CASTING A GIANT SHADOW

The Transnational Shaping of Israeli Cinema

Edited by

RACHEL S. HARRIS *and* DAN CHYUTIN

ISRAELI CINEMA BEYOND THE NATIONAL

An Introduction

Rachel S. Harris

Dan Chyutin

> I had first heard of the Land of Israel in 1925 and, at once, I realized the importance of letting the world know the special timbre of the country, its unique scenery and quality. . . . The solution, in my opinion, was the production of films and I at once got in touch with various companies in that field. It was my intention to establish an independent film center in the Jewish territory of Palestine.[1]

Margot Klausner's first foray into the film industry was with *Land of Promise* (1933), a propaganda documentary she co-funded that represented not only the Jewish settlement in Mandatory Palestine but also the historic and religious diversity of the country. While aiming to capture an authentic view of local realities, the film was conceived from the outset as catering to international audience's tastes. The internalization of these transnational concerns for both Jewish audiences who could be motivated to contribute to the Zionist projects and world audiences who could be made sympathetic to Jewish causes, particularly the desire for a national homeland in Palestine, shaped both the production and reception of *Land of Promise*. As Klausner discusses in her memoir, *The Dream Industry*, the realization of this film depended upon support from multiple institutional actors, investors, and artists. Her first documentary was only made possible because of the interest shown by the European Zionist Congress, who had learned of the enthusiasm of Leo Hermann, the general secretary of the Israeli fundraising organization Keren Hayesod, toward such a project. As the head of the official Zionist fundraising body, he had no film experience but understood that propaganda might serve fundraising purposes. Spurred by the

enthusiasm of his sister Emily, he worked with the American company the Fox Film Corporation, which was interested in making three sixty-minute information films about the region. In the process of becoming 20th Century Fox, the studio was willing to send technicians—"a chief cameraman and a sound technician, with the recording system, as well as an assistant photographer with camera"[2]—on condition that they would be provided with a local director, suitable script, production director, and local financing in Palestine. Klausner, who put up a sizable portion of the initial funds, accompanied the documentary to the Venice Biennale in 1935, where it won the competition. But she was not there to receive the award, having already left to screen her film to Jewish philanthropists elsewhere in Europe.

Fifteen years later, as the new State of Israel was coming into being, Klausner founded its first film studio, the Israel Motion Picture Studios in Herzliya, and went on to serve as its chair and director until shortly before her death. The studio relied on the technical and artistic know-how of international filmmakers, cameramen, editors, and technicians and the purchase of equipment and film stock from abroad in order to be able to develop a local film industry. Yet its transnational nature did not stop there but rather extended to a vision that saw film as a medium for representing the Zionist vision abroad. Her aspirations are inscribed on the studio's cornerstone: "It is the aim of the founders of these Studios to draw the attention of the nations towards our way of life in Israel through the aid of movies, an art which has such a great influence in the world and reaches into all countries; to disclose to all peoples throughout the generations our spiritual and social ideas; to lead them to understand the history of Israel since the time we became a nation until this very day."[3]

This vision of an Israeli cinema placed an emphasis on its Israeliness, on the ways in which its importance lies in the ability to render visible the way of life in Israel; its realization, however, was not predicated on isolating Israel or its filmmaking from the rest of the world. In Klausner's eyes, cinema was firmly grounded in its national borders while simultaneously transcending those borders, functioning in a transnational sphere of operation and intelligibility. In this she was no different than many other players within the history of Israeli filmmaking, though at times nationalizing tendencies within the industry and culture caused one side of the dual vision to be highlighted over the other. Yet, as Klausner discovered, a tension remains between the marketing of Israel on a foreign screen and the international influences that have shaped the industry at home.

Eighty years after the international release of *Land of Promise*, the newly anointed Israeli minister of culture and sport, Miri Regev, announced a new state-sponsored, film-related initiative: the inauguration of a pavilion dedicated to Israeli cinema as part of the Village International of the 2015 Cannes Film Festival. The pavilion at Cannes, whose construction was budgeted at one million new Israeli shekels (NIS), ultimately served to showcase recent Israeli films as well as promote national film funds, film festivals, film schools, cinematheques, and filmmakers. Particular attention was given to facets of Israeli cinema that often go unnoticed—animation filmmaking, for example, as well as nationally produced technological innovations (Virtual Reality [VR] glasses, 360-degree cameras, etc.).[4] While such measures highlighted diversity, their positioning within the pavilion nevertheless submitted them to Regev's message of overarching unity—of Israeli filmmaking as "a source of national pride." Above all else, the success of the initiative seemed bound by its ability to make Israelis feel "proud of the fact that for the first time Israel's flag will fly over its national pavilion at one of the most important film events in the world."[5] To further bolster national pride, Regev also decided to time the inauguration of the pavilion with Israel's Independence Day.

Regev's comments showed clear awareness of the transnational setting in which the pavilion operates ("the Village"), as well as the festival's objectives of transnational marketing and cooperation. As opposed to Klausner, however, Regev promoted a vision and rhetoric that were nationalistic and invested in containing this pavilion and the cinema it was representing under the national heading of Israel.[6] A clear continuation of the government's ultranationalist right-wing message, this stance was critiqued by filmmakers and film reviewers from the opposite side of the political fence, who rightfully saw this as yet another state-operated attempt to circumvent the avowed pluralistic and antinationalist tendencies of Israel's leftist cultural elite.[7] Yet in spite of their opposition, what such commentators shared with Regev was a similar understanding of Israeli cinema as primarily meaningful in the context of an internal dialogue around the national shaping of Israel. Under these conditions, Israeli cinema's participation in a global dialogue and its transnational shaping as a whole were rendered insignificant.

Yet the very desire to showcase Israel at Cannes evokes Klausner's understanding of Israeli films' persistent transnationalism. Situating the case of Israel within a larger conversation about the global nature of cinema and its multidirectional shaping, this book draws its focus from Alan Williams's

notion of "cinematic 'international relations.'" For "if we grant that national cinemas exist, no matter how problematic it is to define them or specify what they 'do' for a nation, then they will necessarily not be defined, or act, in isolation."[8] Our aim is thus to offer a study that considers a multitude of ways in which these transnational connections serve to shape a local industry, ultimately influencing its perception both at home and abroad.

* * *

Film came to Ottoman-ruled Palestine (referred to in Hebrew as Eretz Israel) not long after the birth of the medium. Following their celebrated screening at the Salon Indien du Grand Café in Paris, the Lumière brothers, Auguste and Louis, sent their agents to capture views in Jerusalem, Jaffa, and Bethlehem. They focused primarily on sites of importance to Christianity and on historical traces of Napoleon's Middle Eastern campaigns. While such efforts were followed by others interested in capturing a region significant for its historical and theological relationship to Europe, they themselves did not inform the emergence of a local film industry. This only came into being later, with the growth of the Jewish settlement in Palestine (the *Yishuv*) in the 1920s. Yishuv filmmaking "closely paralleled the evolution of Zionist activity, and on one level constituted an extension of that activity, thus establishing a basically harmonious extension between film pioneers and Zionist pioneers."[9] In this capacity, filmmakers

> sought to present the human drama as part of the national drama. Generally speaking, the figure of the "New Jew" is shown to be a heroic figure that triumphs all the challenges presented to him. He is deprived of almost all personal emotions and his yearnings are directed towards the deliverance of the homeland and making the barren soil bloom. In their filmmaking they created a coherent visual terminology. On the one hand, they used single images or a small series of images that glorified the heroic pioneer—shooting from unconventional angles that made the object appear stronger, offering unconventional positionings of the object, frame cuts, etc. On the other hand, they preferred the "presentation" of reality to be intelligible, distinct, easy to understand, with a simple message that provided an interpretive frame which grounds the image in concrete meaning.[10]

To the extent that these films were focused on "the construction and articulation of the evolving national identity," this identity and its articulation were influenced not only by local but also global factors. The state of flux that typified the Zionist Jewish community during this early period of development allowed it to be open to outside influences even as it attempted

to close ranks around "a shared lifestyle for all its members." Accordingly, this community found itself easily influenced by the "societal and cultural systems with which it was in contact, including those of its neighbouring countries; its population's countries of origin; and countries with developed national film production that meaningfully intersected with [Palestine]—the British cinema system, which was an integral part of the dominating force in these territories during 1917–1948, and the American film system, which has unquestioningly dominated world cinema since the 1930s."[11] Such openness to the transnational manifested itself, among other things, in the fact that many of these films were shaped and mobilized by the desire "to stir Jews in the *Diaspora* to join the efforts of construction and national revival in Palestine."[12] Their creators often received training in Europe and explicitly attempted to create a local vernacular of the styles prevalent there. For example, in his direction of the Palestine-based Zionist film *Avodah* (1935), the German Helmar Lerski combined two sources of influence—the Soviet films of Sergei Eisenstein and Dziga Vertov and the Expressionist techniques of UFA, where he worked in the 1920s.[13] At times, such creators were not immigrants to Palestine but experts contracted to work on a single project, and as such, their take on the Zionist project of Israeli particularity was refracted through their "foreign" sensibilities.[14]

After the foundation of Israel in 1948, the Zionist state hegemony was faced with the challenges of expanding its nationalizing project so as to encompass a growing population of recent immigrants, most of whom were either displaced persons victimized in the Holocaust or immigrants from the Middle East. The filmmaking during this period, itself heavily reliant on the state's approbation for its existence, reflected this concern through its dominant genre—the so-called heroic-nationalist film, essentially a magnification of the cinematic articulation of the national present in the Yishuv cinema. Even as this genre worked at "'socializing' new immigrants at home" into becoming true "Israelis"[15]—like the Sabra, the indigenous Hebrew native who is enmeshed with the Israeli landscape—its framing of *Israeli* particularly remained profoundly transnational. The heroic-nationalist films "encapsulated the nationalist ethos of survival and cohesiveness."[16] Yet their form was pervasively "foreign," especially in terms of adapting the aesthetics, themes, and iconography of Soviet montage on the one hand and the popular Hollywood genres of the domestic melodrama, the war film, and the Western on the other.[17] These influences were again imported by mostly US- and European-trained filmmakers who either immigrated to

Israel or were hired for locally produced projects, including Thorold Dickinson, Larry Frisch, Meyer Levin, Joseph Leits, Joseph Krumgold, Shlomo Soriano, and Peter Frye. Their efforts fashioned the national ethos as both *Israeli*, in the sense of grounded in the local, and *Westernized*,[18] in the sense of reaching toward broader, transnational spheres.

