

The Meanings of ‘Bollywood’

One of the dominant senses of our contemporary times is a massive sense of change in Indian urban life. Several nodes of transformation have been identified as the source of these changes, especially those of economic liberalization and globalization. In the wake of the massive debt to the World Bank incurred by the Indian economy at the end of the 1980s, the Indian government undertook to start dismantling a protectionist regime initiated after Independence to shore up local industrial growth, in order to invite foreign direct investment, including non-resident Indian investment, and to open the Indian market to foreign goods and competition.¹ One of the noticeable changes of this period is the rapid transformation of urban landscapes in line with this new set of compulsions. The clearing of key urban spaces of slum settlements, pavement dwellings and street vending has been inaugurated to set up new markets, malls and entertainment spaces, with a view to build a powerful consumer economy. This efflorescence of a new commodity culture and urbanism has gone hand in hand with contests of various types, specifically on issues of property right, the deployment of municipal government to take over lands, and the displacement of working populations. The new urbanism has also had a complicated intersection with urban environmentalism, as the presence of polluting small factories and workshops in residential areas has given rise to campaigns for industrial relocation, again with considerable impact on a mass of the urban working class.²

Along with this new urbanism and consumer economy, the contemporary period has showcased new types of production centered on information and communication technology, and the high profile given by government and corporate sectors to this area on the basis of the impact made by Indian Information Technology know-how in the global market. In terms of the consumer economy, this context has been marked by an accelerated availability of communication and media forms, from telephony through to satellite broadcasting and cable television, and new systems of distribution and delivery based on digitized formats. Much of this has taken the form of corporate initiatives, with considerable state backing. However, such transformation has not been controllable, and has given rise to different and contested circuits of production, circulation and consumption. Rather than an image of corporate enterprise and leadership, the second focus looks to the phenomenon of more informal, dispersed types of initiative, challenging attempts to control new economic forms through a burgeoning regime of intellectual property rights.³

Where do we place the cinema in this firmament? What does an exploration of the cinema offer us in terms of understanding the new relations between the state, corporate enterprise, media and public life? We have a new context for Indian cinema in the 1990s, one which contrasts sharply to its official status during the decades after independence. If from the 1950s, the cinema in its dominant, commercial format was understood by the state to be a form that did not warrant sympathetic policies, was to be taxed and regulated in order to control its dubious attractions for a mass audience, then the situation has changed substantially. One of the major issues here has been the emergence of a significant market, getting high returns, in Indian cinema's export oriented sector. The phenomenon went hand in hand with the reframing of the nation-state, and, indeed of the national imaginary. Rather than the territorial nation, whose economy, boundaries, and cultural protocols needed protection, we witness the emergence of the global nation, where non-resident Indians come to have an increasingly high profile, symbolically expressed in the annual prime ministerial meetings with the success stories of what are now referred to as PIOs, People of Indian Origins.⁴ Of course, one must emphasize that such a global nation is skewed in its deployment of boundaries, retaining new forms of openness for the successful diaspora, and otherwise constantly emphasizing territoriality when monitoring the movement of undesirable populations across South Asian borders.

The increased importance of the high-end migrant culture, along with the spectacular movement of software engineers into different sites of the world economy, now project the idea of India as a world power with greater confidence. Significantly, rather than yoke such a newly found pride and expansionist logic to a national art cinema,

it has been the commercial mainstream film which has invited most attention. And the export market has been a crucial component in the profile of returns on Indian films by the turn of the century.

\$250,000 was considered a dream figure for overseas rights 10 years ago. Today worldwide rights for a major Indian film range from \$2m-\$3m. The rights for Hindi films in South Africa sell for \$50,000, in Australia for \$60,000. Equally good for non-Hindi. *Muthu* grossed \$1.7m in 23 weeks at a cinema in Japan, and his next film, *Padayappa* was sold in Japan for \$50,000.⁵

The success of Bombay (and Tamil) cinema is composed of a series of intersecting investments, in multi-media forms of distribution and exhibition, (cinema, DVD, VCD, satellite broadcast, video on demand, as well as music rights), and in relation to fashion, advertising, the music industry, Internet websites and live performances. The success of this enterprise suggests how important new corporate cultures have become to the fashioning of the global nation. Earlier arguments that Indian film consumption abroad was important in negotiating identity dilemmas amidst a metropolitan modernity that subordinated ethnic cultures no longer carries the same conviction.⁶ Thus Indian capital abroad has had occasion to bestride public culture triumphantly, displaying its wares in mainline shops, restaurants, cinemas and theatres. A case in point was the month long focus by the well-known British departmental store, Selfridges, in May 2002, highlighting Indian décor and clothes, and deploying a 'Bollywood' theme in its London and Manchester shops. During this period a broad based promotion of South Asian film, dance, theatre and music was undertaken as well, called Imaginasia.⁷

I do not mean to sound judgmental about this cinema simply because of its association with a new, assertive dimension of capital. Especially in the United Kingdom, it has generated a new space for multi-cultural engagements, circumstances which have allowed for innovative outputs which lampoon some of the canonical differences and hierarchies of an earlier metropolitan culture, as witnessed in the brilliance of creations such as the British Indian sitcom *Goodness Gracious Me* (Meera Sayal et al, 1997-2000). If this would indicate the creative end of the spectrum, it is significant how a formerly 'middle' or realist cinema of the diaspora, for example by Mira Nair and Gurinder Chadha, have actively partaken of export-oriented Bombay cinema's investment in the world of the family as commodity form. In contemporary Bombay, the 'traditional' identity presented by family films provides a sheen, a glossy texture where ritual forms such as the marriage, its modes of ornamentation and performance provide a lustrous drape to clothe the self in and offer others transient distraction. This has been the mode for films from *Hum Aapke Hain Kaun*, (Who Am I To You? Sooraj Barjatya, 1994) through to *Dilwale Dulhania Le Jayenge*, (Brave of Heart Wins the Bride, Aditya Chopra 1995) *Pardes/Foreign Land*, (Subhash Ghai, 1997), *Kal Ho Na Ho/Whether or Nor There's a Tomorrow* (Nikhil Advani, 2004), and even down to films such as Gurinder Chadha's *Bride and Prejudice* (2004). Arguably, Mira Nair's *Monsoon Wedding* too can be bracketed in this cycle of production, despite uncovering a narrative of incest trauma and unhappy alliances within the armature of a so-called traditional family culture. This is because it uses the format of the brand – including its ornamentation, energy and performative excesses – in order to place itself in the world market of art cinema, where differentiation from mainstream products provides a distinctive selling point. Crossing the familiarities of an ornamental commodity universe with social concern, Nair's work here appears to spring from a confluence similar to that of the mass cultural genre it seeks to critique and establish a distance from. But in the process it achieved a cross-over success that almost brought it on par with the mainstream 'Bollywood' film.⁸

This question of the extended commodity functions of this cinema also potentially destabilizes the inside/outside dichotomies of the nation. By this logic, a burgeoning world of newly available commodities mobilizes a desire for narratives that both express and draw upon this fascination, while seeking to generate an identity equilibrium within which these desires can be cohered, made happy. The drama of the extended family provides the generic format to explore these drives not only across territorial boundaries, but also across the emergent boundaries initiated by the unleashing of new forms of desire at 'home'. I say only potentially as, while these films are often as successful in India's metropolises as they are abroad, audience profiles and cultural contexts are not the same, and an analysis of different reception contexts could provide for a suggestive mapping of the cultures of Indian film going.

