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Introduction
Remakes and Remaking – Preliminary Reflections

RÜDIGER HEINZE AND LUCIA KRÄMER

Most critical work on film remakes typically begins with a gesture that is equally defensive and corrective, namely the assertion that remakes have an undeservedly bad reputation and that they have been paid almost no serious attention. This gesture is, or should be, no longer possible. By now, substantial critical work has been produced on remakes – increasingly so during the last fifteen years (e.g. Horton/McDougal 1998a; Forrest/Koos 2002a; Verevis 2006; Oltman 2008; Loock/Verevis 2012a), and intermittently at least since the 1970s (e.g. Druxman 1975; Manderbach 1988). Some of this work still resorts to a default position of evaluating the success of the remake in relation to its ‘original’ – a normative approach that criticism about transcultural remakes seems to be especially prone to (cf. e.g. Manderbach 1988; Kühle 2006). However, in the best cases, the criticism about remakes has succinctly dismantled the common prejudices towards the form, disproved their premises as specious, and shown remaking to be a productive and pervasive cultural practice.

Some prejudices against remakes obviously persist, especially in non-academic texts such as newspaper reviews, film magazines, and Internet blogs. Very often they are based on the simplistic notion that when it isn’t busy making bad adaptations or insipid sequels, Hollywood, as the hegemonic global film industry – and by implication the entire U.S.-American popular culture industry – is still the voracious cultural imperialist that steals or buys good ideas from European and East Asian cinema, or recycles its own old ones from a better, bygone era, because it has no good ideas of its own. It then ‘degrades’ them by adapting them to the tastes of an undemanding, consumerist American audience, and in a last vicious step imposes these products on the rest of the world. However, even outside academia such a reductive view of remakes is not unanimous (apart from being demonstrably counterfactual). If it were, the negative implica-
tions of derivativeness and unoriginality associated with the label would hardly encourage film producers and distributors to advertise films as remakes.

Yet a sizeable number of movie productions not only admit that they are remakes but actually flaunt the fact to capitalize on the audience’s familiarity with the original (Midding 2012: 27). DVD packages of originals and their remakes abound, and Apple TV, for example, offers a separate remake rubric. These examples underline the established status of the film remake as a commercial practice, while also evoking the changes in the way it has been deployed: the current practices point towards a more “symbiotic relationship” (Verevis 2006: 17) of remake and original than in pre-video times, when spectators were less likely to remember or be familiar with the remake’s original.¹

The sheer diversity of remakes not only belies facile prejudices but insistently points to their lasting appeal and institutionalized status on a variety of levels (Verevis 2006: 1-34; Moine 2007: 25; Dusi 2011: 361). Film remakes are an established *industrial* category of textual re-working during which existing, and usually already successfully proven material is recycled – a practice often, but by no means always, motivated by economic risk-management. Despite the great differences between individual remakes in terms of style, theme, structure, and narration, the remake can also be considered a (rather fuzzy) *textual* category whose member texts are united by their palimpsestic nature, although these intertextual relations may take a myriad of shapes. The label ‘remake’ in advertising – much like a genre label – thus creates an implicit contract between producers and consumers that establishes the possibility to engage with more than one text simultaneously. Used by reviewers, who recur to the remake as a *critical* category, the label triggers the same effect. Spectators are invited to adopt a comparative form of reception, “to enjoy the *differences* that have been worked, consciously and sometimes unconsciously, between the texts” (Horton/McDougal 1998b: 6; emphasis in original), or, if they are unfamiliar with the original, to discover it along with the new film. This *spectatorial attitude* may be triggered by the paratextual marking of a film as remake, but does not depend on it. When spectators recognize so-called unacknowledged or hidden remakes, for example, it is they who ascribe the status of remake to a film. The remake can therefore also be conceived as a category of reception (Moine 2007: 33; Hutcheon 2006: 1-34; Moine 2007: 25; Dusi 2011: 361).