The relationship of the state leadership to cinema during the pre-state and early statehood periods was marked by "double standards."[19] Despairing that cinema would corrupt the moral fiber of the country, Israel's first prime minister, David Ben-Gurion, was loath to offer government support, and thus the few films that appeared during the late 1940s and 1950s were made with private money. Yet Ben-Gurion was also aware of the potential benefits of building financial and cultural ties with foreign film industries and often made it possible for important transactions to occur in the transnational sphere. A look at the relationship with American producers and distributors render this ambivalence particularly evident. In 1949, for example, the fledgling government signed a lucrative theater-building contract with 20th Century Fox head Spyros Skouras following his successful visit to Israel. Yet this deal was foiled by protectionist government policies that raised import taxes on Hollywood films in the early 1950s—measures that ultimately forced American companies to keep their films in Israeli customs rather than release them to local audiences. At the same time, allowances were given to non-Israeli producers to use Israeli territories as locations for their films, including ones that dealt specifically with Israel's narrative of statehood. The most notable of this latter group was the 1960 Hollywood epic *Exodus*, which received substantial support from the government. The global success of Otto Preminger's film, as well as other like-minded Hollywood productions, such as *Cast a Giant Shadow* (1966) and *Judith* (1966), subsequently made it inevitable for the Zionist leadership to invest more funds in local filmmaking. Concurrently, many Israeli filmmakers found in these big-budget productions a source for continued artistic inspiration.[20]

In fashioning national policies regarding cinema, the Zionist hegemony was less influenced by the desires of the indigenous industry as by the demands of its indigenous audience. The proliferation of movie theaters in Palestine during the British Mandate and their equal popularity throughout Europe and the Middle East meant that both old-timers and new immigrants flocked to the silver screen. Following the establishment of the state, venues appeared throughout the country. By the 1950s and 1960s,

moviegoing became the most popular form of entertainment in Israel. Along with commercial cinemas, the general trade union (the Histadrut, affiliated with the ruling party Mapai) arranged makeshift screenings with a mobile cinema in kibbutz dining halls, transit camps, and settlements, while the army provided films for soldiers and civilians in newly occupied regions such as the southern city of Eilat.[21] Audiences cultivated viewing expectations and developed a taste for escapist fantasies, which the fledgling local industry was too small to satiate. Instead, more than 80 percent of films were imported from Hollywood, while the rest came from Europe, Russia, and the Middle East. The need to import foreign films to serve audiences' demands disturbed critics, who eschewed the lowbrow content, fearing that the foreign imports were not instilling the correct values and attitudes nor serving as educational material to assimilate the populace into Hebrew culture.[22] Yet despite criticism, cinemas were filled and demand remained high; cheaper and more approachable than theater, opera, and musical concerts and without competition from television that would not arrive formally in Israel until 1968, cinema was an easily accessible luxury in a time of otherwise austerity. As such, it disrupted attempts at homogenization by reinforcing sociocultural networks that preexisted citizens' immigration. Moreover, its mass dispersal undermined efforts to shape the populations' viewing patterns. At a period when the establishment was deeply invested in the development and institutionalization of Israeli cultural forms, the filmic medium spilled over Israel's borders.

Contemporaneous Israeli audiences cared little for highbrow, mainly European content and avoided or walked out of films they did not enjoy—calling loudly for their money back. Generally speaking, they wanted to watch popular genres whose plot could be easily discernible even without familiarity with the language on screen or the language of the Hebrew subtitles projected alongside (though not necessarily in sync with the dialogue). In addition, they developed their interest further by following the lives of the stars through the news and in particular through the pages of weekly film magazines *Kolnoa* (*Cinema*) and *Olam Hakolnoa* (*World of Cinema*).[23] The increased investment of government funds led not only to a substantial growth in the industry during the 1960s but also allowed it to compete with the mass appeal of imported popular entertainment films. At the forefront of this effort were the so-called Bourekas films, formulaic comedies and melodramas that often focused on the culture and lifestyles of Israeli Jews of Middle Eastern geographical origin (Mizrahim). Positioning

itself against the didactic content of Zionist propaganda films, this genre was seen as fragmenting the prominent melting-pot ideology and replacing it with a more pluralistic and multicultural vision of Israeli nationhood. As such, it drew its inspiration primarily from diasporic traditions that were otherwise repressed through Zionism's project of homogenous Israeliness.

One obvious source of influence was Middle Eastern popular cinematic traditions. From 1948 until the early 1970s, approximately nine hundred thousand Jews immigrated to Israel from Muslim majority lands. Their language, music, and culture were frequently disparaged by the Jewish European (Ashkenazi) cultural elite and marginalized on the public radio stations that made up Israel's national offerings. Moreover, the Censorship Committee had ruled that Arabic films (which were not subtitled) could only be shown at the cinemas in Arab towns.[24] Nevertheless, along with the local residents, Mizrahi Jews would frequent these cinemas in order to see the mainly Egyptian offerings. Thus, these immigrants maintained their transnational cultural connections, even as the Israeli establishment attempted to assimilate them into a Hebrewist melting pot. This particular transnationalism rarely translated itself into local filmmaking practices during Israeli cinema's period of high Zionist art.[25] Only with the arrival of Bourekas films were filmmakers able to make such influences more noticeable and put them to use in fostering a stronger bond with the local audiences of Middle Eastern descent. Of these, two filmmakers stand out as particularly transnational: George Ovadia, who worked in the Iranian film industry before immigrating, and transported the staples of that cinema into his Israeli melodramas, and Ze'ev Revach, the Moroccan-born actor and director whose work was influenced by the filmic idioms of Arabic—and in particular Egyptian—comedies.[26]

Importantly, though such texts often centered on Mizrahi Jews, with only a few exceptions, their directors were often Ashkenazi. Hence, in shaping their narratives, these filmmakers also brought to bear non–Middle Eastern influences, most notably classic Eastern European Yiddish literature. The status of Yiddish culture in Israeli-Zionist discourse was "complicated from the beginning. On the one hand, the 'negation of the diaspora' ideology . . . and the westernization project of the Ashkenazi Israeli elites . . . worked to oppress Yiddish culture. State cultural institutions defined Yiddish as exilic and anachronistic, and pushed it to the margins. On the other hand, Yiddish culture played a hidden yet vital role in structuring the Hebrew identity of the Zionist Ashkenazi elites in Israel . . . and therefore

appears to have survived underneath the surface of official cultural discourse."[27] The Bourekas films came into being during a period when the ideological controls of Zionism loosened and as such were able to bring Yiddish culture to the surface. Ashkenazi directors

> used them—and offered them for the use of their peers from the Zionist-Ashkenazi elites—in three basic ways: first, the Bourekas films were means through which said elites were able to secretly partake in the Yiddish culture they once spurned; second, Bourekas films helped these elites to assuage the oedipal guilt around abandoning Yiddish culture . . . ; and third, the films were a way of reaffirming their desired identity as European Israelis. In this way Hebrew-Zionists, gained a form of legitimization that was a direct by-product of displacing the unwanted Jewish-diasporic pre-modern identity of traditional Ashkenazi Jewry from the *shtetl* (Jewish rural communities in Eastern Europe) onto a Mizrahi community.[28]

The first and paradigmatic Bourekas film, *Sallah* (1964), was an unprecedented box office success and was viewed by almost the entirety of Israel's population at the time.[29] Concurrently, it ushered in a new era of international successes to Israeli cinema, earning two Golden Globes and receiving an Academy Award nomination for Best Foreign Language Film. In subsequent years, a new enthusiasm for Israeli drama and comedy would grow outside of Israel, in no small part due to subsequent endeavors by *Sallah*'s filmmakers—director Ephraim Kishon, whose films *The Big Dig* (1969) and *The Policeman* (1971) were both nominated for a Best Foreign Film Golden Globe, with the latter winning the award in 1972, and producer Menahem Golan, who directed the Academy Award–nominated *Operation Thunderbolt* (1977) and became a key figure in the transnationalization of Israeli film production. Their efforts opened the way for other young filmmakers to achieve recognition on the global stage, though usually not in the popular genres in which they generally operated as directors—for example, Moshe Mizrahi, whose Israeli dramas *I Love You, Rosa* (1972) and *The House on Chelouche Street* (1973) were nominated for Academy Awards.[30] *Sallah*'s lead actor, Haim Topol, also managed to capitalize on his Golden Globe–winning performance and embark on an international career, which included an Academy Award–nomination and second Golden Globe for his performance as Tevye in the 1971 Hollywood classic *Fiddler on the Roof*. While being the most successful, he was not the only Israeli actor to break out on the world stage around this time. Other examples include Haya Harareet, the first international movie star from Israel,[31] who launched her

career with *Hill 24 Doesn't Answer* (1954) and became known worldwide for her turn as Esther in *Ben Hur* (1959); Ziva Rodann, who played minor roles in *Forty Guns* (1957) and *Last Train from Gun Hill* (1959); Miss Universe competitor Aliza Gur, who acted in *From Russia with Love* (1962) and a host of American television shows; and Daliah Lavi, who was featured in *Two Weeks in Another Town* (1962), *Lord Jim* (1964), *The Silencers* (1966), *Casino Royal* (1967), and *Catlow* (1971), in addition to developing a very successful singing career in Germany.

