class, since they were the only group of people in the society with access to filmmaking and technology related to cinema at the time. To demonstrate such an interest of the Siamese elites in cinema and filmmaking, The Amateur Cinema Association was founded by King Prajadhipok (r.1925–1935). Considering this historical condition of the early days of cinema in

Thailand, the cultural position of cinema is different from that of the West, where it was invented. In the West, cinema is historically defined in relation to the emerging urban life in the context of industrialisation. Within such a context, it is public entertainment whose exhibition venue was in music halls—a public space which "appealed primarily, though not exclusively, to working-class audiences" (Hanson, 2007, pp. 12–13). With a different historical condition, cinema therefore has a different cultural classification when localised in Siam due to the Siamese elites's cultural and political treatment of this visual medium. In short, in the early period of cinema in the country, the activities of film viewing and filmmaking represent a socio-cultural privilege and a luxury due to its limited access within the population. As a technology imported from the West, cinema has been associated with *sakon* since its first day in the country. However, the *sakon* quality as an aesthetic judgement in cinema emerged later when cinema established its commercial status in the postwar decades.

In her genealogy of the Thai film industry, Boonyaketmala (1992) draws on the international relations between the US and Thailand during the Cold War decades as key aspect that encourages the incomparable competitiveness of Hollywood films in the Thai film market. This was because specific policies had been implemented to facilitate the distribution of Hollywood films. From 1947 to 1977, the tariff for foreign films had remained minimal, and the number of foreign films exhibited in Thai cinemas each year—most of which were Hollywood's—were between 400 and 800. In contrast to the number of foreign films exhibited in the cinemas each year throughout these decades, the average number of Thai films produced annually were between 40 and 70, with revenues that contributed 10 to 15% of the Thai market (Boonyaketmala, 1992, pp. 73–74). Apart from a taxation that contributed to the competitiveness of Hollywood cinema in the late 1940s, The Motion Pictures Export Association of America (MPEAA) started an operation in Thailand and developed a strong business connection with the local exhibitors, including the Siam Entertainment Company and the Hollywood Film Company (Boonyaketmala, 1992, p. 77). Such an imbalanced number of Hollywood films exhibited in Thailand, in contrast to Thai films throughout the Cold War decades, might not necessarily reflect *sakon* as part of the audience's aesthetic judgement of films. However, considering *sakon* as a quality associated with cinema since its early

days in the country, this popularised consumption of Hollywood films in the context of commercial cinema in the Cold War can be interpreted as popularising the notion of *sakon* in the area of film reception. With their reception experience of Hollywood films for decades, the Thai film audience have become familiar with the Hollywood film aesthetic—the *sakon* aesthetic—and possibly adopted such an aesthetic as a criterion when determining the merit of films in general. With this treatment of *sakon* in films' aesthetic judgements, the relationship between Thai and Hollywood cinemas can be defined as hierarchical: through the notion of *sakon*, the production quality of Hollywood cinema is an aesthetic benchmark for a Thai film.

In a more recent context, the technological changes to film in the 1990s, and the emergence of Global Hollywood as a condition that defines contemporary film culture, can be considered as contributions to popularising *sakon* as a key criterion in a film's aesthetic judgment. Despite Thai cinemagoers' familiarity with watching Hollywood films since the Cold War decades, the emergence of the multiplex system in 1994 as part of a growing urbanised space in 1990s Thailand increased accessibility to cinema and film viewing on other media platforms, including laserdiscs, VHS tapes, and cable television. As for film reception, since the 1980s, where stand-alone cinemas started to decline and were replaced by mini-theatres located in shopping malls, the demographic of Thai cinemagoers was redefined as young urban middle class—the group which is referred to as the "urban youth" by Hamilton (1994), "teen viewers" by Samranwet (2004), and "bourgeois spectators" by Ingawanij (2007).