¹ It must be noted, however, that especially the production of transcultural remakes usually still relies on the spectators’ unfamiliarity with the original. The relationship of remake and original in such cases is therefore more openly one of competition, which may potentially lead to the elimination of the original in the audience’s minds (cf. Moine 2007: 30; Midding 2012: 28; Leitch 2002: 38, 41, 50).
121). Since unacknowledged remakes are usually unacknowledged because their producers have failed to acquire the necessary copyrights and thus try to evade this spectatorial stance, the phenomenon of unacknowledged remakes moreover underlines that remakes are also a legal category (e.g. Moine 2007: 17). A focus on any of these aspects can be a fruitful starting point for an examination of individual remakes or processes of remaking; yet it would seem that the greatest hermeneutic potential lies in their combination and an analysis of how the levels of production, text, reception, and context are negotiated by those involved in creating, marketing, evaluating, and analyzing remakes.

Critics have engaged with the remake as a theoretical category, trying to determine its features and boundaries as a critical concept. Yet they have tended to grapple with the remake’s ambivalent position and appeal; an appeal that derives, as most critics agree, from the tension between difference and repetition, surprise and familiarity, recognition and reconstruction, and that thus carries with it conflicted discourses of authenticity and originality, as well as tradition and influence. Unsurprisingly, critical literature has struggled to come to grips with these multiple ambivalences. Some critics have attempted a variety of more or less satisfactory definitions and differentiations (e.g. Kühle 2006: 16, 18; Sainati in Dusi 363). Constantine Verevis, for example, in perhaps the best description of the textual nature of film remakes, states that

“film remakes are understood as (more particular) intertextual structures which are stabilised, or limited, through the naming and (usually) legally sanctioned (or copyrighted) use of a particular literary and/or cinematic source which serves as a retrospectively designated point of origin and semantic fixity. In addition, these intertextual structures (unlike those of genre) are highly particular in their repetition of narrative units, and these repetitions most often (though certainly not always) relate to the content (‘the order of the message’) rather than to the form (or the ‘code’) of the film.” (2006: 21; emphasis in original)

Yet, as Verevis himself points out, “any easy categorization of the remake is frustrated […] by a number of factors” and phenomena, such as unacknowledged remakes, non-remakes or alleged remakes that differ significantly in their treatment of the narrative units of the original (2006: 22). Moreover, the issue of narrative units is a slippery one: on a macro-narrative level, all texts are (generic) remakes; on a micro-narrative level, none are.

In light of these problems of definition, other texts, especially dictionaries, lists, and bibliographies, take remakes to be so pervasive and self-explanatory that a definition beyond the most rudimentary – a new version of an older film – is not needed. Many scholars predictably offer taxonomies: Thomas Leitch
(2002), for example, suggests the readaptation (which ignores the first adaptation), the update, the homage, and the true remake (which offers an “improvement”); Michael Schaudig (1996) differentiates between imitative, innovative, and original remakes; Michael Druxman (1975) has the disguised and the direct remake and the non-remake; Harvey Roy Greenberg (1991) distinguishes the acknowledged, close remake from the acknowledged, transformed remake and the unacknowledged, disguised remake; in a “preliminary taxonomy” Robert Eberwein (1998) even lists fifteen different categories that are further subdivided and all in all add up to almost thirty types of remakes. He is the only one to introduce finer distinctions into his typology to capture, for example, aspects of technology (silent to sound), nationality (autoremake from the same country vs. different country), medium (cinema film to TV film), but also gender and race (character constellation), temporal and cultural setting, as well as genre (parody, pornography). Unfortunately, Eberwein’s view is firmly U.S.-centric, and his inconsistent mixture of distinction criteria ultimately renders his typology quite arbitrary. By positing a “film made by a director consciously drawing on elements and movies of another director” (1998: 29) as one type of remake, he moreover expands the notion of the remake to a degree that renders it quite useless as a critical category.

As Dusi has pointed out, such typologies and categorizations do not help us explain the praxis of remaking or understand repetitive structures (2011: 362). In an equally pervasive anti-taxonomic bias, some criticism therefore considers all films as remakes. Verevis, for example, suggests that “each and every film is remade – that is, dispersed and transformed – in its every new context or configuration” (2006: 75; emphasis in original) – which may be useful as a reflection about the nature of film and about the role of reception for the constitution of meaning, but would rob the concept of the remake of its potential for textual analysis. Many critics examine the remake as one of many forms and practices of transposition, translation, interpretation, intertextuality, or hypertextuality. Loock and Verevis, for example, state in the latest book on film remaking that this practice belongs to a “broad range of creative and industrial practices that transform and appropriate existing texts (originals or earlier versions)” in “processes of cultural reproduction” (2012b: 12). The smallest common denominator uniting these attempts to come to grips with the remake seems to be their tendency to restrict the notion of remaking to intra-medial re-workings of texts. Moreover, these assessments are usually embedded in references to a plethora of other concepts – such as the prequel, sequel, spin-off, series, makeover or adaptation, the homage, parody, pastiche or quotation, or plagiarism and copying – and a discussion of the fuzzy borders between them and the remake proper (e.g.
Moine 2007: 10-12). While all of this is certainly true and may serve as a reminder that remaking is one cultural practice of repetition among others, from which it may or may not be categorically different, it is also rather vague and hence not very helpful.