Parallel to the continued-yet-weakened presence of heroic-nationalist war films and the meteoric rise of the Bourekas genre was an attempt to create highbrow Israeli cinema that would rival the contemporaneous achievements of modernist European filmmaking. Awareness of these achievements in Israel was fostered early on by critic and filmmaker David Greenberg, who in the years 1957–1963 published *Omanut Hakolnoa* (*Art of Cinema*), a limited-distribution journal featuring translated articles from *Sight and Sound*, *Film and Filming*, and *Cahiers du Cinéma*. Added to this was a fledgling network of cine-clubs,[32] where Greenberg and other film critics "gave lectures with information about Antonioni, Fellini, Bergman, Godard, and Truffaut . . . so as to broaden the horizons of local cinephiles."[33] This enthusiasm for European art cinema in Israel of the 1950s and 1960s, according to Judd Ne'eman, served "a historical desire" for its predominantly Ashkenazi audience; much more than with the Bourekas genre, it "reflected a yearning for the Jewish life and culture that had existed in prewar Europe and perished in the Holocaust. For many years this yearning was repressed by the Zionist ideological negation of the Diaspora [Shlilath Hagola]. Via the New Wave cinemas of Germany, Poland, and Hungary—countries imbued with anti-Semitic sentiments—the new generation of Ashkenazi Jews in Israel, who had originated in those countries, anchored themselves anew to the European Jewish life that had ceased to exist."[34]

This matrix of desire, combined with disgust at the contemporary state of Israeli filmmaking, pushed a number of young (Ashkenazi) filmmakers during the 1960s to take up European art cinema as their primary source of inspiration. All of them spent time in Paris during the rise of the French New Wave, and some also attended film schools outside of Israel (Avraham Hefner and Dan Wolman in New York, Boaz Davidson and Yigal Burstein in London).[35] Upon their return, they began drawing on these influences to create a new kind of indigenous cinema—one committed "to institute in society the freedom of artistic creation, and to disengage the arts and

the artists from the political elite."[36] The resulting films, retrospectively grouped under the title *New Sensibility*, shied away from Zionist cinema's preoccupation with the national, especially in the epic context of war. Instead they focused on the existential crises of the individual, set to the background of Israel's urban centers. Additionally, rather than be bound by the staples of Zionist-nationalist iconography, these films foregrounded their transnational aesthetics, often through overt references to European (and predominantly French) films of the period. Together, such operations "created an image, often artificial, of Israel as a Western modernized state"[37]—a vision that often signaled an escape, not only to the past of pre-state Diaspora but to a potential future where Israel would become truly transnational (under a European banner). This vision, however, failed to garner audience support; certain notable achievements notwithstanding.[38] The international festival circuit did not welcome the New Sensibility films as much as it did other New Waves, perhaps judging the former to be too derivative, and domestically these works suffered box office failures, even after being hailed as artistic triumphs by the local press.

As much as these filmmakers courted European cinema culture, they shied away from participating in European Israeli coproductions, which were experiencing a surge during the 1960s and 1970s. The majority of coproductions were done with France, while others were made with the help of German, Italian, and British producers. These films often relied on Israeli studios for logistical infrastructure and incorporated Israeli film personnel at key positions. Yet their principal creators were by and large European. These filmmakers were primarily attracted to "cinematic ideas based on Israel's history and actuality."[39] Among such cinematic ideas, one can include the struggles of Zionist settlement and combat (*Give Me Ten Desperate Men*, France, 1961; *Bomb at Midnight*, France, 1965; *The Death of a Jew*, France, 1969; *Five Days in Sinai*, Italy, 1969; and *Stranger in Jericho* [also *The Death Merchants*], Germany, 1975), the impact of the Holocaust (*The Glass Cage*, France, 1965; *The Hour of Truth*, France, 1965; *The Customer of the Off Season*, France, 1970; *The Pedestrian*, Germany, 1973; and *Korczak and the Children* [also *The Martyr*], Germany, 1975), and biblical tales (*Wife of Er*, Italy, 1972; and *Rachel's Man*, UK, 1975). Though at times sporting casts of familiar international actors (for example, Richard Harris, Karlheinz Boehm, Jason Robards Jr., Maximilian Schell, Claude Riche, and Hardy Kruger), these coproductions were often financial flops both inside and outside of Israel, arguably because they were helmed by second-tier directors.[40]

By the end of the 1970s, the Israeli film industry was not only attracting international filmmakers but also exporting its own filmmaking talent internationally. A key figure in this development was Menahem Golan. From early on in his career, Golan, who studied film in the United States and interned with famed B-movie mogul Roger Corman, did not want to limit himself to the narrow boundaries of national film production and viewership. Together with his cousin Yoram Globus, he formed a distribution company (Noah Films) so as to give his products wider transnational exposure. His newfound experiences in global marketing made him aware of the possible limitations of distributing distinctly Israeli films. Though he continued to direct and produce such works and also professed the potential global profitability of such products (a position legitimized through the international successes of many of his productions), Golan gradually began to experiment with making "films according to an 'international' script."[41] The results included star-studded productions set in Israel—for example, *Operation Cairo* (also *Trunk to Cairo*, 1965) with Audie Murphy and George Sanders and *Diamonds* (1975) with Robert Shaw and Richard Roundtree. They also reflected a move to an international non-Hebrewist model—for example, *Escape to the Sun* (1973) with Laurence Harvey and Geraldine Chaplin and *Lepke* (1975) with Tony Curtis, both of which were shot in English. Israeli spectators "were reserved in their reaction to these films,"[42] possibly because it seemed as if they were not their preferred target audience. Yet these productions made enough money internationally to "open up the gates of global success" for Golan and allow him to transfer much of his operation overseas.[43]

This process culminated in Golan and Globus taking over the American production/distribution company Cannon Film in 1979 and establishing it as a force to be reckoned with. At the same time, they maintained their connections to the Israeli film industry, and even their internationally made films continued to display thematic influences that can be identified as Israeli but would go on to become important in the emergence of new styles within the United States and Europe. As Ella Shohat explains, Cannon "showed continued interest in the heroic-nationalist genre, but this time transposed into North American superpatriotic films such as *Delta Force* and *Cobra*, gratifying the desire for an American heroic image suitable to the Age of Reagan."[44] Logistically, rather than follow the trend of big-budget blockbusters that typified Hollywood operations after the success of *Star Wars* (1977), Golan and Globus focused on high-volume,

low-cost production. This allowed them to sustain the business model that informed their operation in Israel: on the one hand, invest heavily in popular genre films, and on the other hand, use profits to fund a small number of artistically ambitious projects. As a result of this policy, Cannon's offerings were remarkably eclectic, combining B-movies in a variety of formats (ninja films, dance films, raunchy comedies, musicals, sci-fi fantasies) with highbrow creations by well-known filmmakers such as John Cassavetes (*Love Streams*, 1983), Lina Wertmuller (*Camorra*, 1986), Jean-Luc Godard (*King Lear*, 1987), Franco Zeffirelli (*Otello*, 1986), and Robert Altman (*Fool for Love*, 1985). Moreover, several of Cannon's more "international" productions—for example, *The Ambassador* (1984) and *The Delta Force* (1986)—were executed in Israel, and the producers also continued to invest in films made by local filmmakers not under their company's banner. Yet their greatest impact on the Israeli film industry resulted from inviting Israeli filmmakers to work with them in Los Angeles. Several of those who moved to the United States during the company's heyday in the 1980s—for example, Boaz Davidson, Avi Lerner, and Danny Dimburt—continued to maintain successful Hollywood careers years after Cannon Group fell into bankruptcy (1990) and its heads returned to Israel.

While Golan and Globus were making a name for themselves and other Israeli producers like Arnon Milchen and Avi Arad were taking their first steps in American filmmaking,[45] the Israeli film industry was going through a major transition. The Yom Kippur War (1973), which caught Israel by surprise and confronted it with the threat of annihilation as well as the rise to power of the right-wing Likud Party after thirty years of left-wing governments (1977), radicalized the political stance of many members of the local film industry's liberal ranks. Disillusioned with the path Israeli Zionism was taking, these filmmakers undertook a "vigorous revision of mainstream ideologies" through the symbolic sites that most connote them: the army, the kibbutz, the pioneer group.[46] They challenged the boundaries of the national Zionist ethos by reclaiming those figures that were excluded from it—mainly Holocaust survivors, homosexuals, and Palestinian Arabs. Particular emphasis was given to interrogating the injustices performed by the Israeli government and the Israeli Defense Forces (IDF) in the Occupied Territories—the so-called Palestinian Wave cinema—in an attempt to challenge the prevailing political climate. Rather than push toward change, however, these films usually evoked indifference, if not downright indignation, among Israeli audiences.

To the extent that these filmmakers were dealing with particular national problems and discourses, they were also professing their commitment to transnational trends within European art cinema and 1970s New Hollywood. Importantly, several of them were key figures in the Europeanized New Sensibility movement, while others were newcomers who came under the sway of new-wave European and American filmmaking as part of their studies abroad and in the newly established Film and Television Department at Tel Aviv University.[47] They wanted to create "quality cinema" in the European tradition and in this sense mimicked its turn toward political radicalism since the late 1960s (as is evident in the works of Jean-Luc Godard, Costa Gavras, Alexander Kluge, and Gillo Pontecorvo, among others).[48] Yet they also did not wish to condemn their films to the unpopularity of previous attempts at Israeli modernist cinema, so, much like filmmakers Martin Scorsese, Robert Altman, and Arthur Penn, they mixed ingredients from European art cinema "with features of the American repertoire—coherent, dynamic, and absorbing plots, as well as known generic patterns."[49] According to Nurith Gertz, "The measure of prevalence given to European ingredients in these films dictated their fate. Films whose makers were intelligent enough to combine characteristics of European and American filmmaking, or use American models that incorporated ingredients from European cinema to begin with, were the main strand in the system and some actually enjoyed wide distribution. Films which relied solely on European cinema were rejected from the system's center and failed to attract the audience's support."[50]

To the extent that it was aimed not only at domestic but also international audiences, this strategy did result in some noteworthy achievements beyond the borders of Israel. For example, Uri Barabash's *Beyond the Walls* (1984) was nominated for an Academy Award for Best Foreign Language Film; Daniel Wachsman's *Hamsin* (*Eastern Wind*, 1982) and Raffi Bukai's *Avanti Popolo* (1986) won major prizes at the Locarno Film Festival; Eli Cohen's *The Summer of Aviya* (1989) landed the Silver Bear Award at the Berlin Film Festival and the Silver Spike Award at the Valladolid Film Festival; and David Perlov's six-hour documentary *Diary* (1973–1983) was shown on Britain's Channel 4.[51] Yet more often than not, the Israeli political films failed to make a lasting mark on the global stage. The only Israeli filmmaker from this generation who did develop a successful transnational career was Amos Gitai. A director of radical political documentaries, Gitai moved to Paris in the early 1980s and gained recognition for his aesthetically complex

and intellectually dense films. By the early 1990s, he had already enjoyed retrospectives in major American and European cities, and the British Film Institute (BFI) had published a volume on his work. In subsequent years, he helmed a string of high-profile feature films, several of which are multilingual and feature recognizable European and American stars (Juliette Binoche, Natalie Portman, Hanna Schygulla, Jeanne Moreau, Léa Seydoux, and Samantha Morton). These works tend to focus on Israel's past (for example, *Kippur*, 2000; *Eden*, 2001; *Kedma*, 2002; and *Rabin, the Last Day*, 2015) or critical social issues in the present (for example, *Kadosh*, 1999; *Free Zone*, 2004; *Promised Land*, 2004; and *Disengagement*, 2005), shaping them through certain formal staples of European modernist film, such as long takes and disjointed narratives. They have consistently enjoyed success at major international festivals (Cannes, Venice) to a level unmatched by the oeuvre of any other Israeli filmmaker to date.