With the cultural treatment of *sakon* as an aesthetic judgement in cinema, and the popularisation of Hollywood cinema in the Thai viewership since the postwar decades, the condition of Global Hollywood could easily become part of the local film culture. The emergence of Thai heritage cinema as rendering the Thai-*sakon* sensibility has been a central theme in the existing scholarship on post-1997 Thai cinema. In these works, the emerging popularity of the genre is defined as a rise, a turning point in the Thai film industry, which is interpreted based on the commercial success of Thai heritage films like *Nang Nak* [นางนาก] (dir. Nonzee Nimibutr, 1999), *The Legend of Suriyothai* (dir. Chatrichalerm Yukol, 2001), and *Bang Rajan* [บางระจัน] (dir. Tanit Jitnukul, 2000). All three films are alomgst the top 20 highest-grossing Thai films of all time according

to the box office data of 2013. However, not every Thai heritage film produced at the time was a box office success. A number of films of the Thai heritage genre released in the post-1997 years were flops: *Tears of the Black Tiger* / *Fa thalai chon* [ฟ้าทะลายโจร] (dir. Wisit Sassanatieng, 2000), *Kunpan: Legend of the Warlord* / *Khunphaen* [ขุนแผน] (dir. Tanit Jitnukul, 2002), and *Born Blood* / *Ko lang wang* [โก๋หลังวัง] (dir. Akaraphol Akaraseranee, 2002). Accordingly, it is insufficient to approach post-1997 Thai cinema using the context of the Asian economic crisis as the sole theoretical ground. With this approach grounded on the economic crisis, one particular film genre—Thai heritage cinema—is central to the study, while other film categories and other aspects in the Thai film industry and beyond have been excluded. Considering the emergence of Global Hollywood in the 1990s and its impact on local film industries worldwide, a comparative study between Thai films and foreign films released in the local cinemas at the time, and an application of Global Hollywood to analysing the Thai film industry, would contribute to the study of post-1997 Thai cinema. Ultimately, existing scholarship is limited by its singular focus on Thai-*sakon* sensibility in the Thai heritage genre shaped by contextualisation of the Asian economic crisis.

References

"หนังไทยโกอินเตอร์ ฝันที่เป็นจริงหรือภาพลวงตา" [Thai films to become successful abroad: a realistic potential or just a daydream?] (May 23, 2001). *Ban Mueang* [บ้านเมือง].

Amporn, J. (2003). Suriyothai: Hybridizing Thai National Identity through Film. *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*, 4 (2), 296-307.

Barmé, S. (2002). *Woman, man, Bangkok: Love, sex, and popular culture in Thailand*. Silkworm Books.

Boonyaketmala, B. (1992). The rise and fall of the film industry in Thailand 1987-1992. *East-West Film Journal*, *6*(2), 62-98.

Chaiworaporn, A (2002). Nostalgia in post crisis Thai cinema. *Focas: Forum on Contemporary Art & Society*, *5*, 298-310.

Ciecko, A. T. (2006). *Contemporary Asian cinema: Popular culture in a global frame*. Berg.

Fuhrmann, A. (2016). *Ghostly desires: Queer sexuality and vernacular Buddhism in contemporary Thai cinema*. Duke University Press.

Goldsmith, B., Ward, S., & O' Regan, T. (2012). Global and local Hollywood. *InMedia*, *1*, 1-11.

Hamilton, A. (1994). Cinema and nation: Dilemmas of representation in Thailand. In W. Dissanayake (Ed.), *Colonialism and nationalism in Asian cinema (pp. 141-161)*. Indiana University Press.

Hanson, S. (2007). *From silent screen to multi-screen: A history of cinema exhibition in Britain since 1896*. Manchester University Press.

Harrison, R. (2005). Amazing Thai film: the rise and rise of contemporary Thai cinema on the international screen. *Asian Affairs, 36*(3), 321-338.

Harrison, R. (2010). Mind the gap: (En)countering the West and the making of Thai identities on film. In A. Jackson & R. Harrison (Eds.), *The ambiguous allure of the West: Traces of the colonial in Thailand (pp. 93-118).* Hong Kong University Press.