Whatever the complex and differentiated qualities of contemporary film culture, one trend seems clear: the state is not so much concerned, anymore, with providing an authentic rendering of cultural identity through a national aesthetic, as was the case in the years after independence. As I have noted, at that time there was constant anxiety to avoid the trap of derivative culture, especially the influence of American culture, and a depletion of traditional art and craft values. In a sense, what we are observing now, at least at the crucial level of the high profile, export oriented Bombay film, is the displacement of nation as art form by nation as brand, adding and deriving distinction and value from products which circulate widely, servicing the global nation in its identity triumphs and struggles, and earning substantial profits. Interestingly, brand India is embraced enthusiastically in the wider bid to convert nations into brand equity, as for example with the recent cultivation of Indian cinema and its apparatus of location shooting and tourism by brand Switzerland, a term knowingly used by the President of one of the most popular resorts of the global India's cinematic vista.⁹

Bollywood, Mark I: The transformation of the Bombay film economy

One of the remarkable features of this transformation is the emergence of the category 'Bollywood'. Nowadays, this term is used as if it had always existed. It is used profusely in trade magazines, television shows, and popular periodicals, and it is used retrospectively. While looking at trade papers of the 1990s, I only started noticing its regular usage in the latter part of the decade. Clearly, it may have been used at various times, but not so systematically as now. Commonsense would suggest that earlier usages would be idiomatic and casual, perhaps sending up the pretensions of a third world imitator of the real American thing. However, there is no such sense of this now, and it would be reasonable to go with the logic that it emerged in the wake of the success of the diaspora-themed films from *DDLJ* onwards. More specifically, the term might then be associated with the reinvention of the family film genre to address not only diaspora audiences but to provide a *mise-en-scene* for the new types of commoditization that have developed around cinema in India.

Ashish Rajadhyaksha has drawn on this set of associations and gone on to designate Bollywood in more expansive terms, as referring to the ensemble of interests that govern the contemporary entertainment industry.¹⁰ In this definition, film is only one element, even if one from which other entertainment and consumer sectors, in television, music, advertising, fashion and websites, derive cultural capital. Rajadhyaksha's argument about the cinema makes a strong bid to emphasise the political significance of its mass cultural influence. He believes that the Bollywood ensemble has fundamentally redefined the lack of fit we have observed between mainstream cinema and nation-state after independence. In his argument, the disjunction between official plans for the cinema's role in the national culture, and the prevailing culture of cinema, afforded the working out of a variety of critical conflicts with the ambition of nation-state architects to institute a civil social form with adequate cultural constituents. These would, for example, include a cinema more oriented to realism and classical and folk art practices.

Rajadhyaksha situates the cinema's historical and political significance in its extension of the field of rights, where the purchase of a ticket afforded the filmgoer a right to a view.¹¹ Here, the cinema provided a space for public access and congregation that was symbolically significant in a society which had prevented those low in the social hierarchy from participating in spaces of public spectacle and performance. Specifically, this was a ritual public, composed of spaces ranging from the temple to various types of classical and ritual performance.¹² This type of right exceeded the ensemble of rights disbursed by the modern enumerative state in relation to citizens who were entitled to vote and thereby receive welfare. Rather, the state had to regulate the rights of the filmgoer, for the cinema generated an illegitimate content which exposed its viewers to cultural denigration. Thus the Government imposed taxes, and subjected films to moral regulation through censorship. As with subaltern and post-colonial societies more generally, the cinema echoed the messier dimensions of democracy's bid for inclusiveness, exhibiting and channeling mass energies that exceeded the normative and procedural prescriptions of an elite modernity.¹³

In Rajadhyaksha's view, contemporary changes in state policy and industrial initiative have threatened these democratic features of the cinema. The threat arises from the new forms of corporatization that have secured the industrial recognition, financial investment and cultural legitimacy historically denied to the cinema. This reorganization has taken place at the cost of the cinema itself, insofar as it was a field of resistance to the imposition of an elite modernity, and provided an arena of contests around social and cultural transformation. The Bollywood sector of Indian film production is anti-cinema, not only because the cinema occupies only a small, if significant space in its commodity complex, but also because it has secured legitimacy and instituted a reformist imaginary long in the making. For Rajadhyaksha, in terms of narrative form, this question of legitimacy is an identitarian project, to do with successfully laying claim to an indigenous authenticity. And it appears to simultaneously regulate and discipline audience responses in that it successfully addresses its audience as a family audience and on the basis of 'family values'.

This is one of several areas where this otherwise insightful mapping of contemporary film economy appears problematic. Firstly, the argument does not appear to accept that criteria of what constitutes indigenous authenticity have changed between the 1950s and the present.

...in the barely concealed claims to some sort of reformism that Bollywood so often presents these days in its biggest successes – the claim of commitment to family values, to the 'feel-good-happy-ending' romance that carries the tag of 'our culture' – one can see the ghosts of past trends going quite far back into time. The problem of the cinema's legitimacy has, since the pre-War years, consistently produced version after version of what was claimed as culturally authentic cinema – authentic because authenticated by the national culture. One distant ancestor to, say, *HAHK*, [*Hum Aapke Hain Kaun?*] would be the pre-War 'Swadeshi' movie – the devotionals and socials emphasizing *indigenism* of story and production. Post-War and in the early years of Independence, there was the first descendant of this indigenism – the cinema that the State repeatedly anointed as 'authentically national'. The process of authentication in this time was more palpable than the films that benefited by various declarations of recommended viewing – and continues to be so, if we see, for example, the extraordinary premium that the film industry continues to place upon the government's national film awards and its tax exemption criteria. One could safely say, however, that among the candidates vying for this kind of accreditation were included Devika Rani and Ashok Kumar socials from the Bombay Talkies studios, reformist musicals such as some of Raj Kapoor's work or some from Dev Anand's Navketan production house (both of which often hired ex-practitioners from the IPTA movement of the 1940s) and realist-internationalist films by directors from Satyajit Ray to Bimal Roy to the early Merchant-Ivory...'¹⁴

It is not clear what defines this peculiar ancestry, as the claims of 'indigenism' of story and production was something that much of Indian cinema laid claim to from the time of DG Phalke onwards. But Rajadhyaksha's argument appears to be that devotional (sometimes seen as a kind of medieval social reform movie by pro-realist critics such as K A Abbas¹⁵), social, 'reformist musical', 'realist-internationalist' films shared certain rationalist drives that fitted a civil-social agenda to educate and reform cinema audiences. If indigenist legitimacy was the claim of this assemblage of films (an unusual one, to put it *very* mildly), then it could only be insofar as 'realism' claims the capacity to be true to the life patterns (and conflicts) of peoples.