Parallel to these developments, the Bourekas genre's presence on the cinematic landscape began to wane, and by the 1980s, it seemed that only Ze'ev Revach's films were keeping it alive. More often than not, this decline was explained as a result of the political shift, with right-wing parties taking up the cause of the disenfranchised Mizrahim and hence rendering unnecessary the Bourekas as a mode of ethnic/racial protest.[52] Yet it may also be accounted for as an outcome of the growing Americanization of Israeli culture, which raised the popularity of certain American cinematic genres.[53] The success of the American nostalgic youth film *American Graffiti* (1973) brought about a wave of similar products situated in the Israeli context, though with a greater erotic emphasis reminiscent of the American sexploitation genre. Avi Nesher's *The Troupe* (1978), a portrait of a military band during the War of Attrition (1969–1970), and *Dizengoff 99* (1979), the story of a group of youth in decadent and liberal Tel Aviv who want to strike it rich by making commercials, traded on intertextual references with American cinematic and popular culture, yet it was *Lemon Popsicle* (1978), directed by Boaz Davidson and produced by Menahem Golan, that was most representative of the trend. The film, focusing on the misadventures of three teenage friends in 1950s Tel Aviv, was seen by close to 1.5 million Israelis and led to seven sequels, most of which would gain cult status. It also became very popular across Europe (especially West Germany), Japan, and the United States (where it was nominated for a Golden Globe and remade in 1982 as *The Last American Virgin*, courtesy of Cannon Film). In addition to this franchise and its derivatives, the period also saw increased

interest in contemporary youth cinema, which mostly mirrored the ascent of coming-of-age films in Hollywood of the 1980s. Like its American counterparts, these Israeli youth films often followed the trials and tribulations of teenage life, including its dark and more rebellious sides, and through them professed a "seeming revolt against all that the parents' generation held sacred and dear;"[54] yet at times they also moved beyond a generalized framework of generational struggle to address more specific social concerns (for example, in *Coco Is 19*, 1985, and *Queen of the Class*, 1986) and thus fed into the zeitgeist of politicizing cinema. The final American genre that made an impact on Israeli films of that era was that of the candid camera. Beginning with *Funny Israelis* (1978), the subsequent decade would see a proliferation of practical joke films (*sirtei metichot*), mostly directed by Bourekas actor Yehuda Barkan. These works operate around the general concept of tricking innocent bystanders while filmmakers catch it all on tape. The tricks are often of a sexual nature and as such create a more "documentary" equivalent to the Israeli youth sexploitation films of the 1980s. Irreverent in their choice of targets, such candid films were interpreted as "breaking the hierarchal, structured dimension of society and creating a social structure without distinction, sans design, a great, egalitarian, boundless community."[55] This inclusive vision of a global "society of pranks" arguably prompted producers to transcend national borders and set three of these cinematic works with a South African background, even as they were still addressing a predominantly Israeli audience base.

In the 1990s, both the raunchy comedies and the politically conscious message films were replaced by a largely somber, seemingly apolitical Israeli cinema. Rather than speak to collective identity and attempt to explicitly resurrect a clear notion of Israeliness, Israeli films during the decade often featured a society fragmented into different parts, with each part operating in a privatized state of internal exile (most evocatively represented in Assi Dayan's formative feature *Life According to Agfa*, 1993). These often include constituencies of Israeli society that the Zionist ethos marginalized and whose identities were in a state of flux. The films depicted the communities' vulnerability vis-à-vis more stable overarching forces or showed resistance serving as critique; in either case, however, thematic concerns rarely amounted to a clear and overt message for action or claim to an alternative structure of national belonging. Yael Munk has described these films as "liminal cinema," in the sense that they divulge an attempt to enact a ritual of separation from the known *communitas*. She connects these thematic

directions to political events that proved traumatic for the Israeli left during the 1980s and 1990s (such as the First Intifada, 1987–1991; the assassination of Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, 1995; and the increasing political power of the religious establishment). Thus, the loss of faith in the power of Zionist Israeliness to guarantee not only progress and modernity but also a basic sense of stability and security engendered an atomizing effect whereby each subject had to resolve its identity away from that ethos. For those who were already displaced by the national ethos, this move marked a certain measure of relief; for those who were part of it, the break was painful.[56]

Deeply impacting this identity crisis and its cinematic expression were not only internal pressures and discourses but also external ones. The effect of globalization on Israeli society from the 1980s in particular had a decisive role in fragmenting national identity from without and promoting an agenda of global collaboration over local separatism. This force—bringing together capitalist economy and progressive politics—led to the initiation of the Oslo peace process and to innovative human rights legislation during the early 1990s. But the subsequent collapse of peace negotiations, in turn, also strengthened a profound sense of localism that clings to the traditional definitions of Israeliness as nationally bound, over and against potential global affiliations.[57] Caught between these competing pressures, Israeli liminal cinema attempted to negotiate its seemingly contradictory demands: escaping national definitions toward global membership while still holding on to a sense of local particularity overdetermined by the national but in search of other, more stable anchors.

This dynamic, which undergirds much of the filmic content of the period, is particularly evident in those films that focused on the recent immigration to Israel of approximately one million post-Soviet Jews (referred to in Hebrew as *Russim*, meaning *Russians*). Many of these texts were directed by nonmembers of this immigration wave and tended to subject filmic representation to the pattern of Bourekas cinema, reducing Russian characters to ethnic stereotypes and advocating assimilation through romantic unions between immigrant Russian women and local Israeli men. Yet as these immigrants began controlling their representation through filmmaking, the result was a more complex, "accented" Russian-Israeli cinema. This cinema unveiled the complexity of local-global/national-transnational pressures in the Israeli context, implicit in the position of "integration without acculturation." As such, these films often "walk a thin line between asserting the immigrants' place in Israel and insisting on their cultural

distinctiveness."[58] The national identity is affirmed in a gesture of localism, while at the same time a transnational bond is evoked so as to assert a cultural distinctiveness—and even more importantly, a form of global citizenship that is part and parcel of the immigrant's experience.

Also evincing the effects of this glocal pressure dynamic is the cinema of second-generation Mizrahi filmmakers. Rather than submit to the reductive positioning of the Bourekas, which shaped Mizrahi identity through the codes of colonial exoticism (the Levant), these filmmakers wished to reclaim their parents' "Arab or Middle Eastern culture as inhabiting the present-day Mizrahi body."[59] Such attempts were not meant to ignore the legacy of Zionist nationalism that erased the Arabness of the Arab Jew so much as place it in critical perspective—to offer a counterbalance. This recognizes transnational affinities existing in a hybrid identity that straddles the global and the local. In making this cultural tradition visible, however, the filmmakers confronted the problematics of a language barrier and the impossibility of traveling or working within their parents' country of origin. This, in turn, according to Yaron Shemer, led to the creation of mediated constructions of the past that often turned toward nostalgia and vintage stylization. These effects are evident in the filmmaking of Hannah Azoulai-Hasfari (*Sh'chur*, 1994, and *Orange People*, 2013), Dina Tzvi-Riklis (*Three Mothers*, 2006), and Benny Toraty (*Desperado Square*, 2001, and *The Ballad of the Weeping Spring*, 2012).[60]

Even more complex in its negotiation of national and transnational cinema is the case of cinema made by Palestinians who are Israeli citizens. These filmmakers are acutely aware of their position as "enemies from within" Israeli national identity, even as they are still defined as national citizens and their projects are funded by Israeli organizations. This dislocation is further exacerbated by the erasure of Palestinian nationhood by Israel, which has made affiliation with the state and its organs an unstable relationship. Under such conditions, the transnational and national are closely (though uncomfortably) interwoven on the level of production and thematics, creating a cinema that embodies "the intricacies of fragmented lives"[61] with multiple and conflicting affiliations that also risks "a replication of a colonial and neo-colonial power dynamic."[62] For those particular reasons, the issue of whether to define Palestinian cinema made with Israeli funds, production resources, and actors as *Palestinian* or *Israeli* has become the focus of a heated debate over the past few years, both in Israel/Palestine and in the global marketplace to which these films are often marketed.[63]

The globalizing tendencies present in the 1990s came to fruition in the 2000s, when the Israeli film industry enjoyed a major boom, not only locally but in its international reputation. Israeli films now headline major film festivals such as Cannes, Venice, Berlin, Sundance, Locarno, Toronto, and Tribeca, where they have often won some of the most important awards. Since 2007, Israel has had an impressive showing at the Academy Awards, with four Israeli fiction films nominated in the Best Foreign Language Film Award Category (*Beaufort*, 2007; *Waltz with Bashir*, 2009; *Ajami*, 2009; and *Footnote*, 2011) and two Israeli nonfiction films nominated for the Best Documentary Award (*5 Broken Cameras*, 2011, and *The Gatekeepers*, 2012). Israeli cinema is now reaching bigger audiences globally, in no small part due to the development of the Jewish film festival circuit. Yet international success has also secured broad theatrical distribution for certain works without the need to rely on a "sold" Jewish/Israeli diasporic viewership—a process that has significantly accelerated with the proliferation of streaming services.

This acceptance also opens the path for many Israeli actors to play substantial roles in non-Israeli films—for example, Gal Gadot, Ayelet Zurer, Ronit Elkabetz, Alon Aboutbul, Uri Gavriel, Mark Ivanir, and Shira Haas. It also brought certain up-and-coming Israeli filmmakers, such as Ari Folman (*Waltz with Bashir*, 2008), Hagar Ben-Asher (*The Slut*, 2011) Yuval Adler (*Bethlehem*, 2013), Tom Shoval (*Youth*, 2013), Nadav Lapid (*The Kindergarten Teacher*, 2014), Aharon Keshales and Navot Papushado (*Big Bad Wolves*, 2013), Guy Nattiv (*The Flood*, 2014), Samuel Maoz (*Foxtrot*, 2017), and Joseph Cedar (*Norman*, 2016) into consideration for directing non-Israeli feature films.