The critical literature and attempted definitions of remakes are usually restricted to the phenomenon of film remakes of other films – so much so that Leitch has even claimed that “only movies are remade” (2002: 37; also Bourdon 2012: 7). Indeed, re-recordings of songs by new artists, for example, are commonly not labeled remakes, though clearly the result of a practice of remaking. It seems both useful and important, therefore, to distinguish between the noun ‘remake’ as a cinematic category, and the practice of ‘remaking’, which also applies to other media and cultural spheres. This distinction, which we owe to Eckart Voigts, also structures our collection, which includes discussions of phenomena of remaking from beyond the realm of film. Film remaking may be “one of several industrial and cultural activities of repetition (and variation)” (Loock/Verevis 2012b: 2), but there are important differences between these cultural activities – differences which are signaled not only by their different labels, but also by their different status. New productions and performances of a symphony by, say, Beethoven, are usually neither called remakes nor re-adaptations (which they are), nor are they typically accused of being mere copies of previous versions of the same piece. The same is true for ballet and theater productions. Clearly, the different forms of reception and evaluation, and the aura and level of prestige accorded to varying practices of ‘differential repetitions’ have to do with the particular medium and art form in which they materialize and thus can tell us a lot about the history, cultural context, function, and perception of a medium and art form.

Rather than trying to improve upon existing definitions of the remake or offering our own, we would like to complement them by listing what we can reasonably say about film remakes and remaking. For a start, remaking is a pervasive and perennial practice in different media and art forms. This means specifically that as a cultural and industrial practice it precedes and exceeds film – for example, in the 17th and 18th centuries, unlicensed transnational remakes of drama were quite common – and that in the medium of film, it is neither a recent nor intermittent phenomenon. Remakes have been a common feature from the very advent of film-making. In Hollywood, the remake flourished during the Classical Studio era and has never disappeared (Verevis 2006: 96-97); in many film industries beyond Hollywood, too, the remake is an established category which includes re-workings of texts from the same national or cultural back-
ground as well as transnational and transcultural remakes. Film remaking, and remaking in general, can thus also be considered *multi-directional*.

Despite the perennial nature of the process of remaking, the products of this process (and their reception) occur in specific historical, social, institutional, and cultural contexts (Verevis 2006: 101). Remaking thus always implies a *double temporality* of continuity and change, albeit with an emphasis on the latter. For, on the one hand, as Braudy points out, any form of remaking “is a meditation on the continuing historical relevance (economic, cultural, psychological) of a particular narrative” (1998: 331) and can thus have a canon-building effect. Yet, on the other hand, remaking is always more or less *transformative*, it comes in numerous and quite diverse variations, and can be propelled by a *host of different motivations and reasons*. The relationship between ‘premake’ (a term borrowed from Oltmann 2008) and remake is complex and defies simplistic hierarchies between ‘original’ and necessarily derivative ‘copy’. After all, the process of remaking is usually conceived of in terms of translating rather than copying, so that a remake is never completely identical with the text it remakes. Remakes in fact evoke distance, rather than proximity, because of the differences that emerge in the process of remaking (Midding 2012: 29). Even in cases where a film remake seems to follow its model shot-by-shot, such as Gus Van Sant’s notorious *Psycho* or Michael Haneke’s *Funny Games US*, there are always temporal, spatial, ideological, textual or medial variations between remake and premake (which some critics have tried to capture with terms like ‘close’, ‘literal’, or ‘transformative’), just as there are multiple possible motivations for remaking (technological, economic, aesthetic, historical, ideological etc.).