Rather than a very loosely defined realist reformism being the ancestor to 'Bollywood', the 'family social' film would appear to be its more obvious predecessor. Madhava Prasad, of course argued that such a feudal family romance, vehicle for the reproduction of 'traditionally regulated social relationships', was in fact the dominant narrative mode of popular Hindi cinema in the 1950s and 1960s.¹⁶ By this logic, rather than Bollywood bringing the family into a position of symbolic and disciplinary ascendancy, it was already in place as the central structuring feature of popular cinema. Further, it was this form, and its system of assemblage through song, dance and comedy, that was looked down upon in state cultural policy and its funding practices, and in the realist protocols instituted by an art cinema intelligentsia. From their perspective, narrative reform required a fundamental reworking of a popular format that had failed to develop industrial coherence, realist methods and psychological portraiture. Chidananda

Das Gupta, a key figure of the art cinema/film society movement, would in fact specify popular narrative structures which cultivated individual subordination to the family as one of the central problems of the popular format.¹⁷ There is a huge gap then between earlier state and art cinema discourses of narrative reform and Rajadhyaksha's invocation of the family as the lynchpin of a long-term reformist discourse.

I have argued that the family film does not, in fact, provide the dominant architecture of the popular. The cinema was generically differentiated, and familial thematics too had a shifting function in the articulation of narrative structures.¹⁸ However, let me backtrack slightly, and offer a different argument to support the centrality of the family in terms of long-term institutional imagination. The critical issue here is not the complexity and variety of what we see on the screen, but what we are not allowed to see, and how this structures the terms of narration. In a crucial sense, Prasad's argument about the feudal family romance centres on how an absolutist gaze constrains the privacy of the couple by textual procedures secured by the institution of censorship.¹⁹ This is echoed in a key document of industrial reform advocacy, the Film Enquiry Committee Report of 1951. While asserting the need for more varied stories and the cultivation of a liberal outlook in terms of social change, for example in the position of women, the committee nevertheless asserted that in India, people preferred to seek entertainment as families.

owing to the family life and habits of Indians in general, we cannot imagine a state of affairs where the parents would generally be ready to go to pictures leaving their children behind. We therefore consider that any plan for the future of the film industry must take account of the fact that these would be seen in an overwhelming majority of cases by adults along with other members of their families. It is necessary therefore, not merely to exercise the greater care in the selection of the material for making pictures but also in their scrutiny when the films are being certified²⁰

The committee's recommendation of state support for industrial reform by sympathetic tariff, taxation and funding policies needs to be counterpointed with a lack of any reform perspective on censorship.²¹ This emphasis was to change with the GD Khosla report of 1969, which argued for a greater flexibility in the depiction of sexuality.²² But even after this, we do not observe a substantial change in what Prasad underlines as a key feature of the regime, the prohibition on the kiss as mark of the privatized space of the couple. In this sense the family as a symbolic limit and disciplinary frame already existed under the aegis of state censorship, it did not have to be brought into being by the new life provided the family film in the contemporary epoch.

Current changes have addressed, explicitly or implicitly, the key constraints which have dogged the institution of cinema since Independence. The Government gave cinema industrial recognition in 1998, and by 2000 banks were formally instructed 'that the central government had listed the entertainment industry including films as an approved activity under industrial concern.'²³ Further, while not reducing the onerous burden of entertainment tax, a number of state governments nevertheless waived it for the periods when multiplex cinemas were being introduced, normally for a three-year period.²⁴ Many states have also pursued flexible municipal policies, allowing land allocated for single screen cinema to be redeployed for multiplex and mall construction, revising statutory cheap ticket classes to target upper class cinemagoers, and more generally making the cinema into a crucial dimension in the fashioning of a new urban vista and consumer economy to attract corporate investment.²⁵ And, while the NFDC continues to fund an art cinema, it is notable that many directors associated with the arts cinema wing, such as Shyam Benegal and Sudhir Mishra, have turned to new corporate investors, such as Sahara Manoranjan and Pritish Nandy Communications for their finance.²⁶ These corporations in turn fund a varied spectrum of commercial filmmaking. Finally, censorship remains a crucial regulatory drive, but its application appears to focus political issues, rather than the representation of sexuality. Thus the key films to suffer censorship have been *Zakhm*, (1999) for its stance against the Hindu Right, *Black Sunday* (Anurag Kashyap, 2005, released 2007), dealing with the bomb blasts that shook Mumbai in 1993, and the documentaries *War and Peace* (Anand Patwardhan, 1998), on India's nuclear bomb, and *The Final Solution* (Rakesh Sharma, 2003), documenting the Hindutva attacks on Muslims in Gujarat in 2002. Notably, films sold on the depiction of sexuality, especially a spate of films produced by Mahesh Bhatt, have not run into any trouble. Interestingly, this is in contrast to the trouble faced by films depicting lesbian

relationships such as Deepa Mehta's *Fire*, (1996) but here again the main source of opposition has been street level violence launched by extremist wings of the Hindu Right to intimidate cinema managements.

This suggests that the family drama, as vehicle of moral order and social regulation is no longer the lynchpin of the contemporary cinematic institution. The transformation of the cinema, and its location within an entertainment and image business spectrum, so well described by Rajadhyaksha, is not clearly yoked to one narrative/institutional architecture. The cinema emerging from this new configuration of the business is varied in its genre structures, much more so than ever before, and this is intimately related to corporatization and its bid to create differentiated product. Whether such product requires significant returns from foreign markets still has to be evaluated, especially, one would anticipate, in spheres such as dvd sales, satellite broadcasting and video on demand. Even modest returns in these sectors would be useful to films of lower budgets. In turn, our sense of consumption patterns for Indian cinema in a global sense might undergo substantial change.

Bollywood Mark II: Multi-sited histories of Indian cinema.

"It's a term only foreigners who don't know our films use". Shah Rukh Khan in conversation with Derek Malcolm, 2002²⁷

"Do not call it Bollywood. This is a very wrong thing to call it. We are not trying to copy Hollywood. We are making films for an audience of a billion people. Over 80% of these people don't have enough food in their bellies. Our country does not provide its people with pool halls, basketball courts and video parlours, so we make films for them that will let them forget their lives for 3 hours. We create total fantasy, not the polished reality that Hollywood portrays. Never forget that, never forget that we are making films that allow people to believe for 3 hours that they are not poor and hungry". Subhash Ghai, 2002²⁸

We have the remarkable phenomenon that representative filmmakers and actors such as Subhash Ghai and Shah Rukh Khan should react against the very brand name which has garnered them such high, easily recognizable global profile. As I will suggest now, this is particularly ironic for the term has been embraced not only by journalists and publicists but by academics as well, at least in the United Kingdom and the USA. The disavowal by key representatives of the Bombay film industry underlines the impression that the term and the brand actually emerged outside India, in places like Birmingham, Leicester and Bradford, where Hindi films are marketed and advertised as Bollywood, and in the bid to capitalize on the 'brand' in film-location economies outside India. However, to denigrate this 'misdescription' as emerging from culturally deracinated contexts may too easily accept what are essentially nationalist terms of criticism that assert the distinctiveness and originality of Bombay Hindi cinema, and the rights of those in India to name it.