These trends reflect an economic reality wherein Israeli film is becoming more and more a global *product*. This has to do, first and foremost, with a shift in the way Israeli cinema is being financed. Traditionally, filmmakers relied on financing from Israeli national and private funds and broadcast bodies. In recent years, however, the Israeli film industry has become highly dependent on funding through international coproductions, and this has created a demand to secure collaboration with non-Israeli production companies and services. Israel has official coproduction agreements with several mainly European countries, of which those with France and Germany have proved the most prolific.[64] The increased awareness of foreign interests

in realizing Israeli projects has resulted in an explosion of coproduction informational conferences and pitching events in Israel, the most prominent of which is the annual Israel Market for International CoProduction, organized by the CoPro Documentary Marketing Foundation. It also led to participation of Israeli filmmakers in international film labs such as those offered by the Sundance Institute. Securing capital from overseas has not only advanced the logistics of film production but also removed certain barriers of international distribution that once handicapped Israeli cinema. Indeed, many Israeli films are selected by major festivals in the countries from which they receive financial support, thereby ensuring their widespread exposure.[65]

The importance of such international cooperation agreements is not only relegated to the artistic sphere but is increasingly serving as a diplomatic tool. In September 2020, Israel signed an historic peace agreement with the United Arab Emirates (UAE). Among the new collaborative agreements that pointed to the normalization of international relations was a partnership between the Israel Film Fund and the Abu Dhabi Film Commission. "Among bilateral workshops and training exercises, the new agreement points to a focus on co-productions and the invitation of a UAE director as a jury member at the 2021 Sam Spiegel International Film Lab."[66] In addition, selected Emirati students will be offered the opportunity to study in Jerusalem at the Sam Spiegel campus in one of three educational tracks. The announcement of this agreement was accompanied by explanations that film offers a "universal language" with the assumption that such language transcends national boundaries, while simultaneously explaining that such a collaboration is intended to promote "tolerance, education and developing a deeper cultural understanding between the Emirati and Israeli people,"[67] Thus film simultaneously works to represent the national to international audiences, and engages in a universal and transnational language that transcends those parameters.

These economic and political shifts undoubtedly affect the nature of representation in Israeli film, which is now further tasked with negotiating between the demands of the local and the global, the national and the transnational. Certain scholarly accounts noted the return of national themes—the Arab-Israeli conflict and the Holocaust, for example—to Israeli cinema in the 2000s, after their relative disappearance during the 1990s.[68] These representations have been less burdened by national specificity than their predecessors, which allowed them in turn to be more

palatable for international distribution. Some achieve this palatability by divesting national themes from their particular attributes, and offering instead a universalized vision of Israeliness.[69] Others, in contrast, choose to maintain the particularity of these themes, but blatantly ignore their intricate complexities.[70] In both cases, profound literacy in Israeli social realities is not required in order to understand these works, and on occasion may even be considered a hindrance to spectatorial pleasure.

On the other hand, many Israeli films of the 2000s continue the 1990s cinematic trend of undercutting a national framework through an emphasis on transnational identity politics. What has distinguished these more recent films, however, is that they "go far beyond merely an authentic presentation of a previously unrepresented 'other'"[71] to Israel's dominant culture. For them, Israeliness ceases to be a reference point to struggle with or relate to; their particular representation of cultural identity figures it as a "detached floating" category unbound by a local determination and easily consumed by global audiences.[72] This manifests in acts of self-exoticization meant to appeal to a global perspective as can be evidenced, for example, in works dealing with the religious ultra-Orthodox Jewish community, like *Eyes Wide Open* (2009) and *Fill the Void* (2012).[73] Other films situate identity politics within genres borrowed from non-Israeli production contexts, most notably the horror film and the mind-game thriller.[74] Finally, there are also those filmic texts which overlay discussions of identity on avowedly globalized narratives that feature transnational relationships and/or overseas travel, such as *James' Journey to Jerusalem* (Africa, 2003), *Walk on Water* (Germany, 2004), *Strangers* (France, 2007), *Noodle* (China, 2007), *The Human Resources Manager* (Romania, 2010), *Tel Aviv Salsa* (Mexico, 2011), *Farewell Baghdad* (Iraq, 2014), and *Magic Men* (Greece, 2014).

In spite of these developments, transnationalism still raises controversy within contemporary discussions on Israeli cinema. Exemplary of this was the critical conversation around the release of Natalie Portman's *A Tale of Love and Darkness* (2015). The adaptation of a celebrated novel by Israeli author Amos Oz, Portman's film was shot in Israel, with all the main actors being Israeli and speaking in Hebrew (including Portman herself, who holds Israeli citizenship and was born in Jerusalem). Production funds came from various Israeli organizations, including governmental ones (it received the largest sum for a single fiction film in 2015 from the Israeli Ministry of Culture and Sports).[75] The film's distribution subsequently defined it as Israeli to Israeli audiences, as in its inclusion within the state-sponsored Israeli

Cinema Day. This definition was met with a swift and harsh rebuttal by several Israeli scholars, who declared Portman's Americanness undercut the legitimacy and authenticity of the film's supposed Israeliness.[76] According to critic and scholar Yuval Rivlin:

> The failure of *A Tale of Love and Darkness* derives from it being an artificial work that is disconnected from what goes around it. The strength and uniqueness of Amos Oz's book came not from the central plot . . . but from the social, familial, personal, and nostalgic mosaic which comprises it. The little anecdotes that Oz described were the secret to its power. Also the linguistic and behavioural nuances that he managed to capture, and which brought 1940s–1950s Jerusalem to life. I doubt it if Portman has the ability to understand the world described by Oz, its vitality, its decline, and Oz's desire to relive it through his book. Oz's ability to touch upon the Israeli undercurrent, hidden away inside everyone who grew up in little Israel, was lost in the transition to the big screen. Portman stuck to the external, universal plot, but without the local context that surrounds it the spectator remains seated in the darkness with little-to-no love toward the tormented characters presented before him.[77]

Rivlin's position exposes the challenge of transnationalism. Rather than dismiss this view as an essentialist perspective of Israeliness, we can embrace it as a means of reconsidering the limits and makeup of *Israeli* in cultural identity and its cinematic expressions. Such a reading impresses upon us the importance of moving away from a definition of *Israeli* cinema through the narrowest of national terms but instead highlights the significance of transnational questions that may enrich our understanding of how this cinema has operated artistically and structurally, as well as in terms of funding, distribution, and reception.

* * *

The following chapters operate under the assumption that "we can no longer pretend to ignore glaring gaps and blind spots in film history previously covered up or glossed over by the national cinema paradigm."[78] By this we do not mean to abolish the national and erect the transnational in its place. Such a maneuver would be problematic, first and foremost because it assumes that Israeli cinema is divorced from questions of national specificity in relation to national conditions and discourses. The reality, however, shows that this is not the case.[79] Furthermore, this position also assumes that the national and transnational are easily separated in a manner that allows us to address one while disregarding the other. As discursive formations, the *national* speaks more to an impulse of delimiting to the confines

of the nation-state and its internal determinants, while the *transnational* speaks to an impulse of breaking away from such confines toward an external interstate sphere of influence and action. Yet the operation of cultural artifacts shows that these categories are almost always implicated by one another in a manner that speaks of dependency rather than disconnect. We would therefore subscribe to JungBong Choi's recommendation that "instead of looking for flat-out ruptures and frictions between the national and the transnational, one has to carefully investigate the complex structure of their mutual meditations."[80] In this sense, then, the choice to title the present introduction "Beyond the National" is meant only to signify our desire to explore more extensively the place of the transnational in this "complex structure."

The first section of this anthology focuses on filmmaking in Israel during the state's early decades—a period marked by high nationalist sentiment and substantial ideological control by the Israeli-Zionist hegemony. Rather than prove Israeli cinema narrated the nation during that time, the chapters here flesh out its transnationalism and, in the process, challenge its normative boundaries as a national cinema. In this capacity, Dan Chyutin's chapter explores Israeli film scholarship's fraught relationship with transnationalism by looking at its attempts at discussing postwar Hollywood films made about Israel's founding period. Through a close reading of Edward Dmytryk's *The Juggler* (1953), Chyutin discusses how the film subtly detaches itself from Israeli Zionism even as it celebrates its accomplishments. This disjuncture, in turn, makes it possible to imagine not only postwar Hollywood films about Israel as a bridge between national ideologies but also those contemporaneous films more commonly defined as *Israeli*. The result is a wider corpus of Israeli cinema that transcends nationally bounded concepts of Israel, even as it retains a certain commitment to and investment in them.

The transnational relationship between Israel and the United States is also explored in Julie Grimmeisen's reading of American culture and its attraction for Israeli actresses during the 1950s and the 1960s. Through a close reading of the women's magazine *La'isha*, Grimmeisen establishes the ways in which American ideals of female beauty were endorsed over and against attempts by Zionist-Socialist hegemony to vilify them as bourgeois. Of particular importance to her is the role this magazine had in promoting several Israeli actresses who fit the aforementioned model and who achieved international acting careers of various degrees of success. These valorized

"beauties" were able to translate the Zionist fixation with corporeal perfection (the New Hebrew Body) into an American idiom, exchanging the former's penchant for asceticism with a celebration of luxury.

Also within an Israeli American framework, Rachel S. Harris, in her reading of several Westerns made in Israel (such as *They Were Ten*, 1960, and *Blazing Sand*, 1960), considers the tensions in importing a "foreign" genre during a time when Israel was determined to create an authentic national culture. Harris charts out a historical trajectory in which affinities between the national myths of Western and Zionist pioneering allowed for the international genre to be reimagined in a local context. But as filmmakers began to innovate outside the boundaries of acceptable pioneering narratives, the tension between importing a foreign vehicle and the expectation that film serve nationalist ends, exposed the problematics of transnational cinema. Teasing out the nationalist anxieties that plagued these productions and particularly their reception, Harris offers an examination of the threat posed by the transnational within the ideological boundaries of high nationalism.

Looking to Europe, Shmulik Duvdevani and Anat Dan's essay considers two radical documentaries—*Much'shar Bli Rosh* (1963) and *Sha'ar Ha'guy* (1965)—made by David Greenberg, a key figure in the mediation of European Art Cinema to Israeli audiences during the 1960s. These films, in their eyes, testify to their creator's expansive knowledge of modernist film aesthetics, influenced as they are by the labor of Art Cinema luminaries Alain Resnais, Georges Franju, and Luis Buñuel. Yet this influence does not define Greenberg's cinematic efforts as derivative, pale impersonations of "foreign" texts lacking in any political and social significance within the Israeli context (as has been the recurrent accusation against Israeli cinematic modernism of the 1960s). Rather, these films are unique in their mobilization of transnational aesthetics toward local political ends within the sphere of the nation, whether in delegitimizing war by comparing its carnage to the mechanics of animal butchery (*Much'shar Bli Rosh*) or in critiquing the collective rituals of memorialization and sacrifice that legitimize this carnage via a self-reflexive recovery of a particularly mythical site of combat (*Sha'ar Ha'guy*).