As in other forms of adaptation, remaking can, because of this distance, change the perception of the text or texts that it transforms. Remaking and remakes are *dialogic*. The remake talks back to and thus potentially multiplies the meaning of the ‘original’ (Dusi 2011: 374), and both depend on each other. There is no remake without a text to remake, and the ‘original’ is only conceived as one because another text has, if not copied, then transformed it. Moreover, there is no one ‘original’: as a logical consequence of the transformative nature of remaking, the remake can never draw on only one other text, but unites intertextual influences form a variety of texts, as does the premake. Remaking is a *recursive* practice, leading to a perpetuation of texts that are all mutually interdependent. The relationship between remakes and originals is thus “neither their resemblance nor their dissimilarity but an intense circulation of images, ideas and words in a system of exchange” (Jacqueline Nacache qtd. in Forrest/Koos 2002b: 28).
Taken together, all of this means that unless we regard them merely as a commercial or legal phenomenon, a critical engagement with remakes and remaking is inevitably comparative along a number of different, heterarchical faultlines; it also has to consider a number of different intra-medial, inter-medial, and contextual aspects, such as social, cultural, political, technological, and economical conditions (of premake and remake). This includes audience expectations as well as processes of dissemination and reception.

The case studies collected in this volume shine a light at many facets of the film remake and at practices of remaking in other medial environments. In a first section, three papers by Oliver Lindner, Michael Butter and Johannes Fehrle engage with examples of intracultural film remakes. Oliver Lindner opens the volume with an essay about the 2011 film *Rise of the Planet of the Apes* and about the ways in which the classificatory discourses surrounding the film hint at the instability of the ‘remake’ category. Lindner does not read *Rise of the Planet of the Apes* primarily as a prequel to the original 1968 *Planet of the Apes* film or its 2001 Tim Burton remake, but argues for a classification of the film as a remake of the fourth film in the original Apes saga, *Conquest of the Planet of the Apes* (1972). Updating the thematic scope of the older film to mirror the 21st-century zeitgeist by references to genetic engineering, the ethics of medical research and the decline of the West, *Rise of the Planet of the Apes* has nonetheless the same narrative structure as the older film. Yet, as Lindner shows, the label ‘remake’ was consciously avoided by the studio. Analyzing the prevalent discourse concerning the classification of the film among critics, fans, and in its marketing, Lindner exposes the enduring connotations of unoriginality of the ‘remake’ category. From this discussion, the concept of the remake emerges as “hotly contested terrain”, as Hollywood favoured describing the film as a ‘prequel’ or ‘origin story’ to stress its originality. While the critics’ discourse tended to adopt this usage or opt for the concept of the ‘reboot’, fan websites and private commentaries were apparently more likely to resist the ‘official’ categorisation. The plurality of labels applied to the film, Lindner argues, underlines the instability of cultural texts and categories in general and the category of the remake in particular, as they are shaped by processes of prescription, description and interpretation.

2 The concept of heterarchy is borrowed from social and information sciences. It describes a system of organization in which there is no stable hierarchy of elements but instead a horizontal relation of elements with context- and objective-dependent, temporary, mixed ascendancy.
In contrast to *Rise of the Planet of the Apes*, the film at the centre of Michael Butter’s essay explicitly signals its status as a remake in its title. Butter presents a comparative reading of John Frankenheimer’s 1962 film *The Manchurian Candidate* and Jonathan Demme’s 2004 film of the same name to argue that Demme’s film is an update that conserves the basic plot structure and character constellation of the earlier film while adjusting them to fit a 21st-century context. The thematic focus has changed from Communism to the War on Terror, transnational capitalism and intense media critique. A detailed reading of the films in the context of important ideological discourses of their times of origin moreover reveals that while Frankenheimer’s film presented the conspiracy at the heart of the plot as a mostly external threat, the enemy in Demme’s film is presented as predominantly internal. In addition, the remake re-works the presentation of the link between conspiracy and femininity of the earlier film and racializes the brainwashing scheme at the center of the plot so that in the later version “brainwashing and bioengineering is performed by white scientists on predominantly black soldiers”. Eventually, Butter argues, both films nonetheless affirm traditional notions of the self, since the threat of being controlled by a dangerous Other is overcome by inner-directed agency.