In fact there seem to be two types of cultural nationalism at stake in contemporary film discourse about Bollywood. The first we could call a Bollywoodian discourse of cultural nationalism. By this I mean a discourse about cinema which has emerged in the wake of global strategies for Bombay film and for the integration of the film economy with other image/sound/music industries such as fashion, interior design, advertising and music. The nationalism of this discourse would lay claim to a distinct cultural constituency that has retained its identity wherever it is located, an identity which can be brought into being and nourished by a particular type of cinematic address; at the same time, the particular ambition of this strategy is exactly to supplement or exceed that national audience by composing a product whose balance of spectacle, choreography, costumes and music should create an allure for a cross-over audience. If this is one's working definition of 'Bollywood', one can be Bollywoodian without subscribing to the brand name. The second, on the other hand, avowedly contests the Bollywood label, apparently insisting on the location of national culture and its cinema 'at home', and as something which specifically addresses not the westernized sectors but the mass of people outside the circuits of modernized leisure and commodity experience. In practice, the very people who espouse this second position such as Ghai and Khan are also robust icons of Bombay cinema's global spread, its integration with other image/music enterprises, in a word, its Bollywoodization. Claims to being the authentic voice of India does not prevent the industry, at one and

the same time, of relaying this Indianness both at home and abroad, for the global nation and for foreign, cross-over audiences.

Arguably, the usage of the Bollywood category is complicated when we shift our location to a diaspora context. I undertake a preliminary exploration of this territory by considering the academic discourse which has emerged around Bollywood in these locations, and primarily the British context. It is perhaps not surprising that the incidence of academic usage replicates the privileged diasporic reference point for the category's emergence and usage in trade and popular discourse. Three features appear notable about this output. The more pedestrian of these is that Bollywood has provided a brand name for publishers to position their product, a phenomenon which probably also pressurizes authors to adopt this category. As a result, the titles of a number of books, which might earlier have simply used Hindi cinema, or 'popular Indian cinema', now use the term Bollywood; however, after indicating the currency of the term in global discourse, they then jettison any use of it when they talk about Indian popular film history.²⁹ What in such instances could be seen to be a compulsion deriving from academic-institutional 'brand equity' may, in a second logic of naming, indicate a more substantial investment, the relative emphasis placed by certain authors on film experience not in India but in the key diasporic locations of the UK and USA. Such a motivation, driven by the impulses of geographical location are often supplemented by a third logic, that of contemporary engagement, often resulting in a cavalier relationship to the past of Indian film. Thus, the term Bollywood has been read back in time, with one account telling us blithely that

the history of Bollywood film viewing in Britain dates as far back as 1926, when King George V and Queen Mary held a command performance of *Prem Sanyas (Light of Asia)* at Windsor Castle. This film was made in 1925 and co-directed (sic.) by the Indo-German team of Himansu Rai and Franz Osten³⁰

The anachronistic usage of the term is startling in its unselfconsciousness. A mise-en-scene of the royal personage overseeing orientalist spectacle appears brazenly penetrated by Shah Rukh Khan and an assembly of bhangra dancers. The casual relationship to history appears only corroborated by the wrong attribution to Himansu Rai of the direction of *Light of Asia*.

What is intriguing is that 'Bollywoodian' criticism does not fail to notice the question mark hanging over the status of the category. After noting the argument that the word may have been generated by "some cocky white journalist to describe the Indian film industry in a somewhat idiosyncratic and derogatory manner", Rajinder Dudrah goes on to note, "Uncertainties aside... Bollywood is more popularly described in relation to, and against, the hegemony of Hollywood... The naming and popular usage of the Mumbai film industry as 'Bollywood' not only reveals on a literal level an obvious reworking of the appellation of the cinema of Hollywood, but, on a more significant level, that Bollywood is able to serve alternative cultural and social representations away from dominant white ethnocentric audio-visual possibilities".³¹

As we will see, it is the argument that Bollywood offers a positive, even counter-hegemonic dynamic to Hollywood and American capitalism, that appears to motivate some of this academic work. The argument is notable too in the introduction to *Bollyworld: Popular Indian Cinema through a Transnational Lens*.³² In this case, also, we notice the fleeting acknowledgment that the category Bollywood is debatable, an admission swiftly recouped as a sign of productive hybridity.

In its very (sometimes) contentious name, Bollywood cinema indicates the crossing of borders. The hybrid term refers to India's commercial Hindi film industry, based primarily, but not exclusively, in the city of Bombay, now officially designated as Mumbai since 1995. It has a complex history, but much like Hollywood, this commercial industry has hegemony over the diverse, regional cinema in India, and circulates globally, from Japan to the US, through a transnational distribution network as well as video piracy.³³

The swift glossing over of the 'contentious' term moves us to a 'complex history' whose invocation includes the mis-description that Bombay's Hindi film industry exercises hegemony over the region. Such a statement is either

ignorant of or indifferent to the power of India's Tamil, Telugu and Malayalam cinemas which often produce more films than Bombay. This strangely casual attitude leads to the hazy claim that Bollywood's reach extends to Japan, which probably refers to the avowed craze of Japanese film audiences not for Hindi but for Tamil cinema, and, in particular, the cinema of Rajnikant.

However, while I certainly believe this gestural relationship to history and, indeed, to cinema, needs to be challenged, to focus on this alone would be to fail to register the issues posed by this writing. The fact that the authors actually acknowledge the uncertain status of the term but nevertheless embrace it, suggests a will to assert some kind of insistent presence through it. As such they provide a window into a particular form of experience that seeks to complicate the idea that Indian popular cinema is primarily understood as centred in India. Such a change of focus implicitly urges a multi-sited tracking of Hindi cinema rather than privileging one space, the point of apparent origins, over others. This is an important agenda, if one that needs to be thought through more carefully than it has been in the introduction to the *Bollywood* volume. Secondly, pro-Bollywood academic discourse tends often to be contemporary in its focus. In the primarily sociological and ethnographic engagements of Dudrah, for example, there appears to be a strong investment in a contemporary culture composed of Hindi cinema, satellite broadcasting, music, especially hybrid forms such as bhangra rap, and practices such as club nights and live entertainment. Collectively, these appear quite critical to the author's account of group practices and cultural identification that is potentially counter-hegemonic in its implications.