At the heart of this volume's second section is the fraught relationship between Palestinian and Israeli cinemas. Palestinian cinema is inherently transnational by virtue of the particular geopolitical conditions in which it operates—namely its attempt to assert a national definition under erasure

by another, who also controls the territory to which both national definitions relate. This difficulty is rendered even thornier in light of the need to make films on Palestine in Israeli territories, which often also necessitates support from Israeli institutions and collaboration with Israeli filmmakers. Ariel Sheetrit's chapter addresses these complexities through its discussion of two celebrated Palestinian films: Annamarie Jacir's *Salt of This Sea* (2008) and Suha Arraf's *Villa Touma* (2014). In both cases, Sheetrit focuses on the shaping of filmic space and what it says about how a particular geography can be occupied simultaneously by multiple national identities with intertwined historical trajectories. Emphasizing the means by which these films thematize transnationalism and expose its influence on Palestinian national consciousness, Sheetrit broadens the scope of her investigation to reveal how their production and distribution were also deeply affected by transnationalism.

Mary Layoun's contribution looks at Palestinian cinema made by Palestinian citizens for ways of "imagining *otherwise* our communities." Her chapter investigates passages and sites as a potential *otherwise* that exemplifies the transnational nature of Palestinian existence, a reality of parallel worlds on a single strip of land that affords different kinds of movements while blocking others. Ibtisam Mara'ana Menuhin's documentary *Write Down, I'm an Arab* (2014) on Palestinian poet Mahmoud Darwish serves as her key example for exploring such movements and their (im)possibilities. Darwish's life was marked by (forced and voluntary) transnational positionings and negotiations, and in this he embodies the difficulties of Palestinians within the contested transnational landscape of Israel/Palestine. Yet in this film, Layoun argues, the exploration of his romantic relationship with Israeli Tamar Ben-Ari also offers viewers "signposts of living together otherwise."

Taking a more somber outlook, Yaron Shemer centers his discussion of Emad Burnat and Guy Davidi's Oscar-nominated documentary *5 Broken Cameras* (2011) on the difficulty of presenting a Palestinian narrative through the transnational cooperation of Israelis and Palestinians. Taking diegetic elements as his focus, Shemer foregrounds the "metonymic sixth camera" as that which exists outside of the raw footage of Burnat's five (broken) cameras—what essentially shows Burnat and contextualizes his political documentary work in the West Bank village of Bil'in from the perspective of his collaborator-observer, Davidi. Rather than *speak with* Burnat, the author shows how Davidi's observation *speaks for* Burnat in a manner that

undermines the latter's agency. This relationship, for Shemer, is an actuation of the lopsidedness in Israeli-Palestinian transnational power relations—an attempt to narrativize the Palestinian through an Israeli perspective, the only one with the "authority to narrate" in this turbulent region.

The third section collects together chapters that deal with the ways in which Israeli filmmaking, in the broadest sense of the term, has interacted with transnational expectations and tastes, permeating through the spheres of production, distribution, and (inter)national reception. Ohad Landesman's contribution to this framework focuses on two documentaries made in and about Israel by prominent non-Israeli artists: *Description of a Struggle* (1960) by Chris Marker and *Promised Lands* (1974) by Susan Sontag. Though relating to diverse moments in Israeli history and disparate in their political agendas, these two films are nevertheless united by a decidedly Euro-American avant-garde style and an *outsider's* perspective. Yet through his careful contextualization, Landesman challenges the simplistic binary between *outside* and *inside*, revealing how both Sontag and Marker were personally invested in Israel and how their stylistic and thematic vision was largely implicated by the national narratives they encountered there.

Zachary Ingle's chapter engages Israeli cinema's expansion beyond its national borders through an examination of two key figures—Menahem Golan and Yoram Globus—and their brazen foray into transnational filmmaking with Cannon Films. Unsurprisingly, because it was deemed more American than Israeli, Golan and Globus's Cannon period has been marginalized in Israeli cinema scholarship. Providing a detailed account of Cannon's operations as a business and a forger of cinematic content, Ingle shows how Golan and Globus maintained important links between their Israeli past and their global expansion. He also reveals how their attempts to create such transnational continuation forced a backlash from local filmmakers in the United States and Europe, which was as much about critiquing the (poor) quality of Cannon films as it was about rejecting their affront to the purity of national categories.

While Cannon's story was marked by the studio's eventual downfall, Josh Beaty's discussion of Jewish film festivals in the United States brings to the fore Israeli cinema's transnational success. Beaty gives us an insider's look into these festivals' operation and specifically into their relationship with local Jewish communities, the primary audiences. Since these audiences come to the festival to experience a sense of community and articulate their ethnic identity and Israel is a key ingredient of both these activities,

the measure by which an Israeli film exhibits Israeliness influences its appeal and marketability. Yet to foreground Israeliness is also to take a stand on Israel, especially in political terms, and in this, programming differs in its selections (and exclusions) depending on the particular community and organizational frameworks.

This catering to *foreign eyes* serves as the overall framework for Yaron Peleg's account of military-focused Israeli films of the 2000s. These works, according to Peleg, resonate with a traditional form of Israeli self-identification called "shooting and crying"—a position of being forced into warfare and suffering through the execution of war duties. Focusing on non-Israeli film reviews, Peleg reveals the overall attractiveness of these films' message in spite of growing transnational condemnation of Israel's militarism. This appeal elucidates the dialectic of Israel as perpetrator and victim that shapes both the understanding and interest of non-Israeli audiences. It also reveals the extent to which non-Israeli liberal elites are anxious about maintaining the balance between these polar opposites as a means of ultimately redeeming Israel amid a critique of its occupation policies.

The fourth section of the book fleshes out the effects of Israel's globalization on Israeli identity, discussing how contemporary Israeli cinema fragments traditional definitions of Israeliness so that they may function as more transnational. In this context, the films are read in light of a determination to denationalize Israeli cinema through universal tropes and an appeal to the transnational and universal, situating it within a global economy of film exchange. Nava Dushi's opening chapter argues that certain Israeli films of recent years undermine the idea of national unity, so prevalent in Israeli filmmaking of previous decades, through an emphasis on the local and on the minor. Marginalized communities stand at the focus of these works, and their alienation from the center is transposed onto the image of Tel Aviv as a fragmented, networked, globalized city. These narrative/thematic foci are refracted through a frame that at least partially challenges notions of narrational cohesiveness and causality. While such challenges force us to consider new possibilities for structure, whether it be social or narrational, what remains an open question for Dushi is the extent to which it allows us to imagine narrative or identity altogether beyond the major (by way of artistic language) and the national (by way of a collective field of reference).

The presence of a tacit dialogue between Israeli filmmakers and global(ized) markets is also what preoccupies Boaz Hagin and Raz Yosef,

who analyze queer representations in Israeli films as instances of "world cinema." Drawing on Thomas Elsaesser's notion of "self-othering" or "self-exotization," the writers note a tendency for certain so-called festival films to create a distance from national identity structures and their corresponding national literacy, projecting queer representations toward broader Western definitions of how a marginal Other should look, either through a rescue fantasy shaped in light of Western neoliberal individualism, where this Other guides Israeli gays out of their homophobic society and toward an embrace of Western individualist gay identity, or through an Orientalist fantasy that sees Israel as a Middle Eastern utopia, combining a Levantine ruggedness of the land and its people with a laissez-faire attitude toward sexual orientation that extends well beyond the borders of cosmopolitan Tel Aviv. By contrast, the writers also point to several Israeli audiovisual texts that disturb these formulas of self-othering, such as in videos made for the Arisa line of monthly Tel Aviv LGBT parties. In these works, accessible on YouTube, camp sensibility and all-out irreverence abound, offering means to connect identities across borders without having to submit to notions of Western progress or Orientalist utopianism.

Concluding this section, Yael Munk's exploration of Hagar Ben-Asher's *The Slut* (2011) reveals it as yet another example of an Israeli film embracing transnational aesthetics. Munk considers the ways in which *The Slut* is rendered both visually and narratively as something not distinctly Israeli. Instead of dealing with the Holocaust or the Arab-Israeli conflict, which serve Israeli cinema as national markers even—or perhaps especially—when marketed abroad, the film engages in a contemporary international cinematic dialogue around global themes such as female sexuality and child abuse. Additionally, Munk highlights Ben-Asher's choice to draw on the aesthetics of feminist filmmaking—most clearly in female-directed French Extreme Cinema—which fosters a global awareness of patriarchal oppression and the means by which it is supported through cinema.

The fifth and final section of this anthology brings together chapters that read the effects of globalization on Israeli cinema, considering films' direct engagement with a second culture or film tradition. These chapters discuss the ways in which Israeli identity has become transnational within cinema, reflecting transcultural trends within the contemporary generation. Opening this section, Tobias Ebbrecht-Hartmann's contribution explores the creation, within the filmic diegesis, of an interzone where Israel and Germany meet—what he describes as "The German-Israeli Cinema of

Encounters." Focusing primarily within this category on the representation of Germany in films conventionally defined as Israeli, Ebbrecht-Hartmann shows how German-Israeli encounters serve primarily as a means of exploring tensions within Israel's history and cultural identity. His exploration into past representations reveals a use of the so-called German topic either in reference to the Holocaust and its affective and ethical charge on Israeli reality or in reference to the topos of journey and migration. As the treatment of these coordinates advances in time, Ebbrecht-Hartmann argues, films tend to address them more self-consciously and, in so doing, loosen Israeli identity's national boundedness—one that is reflected through a greater emphasis on the fluidity of geographical transitions and meetings that ultimately creates an evolving transnational narrative.