Johannes Fehrle’s essay compares Delmer Daves’s 1957 film *3:10 to Yuma* with its 2007 remake by James Mangold. The essay’s basic premise is that when the two versions are read against each other, they highlight one of the sources of insight of adaptation and remake studies: they provide an example of the shift in cultural discourses, in this case about gender roles. Fehrle argues that one of the central challenges and changes of the remake of *3:10 to Yuma* is its different interpretation of concepts of masculinity. While Delmer Daves’s premake addresses and narratively solves issues of a perceived crisis of masculinity in a 1950s American climate by restoring the patriarchal order, the remake provides enough breaking points to allow for a double reading which reflects a plurality of various gender concepts in the early 21st century. It includes both a slightly updated reiteration of the premake’s reinstatement of a hegemonic masculinity, and, for the more skeptical parts of contemporary audiences, reveals the breaking points in this ideal of masculinity. Thus, the two film versions can then be read to answer a question customarily identified as a key interest of remake studies, the shifting cultural work of texts.

While this shift is also at the center of the contributions by Martin Lüthe and Lucia Krämer, which form the second section of the volume, they engage with examples of transcultural rather than intracultural remaking practices. In her essay about Indian remakes of Western films, Krämer begins with the observation that in connection with Hindi films, the fact that filmmakers re-work storylines
from other films and film industries – and the fact that these sources usually remain unacknowledged – are often presented as typical of the Mumbai film industry, which thereby emerges as derivative, unoriginal and parasitical. In fact, she notes, the term ‘Bollywood’, which is often used as a synonym for the Hindi film industry or, more generally, popular Indian cinema, has been interpreted by some to express just this derivativeness. As Krämer points out, however, not all remaking in the Hindi film industry is illicit. It is a regular practice to remake older Hindi films, for example, and it is also common for successful films that were originally produced in South India to be remade in Hindi with local film stars. The crucial difference is, she continues, that whereas Indian sources of remakes are generally acknowledged, foreign sources usually are not. In her essay, Krämer first suggests some additions and modifications to the list of ‘Indianization’ strategies that critics have identified in transcultural Indian remakes, before going on to outline the institutional background of unofficial remaking in Bollywood and to discuss its textual and conceptual implications for the notion of the (transcultural) film remake. The essay reminds us that specific practices in film industries beyond Hollywood and Europe may question unspoken assumptions of the alleged ‘norms’ of remakes and remaking.

Lüthe’s essay brings together the two spheres of adaptation and globalization in his reading of Martin Scorsese’s The Departed as a remake of the 2002 film Infernal Affairs directed by Wai-Keung Lau and Alan Mak. He argues that one of the central topoi of The Departed – a schizophrenic threat to identity – is inscribed in its very own formal relationship with its central ‘source material’, the 2002 Hong Kong movie Infernal Affairs: while The Departed represents a serious effort to remain faithful to its source on the one hand – by deploying extensive verbal, visual, and general cinematographic citations – the film also illustrates an eagerness to leave behind the original Hong Kong film according to the logic of its spatial, and cultural, re-contextualization. Lüthe traces this sense of fragmentation and dislocation both on the level of the remake’s narrative as well as on the structural level (of the form of the remake), further arguing that this remake can as much be read as being about the act of global cultural remaking as about the more conventional and intuitive themes emerging from the movie plot, such as the standard ‘organized-crime-vs.-the-police’ narrative, the audiovisual logic and aesthetics of the movie, or its central characters representing (the will to do) good and evil in the world.

The third and last section of the volume brings together four essays that extend the focus to inter-medial remaking practices. Till Kinzel opens this section with a piece that advocates the concept of re-adaptation to conceptualize the textual webs spun around texts that are adapted and/or remade particularly frequent-
ly. Using the example of Charles Dickens’s classic *Oliver Twist* Kinzel focuses on the TV miniseries version of the story scripted by Alan Bleasdale (ITV 1999) and David Lean’s film version from 1948 to discuss how their narrative structures and their representation of ‘the Jew’ Fagin illustrate the manifold textual and medial influences shaping each new re-working of the text. Audiovisual versions of the story are always both (inter-medial) adaptations of the novel and its illustrations as well as (intra-medial) remakes of earlier screen versions, and the creativity set free by working within such a textual cosmos, Kinzel argues, means that there can never be a ‘definitive version’ of “masterplots” (Abbott 2002: 42) such as *Oliver Twist*.