The stated aim of the *Bollywood* volume is to expand the terms of historical thinking, by collating a loose cluster of research that roams in space and time, going as far back as the 1930s, and moving from North to South Africa, and onto Germany, England, New York, and into the cultural experience of a host of different migrant communities, their second and third generation descendants. The ambition proposed by the editors is to question a national framework for 'Bollywood', and to argue that both as product and as experience, transnational aesthetic impulses, and multiple sites of reception constituted popular Indian film.³⁴

There are several problems with what at first glance has the virtue of a more open and exploratory approach in researching film history. Firstly, I do not believe it is sufficient to suggest that transnational film circulation and multiple aesthetic currents determine the output of a specific industry. There are obviously context driven ways of selecting and configuring influences, and, further, to understand the impact of such currents, we need to mobilize some form of analysis that will move us beyond the impressionistic (and widely made) statement that Hong Kong kung fu cinema impacted Bombay in the 1970s. Also, rather than dismissing the national as an oppressive and restrictive conceptual frame, we need clearer investigation of how the national frame functions: as in the films and genres national industries produce, the way the state regulates the industry through censorship, licensing and other controls, what films are imported, and how film content is distributed through the various film circuits which define the market. One does not need to be nationalist to pursue these questions. Further, the transnational needs greater precision in its usage, as Fredrick Cooper has argued about the more general category of the global.³⁵ Regional distribution offices in the Middle East, North, East and South Africa date back to the 1940s and were feeding into a particular market for 'Arabian night stories', and Laila Majnu, Shireen Farhad style love legends. There were definite narrative and performative cultures involved here that included North India in their field. These cultures were pre-national, and continued to have an existence after the formation of nation-states, but were thus transnational in a very specific arc of shared culture.³⁶

The particular composite nature of popular film form in India certainly distinguished it from the traditions of Hollywood film-making, while still generating, in the long run, definite narrative conventions and musical forms which underwent changes in interaction with new constellations of film, musical, and literary cultures. However, Kaur and Sinha require this composite form to do something more:

If Hollywood represents the homogenizing effect of American capitalism in global cultures, a study of Bollywood allows a unique opportunity to map the contrasting move of globalization in popular culture. Bollywood's integration with film studies has brought it closer to the conceptual frameworks developed for Hollywood narratives (audience voyeurism, narrative techniques and so on), and consequently

Hollywood's cultural capitalism is mapped, consciously or unconsciously, onto that of India's commercial cinema. One fundamental difference between Hollywood and Bollywood is that the former pushes world cultures towards homogenization, whereas the latter introduces in those cultures a fragmentary process. Hybrid in its production since its beginnings, the circulation of India's commercial cinema through the globe has led to the proliferation and fragmentation of its fantasy space, as its narrative and spectacle beget diverse fantasies for diasporic communities and others.³⁷

Contra this formulation about Hollywood, writers such as Miriam Hansen have argued the importance of the diverse and reinventable terms of Hollywood cinema, especially in the way its body genres circulated and were reformatted in different territories, and how films were altered, for example in terms of endings, to suit different markets.³⁸ The issue then is not simply one of one form and industrial culture inviting a singular, homogenizing textual effect and corresponding theoretical apparatus, and the other resisting it.³⁹ Hollywood cinema too has been subject to 'fragmentation' and its meanings recalibrated. Such an unsettling of textual unity and coherence relates not only to a changed evaluation of how films circulate, the forms they assume and the meanings they acquire in different contexts. It is also a definite methodological intervention that points to linkages between film and other sound/image/design elements within a wider economy of perception. Thus aspects of Hollywood films, its specific genres and ancillary features such as publicity, have been explored, for example, to generate linkages with window shopping,⁴⁰ sensationalist photo journalism, urban mapping and spatial practices,⁴¹ discourses of domesticity⁴² and of mobility, for example in gauging the status and imagination surrounding different technologies of transportation.⁴³ And, in the context of Indian film studies, we have observed similar currents recently, for example in Ranjani Mazumdar's research into the linkages between contemporary film culture, and practices ranging from urban planning and spatial mapping to fashion photography and interior design.⁴⁴ These approaches do not necessarily supplant an engagement with story-telling codes and practices; rather they engage filmic material in a meta narrative relating to another story, for example that of the transformations in economies of desire wrought by the market, the recalibration of sense perception in the wake of modern technological changes, and the story of the city, its built and imaginary environment, its relay of speed and danger, of crowds and anonymity. This engagement with such an interpenetrative design, where elements in one discipline/field/business of perceptual organisation are made to speak to others, expands the terms on which the interpretation of film narrative is undertaken, rather than to sideline narrative itself. Further, this offers new opportunities to think about the effect of cinematic images, sequence, and generic elements as films circulate in different territories and offer modular forms with which to engage audiences in new regimes of sensational experience, as Hansen suggests.⁴⁵

Bollywood's tendentious story of Hollywood hegemony versus Bollywood diversity thus begs the question whether Hollywood is, indeed, as unified a phenomenon as the formulation requires it to be. Further, the argument that Indian cinema has a fragmentary dimension which allows for it to appeal and recombine with diverse local cultures may also beg the question whether such attraction is so unbounded. As I have argued, the longer history of Indian film circulation indicates its participation in a cultural arc where there are overlaps in certain narrative, musical and performance cultures. Such cultural networks were subject to revision and augmentation, especially after the formation of nation-states, when cultural exchange between states, eg India and the Soviet Union, opened up new markets and cultural territories, in the Soviet bloc, China, and, probably as some kind of knock-on effect, in the privatized distribution territories of Greece⁴⁶ and Turkey⁴⁷ as well; and again, when under the impact of globalization, the Bombay film industry entered the US and UK markets on new terms.

Keeping this in mind, we will note that the articles on Bombay film reception in this volume make very different entry points into understanding the attraction of Indian films. The first and most straightforward of these relates not to diversity but to a certain sameness of experience: how diasporic Indian communities view films as families, and to negotiate generational differences and cultural challenges posed by the new cultural context. From Marie Gillespie's work on video consumption in South Asian families, to *Bollywood* articles by Christiane Brosius on Germany⁴⁸ and Narmala Halstead⁴⁹ on West Indian migrants, it is not fragmentation and recombination which such accounts retail, but a fairly systematic cultural function internal to the diaspora community. Such an allure, centred

on ideas of kin obligation and filial duty have also more generally been understood to be the attraction Indian popular films offer audiences avowedly defined by traditional social mores. We may be skeptical that Hindi films elicit such a consistent type of reception across the world, and on the grounds of an affiliation to traditional social norms. I have earlier suggested that the idea of a transitional social and cultural context might provide us with a sense of the attractions involved,⁵⁰ but this needs to be fleshed out if such a formulation is not to collapse into that of a sociological explanation. Here Brian Larkin's article on *bandiri* music provides for a significant point of departure. Where his earlier writing gave us a vivid sense of the place of the cinema within the coordinates of urban transformation in an Islamic society,⁵¹ the article on *bandiri* engages with the content and form of cultural experience and, more specifically, the handling of the erotic rather than familial dimensions of 'Bollywood' films.⁵² This is not fragmentation, and its recombinations are deeply ambivalent, as Hindi film melodies are used with words that apparently abide by cultural injunctions against the expression of erotic desire. The issue here seems to go beyond the countering of Hollywood by affiliation with its more diversified other. For this is an appropriation of Indian film melody, at once gesturing to the original and its erotic content for the knowledgeable spectator/listener, and apparently neutralizing it through the observation of local religious injunction. Thus, for this operation, Bollywood too is problematic, and the task is to manoeuvre the problematic allure of 'Bollywood' into 'local' forms.