Tackling the notion of transnational encounter through aesthetic influence, Neta Alexander discusses a new brand of Israeli cinema—the New Violence—through its relationship with the global cinematic movement of New Extremism. She notes that the creators of New Violence all grew up during a period (1980s–1990s) marked by repeated conflicts arriving in very short order and thus were continuously exposed to violence as both citizens and soldiers. Yet when they aimed to express this experience through cinematic means, their primary source of inspiration was the confrontational aesthetics of European New Extremism rather than the more indigenous traditions of past Israeli films. Thus envisaged, New Violence seems to bridge the national and transnational in fruitful ways, both indicating the ways in which a foreign cinematic language can help address local problems and even reinterpret the idea of the local and how concurrently it can also make these local problems legible—and even interesting—to foreign audiences. Alexander's analysis of this dynamic stresses the importance of the former negotiation and uses it as means of distinguishing Israeli New Violence from European New Extremism; thus, while the latter avoids making clear political gestures and settles for a vague critique of bourgeois society, the former is committed to addressing the political conditions in Israel and to arousing Israeli audiences toward political action.

The final chapter sees Pablo Utin discussing the dialogue of three contemporary Israeli filmmakers—Navot Papushado, Aharon Keshales, and Eran Kolirin—with South Korean films. Through interviews with Papushado and Kolirin, Utin fleshes out the intricacies of this particular "transnational exchange," which could not be simplistically understood as a mere meeting of two mutually exclusive national cinemas and cultures. Rather,

Figure 0.1. Zion Cinema, Jerusalem (June 4, 1978). Courtesy of photographer Reuven Milon.

what emerges here is a complex dynamic where the Israeli filmmaker incorporates characteristics, which he defines as typically Korean, into a style that is both idiosyncratically personal and collectively Israeli, thereby creating a new hybrid version of Israeli cinema and Israeliness in general. As such, this negotiation testifies to the ways in which contemporary Israeli film maintains a transnational encounter even as it places itself, squarely and unabashedly, under the heading of the nation.

For "Israeli" is never a static and uncontested term, and this is not only due to the manifold nature of its internal ingredients, but also to the complexity of its transnational shaping. The cover image we chose for this

volume speaks directly to this complicated legacy. Capturing the front of the Zion Cinema in Jerusalem, a name that reflects ideological hopes for return and redemption, we spy a familiar American film poster with credits that have been Hebraized for the local audience. Yet this is not *Gone with the Wind*'s first release in 1939, but a reissue nearly four decades after its production. Screened a decade after the Six-Day War, a war that would lead to decades of occupation of the Arab population in the land's Eastern parts and expose a legacy of racism, prejudice, and oppression for subjects who could not become citizens, this photo is a convoluted matrix of national identification and institutionalized racism that overdetermines much of "Israeliness." Israel no more imported its racism in a pure form than the United States exported it. Rather, these conceptions of nationhood, war, honor, duty, and community were translated into local contexts and framed through language and imagery that resonated with regional specificity. Thus Israeli films, like American films that had preceded them, drew cultural distinctions between those who were part of the polity and those who stood outside it, creating cinematic drama out of this tension and heroes out of those who protected and embraced the Zionist vision and rejected their own competing national interests. In the following decade, race consciousness would emerge in critical forms within Israel; this too was exported from America as a local variant of the Black Panthers. Yet whereas in the United States this movement served an African American population who had lived with centuries of slavery, discrimination, and subjugation, in Israel it was a protest movement of second-generation Jewish immigrants from North Africa and Middle Eastern countries, citizens with equal political rights who experienced economic and social discrimination. Their activism would ultimately result in a dramatic political loss for the ruling hegemony in the 1977 elections. It would take another decade before the grassroots Palestinian protest movement of the First Intifada would reshape the Israeli political landscape permanently. In the moment this photograph was taken, the national epic was no longer a rallying cry for Israeli audiences. Like *Gone with the Wind* itself, Israeli cinema would face a reckoning in the coming decades about what was represented on screen, and why.

In deconstructing the multiple sites of transnational engagement, this book ultimately sets out to offer a means to consider a small national cinema and its structural, economic, cultural, and artistic impact on a global stage. Recognizing the multiple ways in which transnationalism affects

filmmaking and has become a tool for thinking about cinema, these essays explore a range of critical points of engagement. At the same time, *Casting a Giant Shadow* also makes visible the ways in which these transnational influences are drawn back into the national paradigm, thereby continually questioning and reshaping the very meaning of *national cinema*.

Notes

1. Margot Klausner, *The Dream Industry: Memories and Facts 25 Years of Israel Motion Picture Studios Herzliya Ltd. 1949–1974* (Herzliya: Israel Motion Picture Studios, 1974), 12–13.

2. Ibid., 15.

3. For an insightful account of Klausner's legacy, see Boaz Hagin, "Margot Klausner and the Pioneering of Israeli Cinema," *Screen*, no. 2 (2018): 158–175.

4. Ministry of Culture and Sport-Culture Authority, "The Ministry of Culture Unveils the Operation in the First Ever Israeli Pavilion at the Cannes Film Festival" [in Hebrew], Ministry of Culture and Sport website, April 11, 2016, accessed June 8, 2016, http://mcs.gov.il/Culture/Professional_Information/events/Pages/IsraelCann.aspx.

5. Neta Alexander, "Israel's Image-Bolstering Video to Cannes Is a Complete Mess," *Haaretz*, May 12, 2016, accessed June 8, 2016, http://www.haaretz.com/israel-news/.premium-1.719290.

6. Indeed, this point is made clear in early promotional mock-ups of the pavilion, which were plastered by banners with the title "The Israel Cinema." What may be construed as a grammatical error also offers a telling clue to the pavilion's underlying strategy of showcasing Israel to the world: placing cinema at the service of an idea of the nation (Israel), rather than using national currency (Israeli) as a descriptive of a film's territorial and societal origin.

7. For examples of this criticism, see Edna Fainaru, "Israel to Open Contentious Second Cannes Stand," *ScreenDaily*, March 21, 2016, accessed June 8, 2016, http://www.screendaily.com/news/israel-to-open-contentious-second-cannes-stand/5101635.article; Nirit Anderman, "Two Israeli Pavilions at Cannes Film Festival: A Welcomed Addition or a Waste of Public Funds?" [in Hebrew], *Haaretz*, March 23, 2016, accessed June 8, 2016, http://www.haaretz.co.il/gallery/cinema/.premium-1.2892513; Amir Bogen, "Cannes Film Festival: The Israelis Party, ISIS Threatens" [in Hebrew], YNET, May 11, 2016, accessed June 8, 2016, http://www.ynet.co.il/articles/0,7340,L-4802235,00.html; Ido Dagan, "Disappointment to Israelis at Cannes: The Israeli Pavilion Cost a Lot but Made Little Contribution" [in Hebrew], *NRG*, May 17, 2016, accessed June 8, 2016, http://www.nrg.co.il/online/47/ART2/778/897.html; and Ravit Hecht, "The Periphery at Cannes: Miri Regev's Ostentatious Quest at the Taxpayer's Expense" [in Hebrew], *Haaretz*, May 18, 2016, accessed June 8, 2016, http://www.haaretz.co.il/gallery/opinion/.premium-1.2948109.

8. Alan Williams, "Introduction," in *Film and Nationalism*, ed. Alan Williams (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2002), 10.

9. Ella Shohat, *Israeli Cinema: East/West and the Politics of Representation* (1989; rev. ed., London: I. B. Tauris, 2010), 15–16.

10. Ariel L. Feldstein, *Pioneer, Toil, Camera: Cinema in the Service of the Zionist Ideology, 1917–1939* [in Hebrew] (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 2009), 185. In this and all subsequent quotations from Hebrew sources, unless otherwise indicated, the translation is ours.

11. Moshe Zimmerman, *Signs of Movies: History of Israeli Cinema in the Years 1896–1948* [in Hebrew] (Tel Aviv: Dionun-Tel Aviv University Press, 2001), 25.

12. Miri Talmon and Yaron Peleg, "Introduction," in *Israeli Cinema: Identities in Motion*, ed. Miri Talmon and Yaron Peleg (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2011), xi. Our emphasis.

13. Ariel Feldstein, for example, argued that the particular representation of Zionist pioneers in Aleksander Ford's 1933 film *Sabra* testifies to the filmmaker's desire to make them less an emblem of Zionist nationalism than of his Polish socialist values. Feldstein 2009, 157.

14. Ibid., 145–148.

15. Shohat 2010, 53.

16. Talmon and Peleg 2011, xiii.

17. See, for example, Nurith Gertz, *Motion Fiction: Israeli Fiction in Film* [in Hebrew] (Tel Aviv: Open University Press, 1993), 70–90.

18. Talmon and Peleg 2011, xii.

19. David Shalit, *Projecting Power: The Cinema Houses, the Movies, and the Israelis* [in Hebrew] (Tel Aviv: Resling, 2006), 46.

20. On the role of *Exodus* in shaping Israeli national mythology and its cinematic expression, see, for example, Yosefa Loshitzky, *Identity Politics on the Israeli Screen* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2001), 1–14. Importantly, American productions shot in Israel were not only limited to films that dealt with the founding of the state; other examples include the Western *Billy Two Hats* (1974), the musical *Jesus Christ Superstar* (1973), and thrillers *Rosebud* (1975) and *The Sell Out* (1976). While these were not as impactful as the first group of Hollywood films, one can at the very least note some choreographic influences of *Jesus Christ Superstar* on the Israeli musical *Kazablan* (1974).

21. See Anat Helman, *Becoming Israeli: National Ideals & Everyday Life in the 1950s* (Lebanon, NH: UPNE/Brandeis University Press, 2014), 113–139.

22. Ibid.

23. Nathan Gross and Yaakov Gross, *The Hebrew Film: Chapters in the History of Silent and Talking Film in Israel* [in Hebrew] (Jerusalem: self-published, 1991), 395–396.

24. Helman 2014, 113–139.

25. Iraqi-born Nouri Habib's *Without a Homeland* (1956), dealing with the trials and tribulations of Yemenite Jews immigrating to Israel, is an obvious exception.

26. Sigalit Banai, "Arabic and Iranian Films in Hebrew: The Arabic Roots of Israeli Cinema," conference paper, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel, June 7–9, 2006.

27. Rami Kimchi, *The Israeli Shtetls: Bourekas Films and Yiddish Classical Literature* [in Hebrew] (Tel Aviv: Resling, 2012), 205.

28. Ibid., 227–228. The rise of Yiddish culture in Israel (in conjunction with the theatrical success in America of *Fiddler on the Roof*) also brought about a small cycle of Israeli films on shtetl life, including *Two Kuni Lemel* (1966), *Tevye and His Seven Daughters* (1968), and *Miracle in the Town* (1968). It may also have instigated another small cycle of comedies about contemporary Israeli-Ashkenazi Ultra-Orthodoxy that Shohat terms "'Gefilte-Fish' films (the Ashkenazi bourekas)" (110) and that include *Kuni Lemel in Tel Aviv* (1976), *The Black Banana* (1976), and *Kuni Lemel in Cairo* (1982). See Shohat 2010.