Ingawanij, M. A. (2007). *Hyperbolic Heritage: Bourgeois Spectatorship and Contemporary Thai Cinema* [Doctoral dissertation, University of London]. London.

Lau, J. K. W. (2003). *Multiple modernities: Cinemas and popular media in transcultural East Asia*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Miller, T. (2001). Introduction. In T. Miller, N. Govil, J. McMurria, & R. Maxwell (Eds.), *Global Hollywood*. British Film Institute.

Monk, C. (2012). *Heritage film audiences: Period films and contemporary audiences in the UK*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Panichkul, I. (March 17, 2008). 'ภารกิจท้าทาย 'นายกสมาคมผู้กำกับ ภาพยนตร์ไทย' '. *โพสต์ทูเดย์.* p. C7.

Peleggi, M. (2002). *Lords of things: the fashioning of the Siamese monarchy's modern image*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Samranwet, W. (2004). ภาพยนตร์ไทย: มุมมองทางธุรกิจ [Thai cinema: a business perspective]. *วารสารศาสตร์* [*Warasansat*], 1 (November), 100-112.

Uabumrungjit, C. (2012). The age of independence: Looking back on the first decade of the short film. In M. A. Ingawanit, & B. McKay (Eds.), *Glimpses of freedom: Independent cinema in Southeast Asia (pp. 47-62)*. Southeast Asia Program Publication.

Filmography

Adamson, A. (Director). (2005). *The chronicles of Narnia: The lion, the witch and the wardrobe* [Film]. Walt Disney Pictures; Walden Media.

Akaraseranee, A. (Director). (2002). *โก๋หลังวัง / Ko lang wang* [Born blood] [Film]. Sahamongkol Film International.

Cameron, J. (Director). (1997). *Titanic* [Film]. Twentieth Century Fox.

Chantornsiri, P. (Director). (2004). จดหมายรัก / *Chotmai rak* [The letter] [Film]. Sahamongkol Film International.

Chatrichalerm Yukol (Director). (2001). *สุริโยไท* [The legend of Suriyothai] [Film]. Prommitr International Production.

Jackson, P. (Director). (2001-2003). *Lord of the rings* trilogy [Film]. New Line Cinema.

Jitnukul, T. (Director). (2000). *บางระจัน* [Bang Rajan] [Film]. Film Bangkok.

Jitnukul, T. (Director). (2002). ขุนแผน / *Khunphaen* [Kunpan: Legend of the Warlord] [Film]. Five Star Production.

Limtrakul, R. (Director). (1995). *โลกทั้งใบให้นายคนเดียว / Lok thangbai hai nai khon diao* [Romantic blue] [Film]. R.S. Film.

Nimibutr, N. (Director). (1997). *2499 อันธพาลครองเมือง / Song si kao kao anthaphan khrong mueang* [Dang Bireley's and young gangsters] [Film]. Tai Entertainment.

Nimibutr, N. (Director). (1999). นางนาก / *Nang Nak* [Film]. Tai Entertainment.

Pinkaew, P. (Director). (1992). รองเท้าตะแล่บแปล๊บ / *Rong thao ta laep plaep* [The magic shoes] [Film]. R.S. Film.

Ratanaruang, P. (Director). (1999). เรื่องตลก 69 / *Rueang talok hok kao* [6ixtynin9] [Film]. Five Star Production.

Ratanaruang, P. (Director). (2001). มนต์รักทรานซิสเตอร์ / *Monrak thransittoe* [Transistor love story] [Film]. Five Star Production.

Sassanatieng, W. (Director). (2000). *ฟ้า ทะลายโจร* / *Fa thalai chon* [Tears of the black tiger] [Film]. Film Bangkok.

Watin, N. (Director). (1996). *เด็กเสเพล* / *Dek se-phle* [Dangerous years] [Film]. Five Star Production.