Here film-related elements such as music are made over into a new cultural composition and practice. If Larkin suggests how this happens with *Bandiri* music, then Dudrah's ethnography of clubs where Hindi film images provide a background into which images and sequences are inserted is an index of the assemblage.⁵³ Elements are separated out and reconfigured, and the space/image/sound relation becomes the very site of subjectivity. Dudrah's ethnographic work with Amit Rai in New York extends the idea of the assemblage as the intersection between cinema hall and auditory, visual and tactile bodily pleasures available in the surrounding space, and through the sound and image technologies whose regime of simultaneity connect the subject to a wider universe.⁵⁴

These is an imaginary here which refuses the limits of the cinema hall, or of a unified filmic address in defining the scope of film experience. For, in these accounts, filmic experience is now substantially hybridized as it is entangled, mixed, remodeled, by its mobilization into the highly fluid forms of contemporary media experience. However, even if we were to take the space and address of the cinema as primary vehicle of experience, we could still contest the idea that audience reception of the cinema event is of only of one type. Thus Raminder Kaur displays justifiable unease at the idea that the meanings of Hindi films can be accepted at face value, that is in terms of legitimizing fixed identities and 'family value', at least for younger, professional Indian film goers in Britain.⁵⁵ On the basis of conversations with filmgoers who are second or third generation Indians and Pakistanis, and presumably her own response, Kaur points out that her interviewees regard the film story, its characters and its message with skepticism, irony and pleasure, and, she estimates, a displaced identification. Identification is with the situation of viewing, and with the others who view, rather than with the screen fiction, and this provides the ground of cultural identification. This is in counterpoint to the involvement of an earlier generation who saw the cinema as vehicle of belonging (to earlier times and places). Bollywoodian criticism or, to put it less polemically now, criticism which takes the parameters of the contemporary diaspora as their primary object, like Dudrah or Kaur, seem to consciously divest the cinema of the identity longings associated with it by an earlier generation. In the process, the family is also supplanted as privileged context in which the Hindi cinema was experienced and afforded the possibilities of a shared culture and generational negotiation of identities⁵⁶ Such a critical disposition certainly appears to offer a more complex sense of diasporic film cultures than a strictly identity bounded one yoked to the axis of the past would. The alternative to a framework based on identity-derived and reinforcing film culture is not that clear, however. Dudrah, for example, seems to fall back on just such a function in his interviews with filmgoers. In his case, the more productive agenda appears to arise from an engagement with the ethnographies centred on mediatized spaces such as the dance clubs with their refabricated Hindi film *mise en scene* and the possibilities of mixed audiences.⁵⁷

There is another factor, exceeding that of consumption internal to the diasporic community. This is the particular self-image Hindi cinema conveyed to its audiences and to a wider public culture. Thus Thomas Blom Hansen notes that younger audiences had been falling off from viewing Hindi films in Durban, and *Kuch Kuch Hota Hai* changed all of that because it provided a modernized self-image to Indian youth, and in their perception, held up a more satisfactory mirror or window for non-Indian culture to look into. Here, as in England, there was a substantial shift in urban connotation when, after apartheid, hitherto white-controlled residential and upmarket commercial areas now changed hands. The cinema for Indian films now came to be located in more fashionable malls and shopping areas, and, while dominantly being consumed by Indians, nevertheless offered the possibility of a crossover audience. Here, in contrast to North Africa for instance, a history of segregation ensured that African viewership was minimal, and Indian film viewing thereby remained an activity restricted to the diasporic community.⁵⁸

There is a final, specifically oppositional cultural agenda to a certain strand of British based Bollywoodian criticism, and this relates to the carving out of a space within Black British Cultural Studies. In a more substantial engagement with local cinema history, Dudrah has sketched the history of cinema exhibition for Indian films in Birmingham, a major residential concentration for the diasporic population after the Second World War.⁵⁹ Three sequences emerge. The first immediately followed the war, capturing the moment of diasporic settlement. This has resonances with work by Nirmal Puwar on the Ritz cinema in Coventry, a specifically working class settlement associated with car manufacturing. In Puwar's account, the cinema hall was part of a longer history of public gathering, which involved live performances, wrestling matches, and political meetings, along with cinema screenings.⁶⁰ This is reminiscent of ways in which the cinema provided an opportunity or intersection with other types of popular performance and public interaction, as for example Kaushik Bhaumik has shown for the way the Girni Kamgar working class union of Bombay used halls in the 1920s.⁶¹ Other sequences follow in the wake of changes in urban geography and settlement, for example the settlement of inner cities by Asians and Black populations in the wake of white populations moving out. This occurred in the 1970s, and was substantially checked with the emergence of videocassette retail in the 1980s, in which the Asian video shop became a prominent market. Dudrah makes the important point here that the political engagement of Black British cultural studies reanimates places that were considered run down or depleted in terms of urban infrastructures by showing how regular cultural activity made these over into live public cultures. The final phase is that of the contemporary, where white-owned and frequented halls came under Asian management, and Indian film started being shown on a regular basis. The last phase relates to the current epoch, and the renewal of the Bombay film industry in its bid to create new linkages and generate new types of production.

This suggestive outline of different periods of Indian film exhibition in Birmingham emphasizes the role of Indian filmgoing in terms of community formation and public culture. However, the symptomatic naming both of present and past film cultures as Bollywood points to a crucial problem with the present state of play in this field. Crucial here is a substantial absence of the cinema, whether as textual form involving narrative and performance, or as industrial product, from the accounts generated in this body of work. The focus tends instead to be on audiences separated out from the practice of film viewing. Thus, even Dudrah's suggestive entry into the mapping of the different phases of post Second World War cinema lacks any reference to the agencies of film circulation, what films were shown or were popular in which circuits, a project which would render Indian film history in a more site-specific way.

The crucial problem with this contemporary launching point for analysis is the danger of accepting or involuntarily reproducing the parameters set by the business form. Thus Dudrah, Sinha, Kaur and others urge that Bollywood be taken as an alternative to Hollywood, as a bid to assert cultural choices against racially marked hierarchies determined by the value placed on Hollywood as the norm. However, 'Bollywood' as business is equally intent on being an alternative by breaking into markets dominated by American film, aiming for crossover appeal, and building complex commodity networks. So to valorize it indiscriminately appears merely to echo its objectives. These include 'Bollywood' motivating university degree courses, universities liaising with local business initiatives, metropolitan councils building on Bollywood's drive to set up venues equipped for location shooting, universities

and councils throwing themselves into the commercial networks of Bollywood film shows and awards, and museums staging 'Bollywood' retrospectives. While the generation of employment is hardly something to be indifferent to, and we may understand the rationale of local government getting on the Bollywood bandwagon, a scholarly agenda needs to develop autonomously of this logic.⁶²

A marked absence in these attempts to diagnose Bollywood, whether by Rajadhyaksha or the British and US based criticism, is any substantial reference to film form, story-telling practices, actorly and star economies, and even on-screen performance cultures. The filmic dimension of film studies seems to have been lost in the process of trying to understand the political economy and sociology of the cinema institution. I believe any agenda for the study of contemporary film culture needs to pay attention to such screen economies and practices, and require to take not only the 'Bollywood' family film seriously, but also the broader spectrum of film products, especially in relation to novel genre dynamics. There are substantial changes in the symbolic economy of the stories retailed by the contemporary institution of the cinema, ones more complex than any formulaic rendering of the cinema could capture. And these new forms, including performance cultures and actorly economies centred on stars such as Shah Rukh Khan offer us possibilities to think through the itinerary of Hindi cinema as it traverses a host of different spaces and audience cultures.