29. Yael Munk and Nurith Gertz, *Revisiting Israeli Cinema: 1948–1990* [in Hebrew] (Ra'anana: Open University of Israel Press, 2015), 41.

30. Working in France during the late 1970s, Mizrahi would eventually win the award for his French film *Madame Rosa* (1977).

31. Moshe Zimmerman, *Leave My Holocaust Alone: The Impact of the Holocaust on Israeli Cinema and Society* [in Hebrew] (Haifa: University of Haifa Press/Zmora Beitan, 2002), 156.

32. These clubs operated primarily in Israel's major metropolitan centers: for example, the Beit Lesin film club in Tel Aviv; Hebrew University's student film club in Jerusalem; and Lia and Wim Van Leer's film club in Haifa's Beit Rothschild. See Ariel Schweitzer, *The New Sensibility: Modern Israeli Cinema in the Sixties and Seventies* [in Hebrew] (Tel Aviv: Babel, 2003), 97.

33. Gross and Gross 1991, 398.

34. Judd Ne'eman, "The Death Mask of the Moderns: A Genealogy of New Sensibility Cinema in Israel," *Israel Studies* 4, no.1 (1999): 112.

35. Schweitzer 2003, 92–93.

36. Ne'eman 1999, 110.

37. Schweitzer 2003, 150.

38. Most notably, Oded Kotler receiving the Best Actor Award at the Cannes Film Festival for his starring role in *Three Days and a Child* (1967).

39. Gross and Gross 1991, 390.

40. Ibid., 386. One exception is Chris Marker, who directed his 1960 documentary *Description d'un combat* in Israel. See also Boris Trbić, "Description of a Struggle," *Senses of Cinema*, no. 52 (September 2009), accessed June 16, 2016, http://sensesofcinema.com/2009/cteq/description-of-a-struggle/.

41. Gross and Gross 1991, 300.

42. Ibid., 303.

43. Ibid., 302.

44. Shohat 2010, 98.

45. Milchen was involved in Israeli movie production during the 1970s and became a major Hollywood player in the 1980s and 1990s with such high-end productions as *Once Upon a Time in America* (1984), *Brazil* (1985), *Pretty Woman* (1990), and *L.A. Confidential* (1997). Arad immigrated to the United States after the Six-Day War (1967), began making animation films for American TV in the mid-1970s, and founded Marvel Studios in the early 1990s.

46. Talmon and Peleg 2011, xiv.

47. Indicative and conducive of this influence is the publication of two new film journals during this period—*Closeup* (est. 1973), by Tel Aviv University's Film and Television Department, and *Kolnoa 74* (est. 1974), by the Israeli Institute for Cinema. Many of the writers and editors of these journals largely belonged to the aforementioned groups and used their position to promote cinephilic knowledge among their peers, especially surrounding European and American new waves. Helpful in their endeavors was also the establishment of the Tel Aviv (1973), Haifa (1973), and Jerusalem (1974) cinematheques. See Gross and Gross 1991, 398–402.

48. This is clearly evident in the *Kayitz* manifesto, which a group of young Israeli filmmakers published in 1977 and which called for government bodies to support quality films over popular entertainment ones.

49. Gertz 1993, 240.
50. Ibid.
51. See also ibid., 259–260.
52. See, for example, Meir Schnitzer, *Israeli Cinema: All the Facts/All the Plots/All the Directors/and Reviews* [in Hebrew] (Tel Aviv: Kineret, 1994), 16.
53. Amir Chetzroni and Shmulik Duvdevani, "On the Tel-Aviv Hedonism of the Cinema of Avi Nesher" [in Hebrew], *Resling* 7 (Summer 2000): 102.
54. Gertz 1993, 244.
55. Haim Lapid, "Flat on Its Back: A Scholarly Study of Israeli Hidden-Camera Movies" [in Hebrew], *Theory and Criticism* 2 (Summer 1992): 48.
56. Yael Munk, *Exiled in Their Borders: Israeli Cinema between the Two Intifadas* [in Hebrew] (Ra'anana: Open University of Israel Press, 2012).
57. Uri Ram, *The Globalization of Israel: McWorld in Tel Aviv, Jihad in Jerusalem* (London: Routledge, 2008); Yoav Peled and Gershon Shafir, *Being Israeli: The Dynamics of Multiple Citizenship* [in Hebrew] (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University Press, 2005), 40–44.
58. Olga Gershenson, "'Is Israel Part of Russia?' Immigrants on Russian and Israeli screens," *Israel Affairs* 17, no. 1 (January 2011): 167.
59. Shohat 2010, 304.
60. Yaron Shemer, *Identity, Place, and Subversion in Contemporary Mizrahi Cinema in Israel* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2013). See also Raz Yosef, "Restaging the Primal Scene of Loss: Melancholia and Ethnicity in Israeli Cinema," *Third Text* 20, no. 3/4 (May/July 2006): 487–498.
61. Shohat 2010, 277.
62. Yael Friedman, "Guises of Transnationalism in Israel/Palestine: A Few Notes on *5 Broken Cameras*," *Transnational Cinemas* 6, no. 1 (2015): 29.
63. In the past decade, several Palestinian filmmakers, such as Hany Abu-Assad and Elia Suleiman, have consciously worked to avoid using any Israeli financial or production resources in their works in order to bypass this conversation to the degree possible. Yet they may still use casts that include Palestinian actors with Israeli citizenship—an act that serves as its own political statement about citizenship and identity.
64. See, for example, Ofir Bar-Zohar and Hila Herzog, "Bourekas with Champagne" [in Hebrew], *Haaretz-The Marker*, July 20, 2008, accessed June 17, 2016, http://www.haaretz.co.il/hasite/spages/1004267.html.
65. For more on selling Israeli films overseas and how this relates to questions of coproduction, see Orr Sigoli, "Marking Territory: Two Israeli Producers and Two American Distributors Talk about Selling and Marketing Films" [in Hebrew], *Srita*, August 23, 2016, accessed August 23, 2016, http://srita.net/2016/08/23/israeli-movies-in-foreign-territories.
66. Joe Snell, "UAE-Israel film Collaboration Latest in Surge of Normalization Deals," *Al-Monitor*, September 21, 2020, accessed September 26, 2020, https://www.al-monitor.com/pulse/originals/2020/09/film-tv-israel-uae-emirates-collaboration-normalization-deal.html#ixzz6Z9xxGLrP.
67. Israeli 21c Staff, "Israeli-UAE Film Deal Aims to Promote Tolerance," *Israeli 21c*, September 25, 2020, accessed September 26, 2020, https://www.israel21c.org/israeli-uae-film-deal-aims-to-promote-tolerance/.
68. See, for example, Ilan Avisar, "The National and the Popular in Israeli Cinema," *Shofar* 24, no. 1 (Fall 2005): 142.

69. See, for example, Alison Patterson and Dan Chyutin, "Teaching Trauma in (and out of) Translation: Waltzing with Bashir in English," in *Media and Translation: An Interdisciplinary Approach*, ed. Dror Abend-David (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014), 221–241.

70. See, for example, Boaz Hagin, "Male Weeping as Performative: The Crying Mossad Assassin in *Walk on Water*," *Camera Obscura* 23, no. 2 (2008): 102–139.

71. Nitzan Ben-Shaul, "Disjointed Narratives in Contemporary Israeli Films," in *Israeli Cinema: Identities in Motion*, ed. Miri Talmon and Yaron Peleg (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2011), 117.

72. Ibid., 115.

73. See also Boaz Hagin and Raz Yosef, "Festival Exoticism: The Israeli Queer Film in a Global Context," *GLQ* 18, no. 1 (2012): 161–178.

74. See, for example, Boaz Hagin, "'Our Traumas': Terrorism, Tradition, and Mind Games in *Frozen Days*," in *Deeper than Oblivion; Trauma and Memory in Israeli Cinema*, ed. Raz Yosef and Boaz Hagin (New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013), 199–221; Olga Gershenson and Dale Hudson, "Nightmares of a Nation: Israeli Horror-Satires *Rabies* and *Big Bad Wolves*," *Journal of Cinema and Media Studies* 59, no. 1 (2019): 44–65.

75. Avraham Carmely and Hila Maimon, *Cinema in Israel: Yearly Review 2015* [in Hebrew] (Jerusalem: Ministry of Culture and Sports, 2016), 11, accessed January 26, 2019, https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/221b0b_2c6322f491354f90becd377adc2f065e.pdf.

76. Benjamin Tovias retrospectively reported that Oz "showed greater generosity toward the young artist [Portman] in her directorial debut, surely greater than that afforded to her by quite a few critics and members of the local film business who were quick to butcher it—some hours after its Cannes premiere, others in hallway conversations after seeing an incomplete cut. Several of the objectors imparted a patronizing and chauvinistic attitude: how can she, an American youth who fell in love with Oz's book and took barely a semester of studies at Hebrew University [in Jerusalem], dare to adapt our greatest author?" See Benjamin Tovias, "Give Respect to the Darkness" [in Hebrew], *Yediot Aharonot*, December 31, 2018.

77. Yuval Rivlin, "A Tale of Disappointment and Natalie Portman" [in Hebrew], *Mida*, September 25, 2015, accessed January 26, 2019, https://bit.ly/2SbU9e4.

78. Yingzin Zhang, "Chinese Cinema and Transnational Film Studies," in *World Cinemas, Transnational Perspectives*, ed. Natasa Durovicova and Kathleen Newman (London: Routledge, 2010), 123.

79. The same rule may also apply to other cinemas, for as Will Higbee and Song Hwee Lim claim, "In fact the national continues to exert the force of its presence even within transnational film-making practices" (10). Yet it may also be true that since Israel's nationhood is still in contention due to conflicts from within and without, its preoccupation with the national is potentially more heightened in comparison to that of other countries not operating under similar conditions. See Will Higbee and Song Hwee Lim, "Concepts of Transnational Cinema: Towards a Critical Transnationalism in Film Studies," *Transnational Cinemas* 1, no. 1 (2010).

80. JungBong Choi, "National Cinema: An Anachronistic Delirium?," *Journal of Korean Studies* 16, no. 2 (Fall 2011): 188.