In her essay about dance versions of *Romeo and Juliet*, Maria Marcsek-Fuchs further investigates the concept of (re-)adaptation, this time in relation to ballet. Marcsek-Fuchs applies the perspectives of (intra-medial) ‘remaking’ and (inter-medial) ‘adapting’ to a chain of texts ranging from Shakespeare’s tragedy and Prokofiev’s score to a series of 20th- and 21st-century choreographies by Leonid Lavrovsky, John Cranko, Sir John MacMillan, John Neumeier, Rudolf Nureyev, Matthew Bourne and Mark Morris. She thereby demonstrates the symbiotic and “palimpsestuous” (Hutcheon 2006: 6) relationship between the practices of (re-)adaptation and remaking that result in versions ranging from classical ballet to contemporary dance which apparently share specific ‘originals’ (foremost Shakespeare’s text and Prokofiev’s score), but which ultimately also constitute a dense web of both intra- and inter-medial allusions, citations and ‘re-writings’, as suggested by Robert Stam’s concept of the ‘cumulative hypotext’ (qtd. in Verevis 2006: 83). Ultimately, Marcsek-Fuchs’s approach to the *Romeo and Juliet* dance versions via the prism of remaking allows her to draw various more general conclusions. She draws a distinction between implicit and explicit processes of remaking and advocates the suitability of the approach to both entire works and parts thereof. Most important, her study of dance remakings “problematises the concepts of ‘adaptation’ and ‘remaking’ as two interdependent phenomena, as dance remakings rely on both the medium’s kinetic intra-mediality and its cultural adaptation processes”.

Sabine N. Meyer’s essay proposes that *Avatar* is in fact a remake of *Dances with Wolves*. The starting point of her investigation is the exact relation between premake and remake, i.e. the interplay between similarity and difference. Meyer argues that *Avatar* both confirms, as well as questions, *Dances with Wolves*. She then investigates both similarities and differences between the movies with respect to plot, character constellations, cinematic styles, and the employment of stereotypes and myths. According to her analysis, both films position themselves strongly against U.S.-American imperialism and environmental degradation and
purport to present positive images of indigenous peoples. While doing so, however, they perpetuate long-held stereotypes and myths that, in the final analysis, run counter to their alleged revisionism. The most significant difference between the two movies can be located in their respective conceptualizations of the future. With its optimistic and future-oriented outlook and its emphasis on indigenous survival and pantribal collaboration, Avatar significantly modifies its premake. This modification, however, Meyer argues, does not suffice to categorize Avatar as a re-reading of Dances with Wolves with the aim to subvert the latter. Finally, its situatedness between repetition and difference leads Meyer to an evaluation of indigenous responses to Avatar with a focus on indigenous rights activism. She concludes that the ‘Avatar activism’ of indigenous groups and environmental activists around the world remakes Cameron’s movie and endows it post hoc with a degree of political vision it never had. Her essay thus implicitly extends the notion of remaking to forms of cultural appropriation such as political activism.

The volume closes with an essay by Martin Butler that addresses yet another media sphere: Web 2.0 environments. Butler debates the implications of the forms of expression made possible by Web 2.0 contexts for the theorization of forms of ‘making’ and ‘remaking’. His discussion focuses on the example of Star Wars Uncut: A New Hope, an online movie project in which amateur fans recreated 15-second snippets of the original film, which were then re-combined into a remake of Star Wars: A New Hope that is held together by the original soundtrack but mixes a variety of film techniques. Aesthetically, the project illustrates the affinity to mash-ups of remaking processes in Web 2.0 environments. Concerning the ethics of the project, this aesthetics arguably translates into a celebration of creative diversity, amateurism and notions of autonomy and self-expression. While constituting a “web-based archive of media technologies in the very shape of a movie”, Star Wars Uncut: A New Hope thus also contains an implicit political momentum by supporting romantic readings of the democratizing potential of participatory culture, especially, as Butler argues, when it is viewed in relation to Lucasfilm’s attempts at regulating Star Wars fan activity. Going further, Butler suggests that, since participatory environments encourage communal forms of expression in which original individual expression is subsumed in a larger project of collective creation, they may be considered as spaces where remaking is revived “as the modus operandi in cultural production and cultural memory formation” and thus far exceed the notion of remaking generally associated with the film remake as industrial category.