References:

¹ Cheryl Payer, *The Debt Trap: the IMF and the Third World*; Kavaljit Singh, *Global Financial Flows*, Madhyam, Zed Books, 2000; Cheryl Payer, *Lent and Lost: Foreign Credit and Third World*, Zed 1991; Richard Peet, *Unholy Trinity: the IMF, the World Bank and The WTO*, Zed, 2003

² See Lawrence Liang, 'Porous Legalities and Avenues of Participation', Solomon Benjamin, 'Touts, Pirates and Ghosts' for the possibilities of manoeuvring around the law in issues such as land allocation, access to urban amenities, and intellectual property contests; Anand Vivek Taneja, 'Begum Samru and the Security Guard', for changes in land allocation to facilitate the construction of malls and multiplexes in Delhi; 'Complicating the city: media itineraries', by Media Researchers@Sarai, all from *Sarai Reader 05: Bare Acts*, Delhi, CSDS, 2005. Awadhendra Sharan, 'Claims on Cleanliness: Environment and Justice in Contemporary Delhi', *Sarai Reader 02: The Cities of Everyday Life*, Delhi, CSDS, 2002; and 'New Delhi': fashioning an urban environment through science and law', in *Sarai Reader 04: Bare Acts*, for urban environment issues

³ For an overview, Ravi Sundaram, 'Uncanny Networks: Pirate, Urban and New Globalization', *Economic and Political Weekly* 39 (1), January 3 2004; Rakesh Kumar edited, *Medianagar*, 1 and 2, Delhi, Sarai-CSDS, 2004-2005

⁴ See the website of the organisation of PIOs, <<http://www.gopio.org>>

⁵ Bhuvan Lall, 'Indian Summer', *Screen International* 24 November 2000

⁶ Marie Gillespie, *Television, Ethnicity and Cultural Change*, New York, Routledge, 1995

⁷ See *Screen* 3 May 2002, <www.screenindia.com/archive> consulted 28 December 2007

⁸ *Monsoon Wedding* was the most successful of the 'cross-over films', and made returns of 3.2 million pounds in the UK and \$13.9 in the USA. *Screen Digest* July 2003. By 2002 it was reported that the standard return on a 'superhit' Bollywood film would be 3.8 million pounds, but importers were aiming to cross the 9 million barrier. Bhuvan Lall, 'Indian pins box office hopes on *Devdas*', , *Screen International*, 5 July 2002

⁹ *Screen*, May 2002. See also the moves of the Greater Zurich Area to encourage Indian film, tourism and other 'branded' products, including ayurveda and yoga, in the bid to 'brand' Switzerland as a base for European business. 'Switzerland keen to market Bollywood merchandise' *Times of India* online 28 September 2006, consulted 31 December 2007. <<http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/articleshow/2033440.cms>>

¹⁰ 'The Bollywoodization of Indian Cinema: Cultural Nationalism in a Global Arena', in *Inter-Asian Cultural Studies*, 4 (1) April 2003, special issue on 'Cinema, Culture Industry and Political Societies'.

- ¹¹ Also see his 'Viewership and Democracy' in Ravi Vasudevan ed., *Making Meaning in Indian cinema*, New Delhi : OUP, 2000.
- ¹² Rajadhyaksha draws on the work of Karthigesu Sivathamby, *Tamil Film as a Medium of Political Communication*, Madras, New Century Book House, 1981
- ¹³ For the argument about the contradictions between modernity and democracy, Partha Chatterjee, *The Politics of the Governed: Reflections on Popular Politics in Most of the World*, New York, Columbia University Press 2004
- ¹⁴ Rajadhyaksha, 130
- ¹⁵ K.A. Abbas, 'Sant Dnyaneshwar – his miracles and Manushya Dharma', *Bombay Chronicle* 25 May 1940, reprinted in Babu Watve, V. Damle and S. Fattal, Pune, National Film Archive of India, 1985, 33-35
- ¹⁶ *Ideology of the Hindi Film*, New Delhi, OUP, 1998, 30-31
- ¹⁷ Chidananda Das Gupta, 'The Oedipal Hero' in *The Painted Face: Studies in Indian Popular Cinema*, New Delhi, Roli Books, 1991, 70-106
- ¹⁸ 'Shifting Codes, Dissolving Identities', in Vasudevan, *Making Meaning*; and Vasudevan, *The Melodramatic Public*, forthcoming, chapter one
- ¹⁹ 'Guardians of the View: the Prohibition of the Private', *Ideology of the Hindi Film*.
- ²⁰ *Film Enquiry Committee*, 59; for the importance of more 'progressive' representation of women in the cinema, 45-46
- ²¹ For censorship, *Film Enquiry Committee*, 21
- ²² *Report of the Film Enquiry Committee on Film Censorship*, New Delhi, Government of India Publications, 1969
- ²³ Bhuvan Lall, 'The Talk of Mumbai... Industry Gains Its Wings', *Screen International*, 1 December 2000
- ²⁴ 'New multiplexes are granted a five-year tax subsidy by state governments: entertainment tax is waived for the first three years, and there's a 50 per cent and 25 per cent waiver for the fourth and fifth years respectively (by which time capital costs are more than recovered). Single-screen theatres, on the other hand, pay 45% entertainment tax', 'Multiplex Mafia Rules Tinsel Town', *The Times of India*, 29 May 2006, <<http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/articleshow/1585472.cms>>, consulted on 18 January 2008
- ²⁵ See Anand Vivek Taneja, 'Begum Samru and the Security Guard', *Sarai Reader 05: Bare Acts*
- ²⁶ Vasudevan, *The Melodramatic Public*
- ²⁷ *Vanity Fair* Supplement 2002, 4
- ²⁸ *Vanity Fair* Supplement 2002, 12
- ²⁹ This would be the case with Tejaswini Ganti, *Bollywood: a Guidebook to Popular Hindi Cinema*, Routledge 2004, and Vijay Mishra: *Bollywood: Temples of Desire*, Routledge 2002
- ³⁰ Rajinder Dudrah, *Bollywood: Sociology Goes to the Movies*, London, Sage, 2006,
- ³¹ Dudrah, op. cit.
- ³² edited by Ajay S. Sinha and Raminder Kaur, New Delhi, Sage, 2005
- ³³ *Bollyworld*, 16
- ³⁴ 'The question it explores is: how and in what ways did global dynamics take on such a regionalist or nationalistic veneer in the history of Indian cinema; and, how do movies from the subcontinent continue to interact with their global counterparts in their multifarious forms?' *Bollyworld*, 14. The first question, about how the national constrains our understanding of the wider network of which it is a part, is not really pursued. The editors themselves offer a rather unhelpful understanding of the national in their estimation of Phalke, for example. 'Phalke's Hindu mythologicals did not have an even affect on all parts and people of India, particularly if one considers the reluctance of Muslims to view movies about Hindu deities (apparently taken from Steve Hughes dissertation on early film exhibition in South India, 'Is there an audience out there', University of Chicago, 1996, 179, 185. In fact Hughes points out that while *Raja Harishchandra*, 1913, was not substantially exhibited in the South, *Shree Krishna Janma*, 1918, was, and was successful at large. Steve Hughes, 'Mythologicals and Modernity: Contesting Silent Cinema in South India', in Stephen P. Hughes and Birgit Meier edited *Postscripts: the Journal of Sacred Texts and Contemporary Worlds*, 1.2/1.3, 2006, 207-235. To assume that Muslims would not venture out to see Hindu

mythologicals suggests a fetishistic understanding of identity and its attributes. The introduction is also littered with strange remarks about the nature of Indian nationhood, eg. that “in the post-Independence years... Hindi language commercial cinema quickly came to be seen as the “national” cinema of India”. By whom? When the Indian government started its system of national awards, it was Ray’s *Pather Panchali* which won the first award. While the volume does not pursue the question of the national coherently, some of the articles productively address the second question, about interaction, especially those by Rosie Thomas and Brian Larkin.

³⁵ Fredrick Cooper, ‘What is the Concept of Globalization Good For? An African Historian’s Perspective’, *African Affairs* 100 189-213

³⁶ Vasudevan, *The Melodramatic Public*, introduction to Part Two

³⁷ *Bollyworld*, 15

³⁸ Miriam Hansen, ‘The Mass Production of the Senses’, in Christine Gledhill and Linda Williams edited *Reinventing Film Studies*, London, Edward Arnold, 2000

³⁹ This despite Hollywood’s extension of ideological hegemony through the apparatus of a film studies fashioned for it being imposed on the study of ‘Bollywood’ cinema!

⁴⁰ Anne Friedberg, *Window Shopping: Cinema and the Postmodern*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1993

⁴¹ See especially Edward Dimendberg, *Film Noir and the Spaces of Modernity*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press 2004

⁴² This is especially notable in studies of melodrama and the women’s film, and how such discourses reflect on constructions of the domestic sphere. See for example Kathleen Mchugh, *American Domesticity: From How To Manual to Hollywood Melodrama*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1999; Nancy Abelman deploys melodrama’s poetics of loss and pathos to explore the subjectivity of women riven from home through political upheavals and economic compulsions in the Korean context. See her ‘Melodramatic Texts and Contexts: Women’s Lives, Movies, and Men’ in Kathleen Mchugh and Nancy Abeleman edited *South Korean Golden Age Melodrama: Gender, Genre and National Cinema*, Wayne State University Press, 2005

⁴³ Lynn Kirby, *Parallel Tracks: the Railroad and Silent Cinema*, Durham, Duke University Press, 1996; Paul Virillio, *War and Cinema: The Logistics of Perception*, London, Verso, 1989; Ben Singer, *Melodrama and Modernity: Early Sensational Cinema and Its Contexts*, New York, Columbia University Press, 2001; Kristin Ross, *Fast Cars, Clean Bodies: Decolonization and the Reordering of French Bodies*, Cambridge, MIT Press, 1996

⁴⁴ Ranjani Mazumdar, *Bombay Cinema: Archive of the City*, Delhi, Permanent Black, 2007

⁴⁵ Miriam Hansen, ‘The Mass Production of the Senses’; ‘Falling Women, Rising Stars, New Horizons: Shanghai Silent Film as Vernacular Modernism’ *Film Quarterly* 54 (1), Autumn 2000, 10-22

⁴⁶ Dimitris Elefthoritis, ‘A Cultural Colony of India’, *South Asian Popular Culture*, 4(2) October 2006, 101-112.

⁴⁷ Ahmet Gurata, ‘Translation and Reception of Indian Cinema in Turkey: the Life of Awara’, forthcoming in Kaushik Bhaumik edited, *The Indian Cinema Book*, London, BFI publishing

⁴⁸ Christiane Brosiusec, ‘The Scattered Homelands of the Migrant: Bollyworld through the Diasporic Lens’, *Bollyworld*, 207-238

⁴⁹ Narmala Halstead, ‘Belonging and Respect Notions vis-a-vis Modern East Indians: Hindi Movies in the Guyanese East Indian Diaspora’, *Bollyworld*, 261-283’

⁵⁰ Vasudevan, ‘The Politics of Cultural Address in a ‘Transitional’ Cinema’, in Gledhill and Williams, *Reinventing Film Studies*.

⁵¹ Brian Larkin, ‘Materializing Culture: Cinema and the Creation of Social Space’ in Faye Ginsburg, Lila Abu-Lughod, Brian Larkin edited *Media Worlds: Anthropology on New Terrain*, Berkeley: University of California Press. pp. 319-336

⁵² ‘Bandiri Music, Globalisation and Urban Experience in Nigeria’, in Kaur and Sinha, *Bollyworld*, 284-308; see also Mathias Krings, ‘Muslim Martyrs and Pagan Vampires: the Popular Video Film and the Propagation of Islam in Northern Nigeria’, for how local film production simulates ‘Bollywood’ dance, but through an economy of bodily

presentation that attempts to curb sexual excess. 'Stephen Hughes and Birgit Meyer edited *Postscripts* 1.2/1.3, 2006, 183-204'

⁵³ 'Queer as Desis: Secret Politics of Gender and Sexuality in Bollywood Films in Diasporic Urban Ethnoscapes, Dudrah,' *Bollywood*, Chapter Five

⁵⁴ 'Bollywood Cinema-Going in New York city', Dudrah, *Bollywood*, Chapter Four

⁵⁵ Raminder Kaur, 'Cruising on the Vilayeti Bandwagon: Diasporic Representations and Reception of Popular Indian movies', in Kaur and Sinha, *Bollyworld*, 309-29

⁵⁶ Thus Rajinder Dudrah criticizes Gillespie for making the "flawed claim that a generational split can be detected in the ways in which first and second generation diasporic South Asians read popular Hindi cinema – the former as purveyors of cultural tradition and the latter as struggling to come to terms with cultural negotiation between the two generations" *Bollywood*

⁵⁷ 'Reading Popular Hindi Films in the Diaspora and the Performance of Urban Indian and Diasporic Identity', Dudrah, *Bollywood*, Chapter Three

⁵⁸ Thomas Blom Hansen, 'In Search of the Diasporic Self: Bollywood in South Africa', *Bollyworld*, 239-260

⁵⁹ Rajinder Dudrah, 'Vilayati Bollywood: Popular Hindi Cinema-Going and Diasporic South Asian Identity in Birmingham,' *The Public*, 9 (1) 2002, 19-36

⁶⁰ Nirmal Puwar', 'Kabhi Ritz, Kabhie Palladium: South Asian Cinema in Coventry 1940-1980', *Wasafiri*, Special Issue on Global Cinema. See also Nirmal Puwar's film *Coventry Ritz Cinema*, produced by AV Frontline, <<http://www.darkmatter101.org/site/2007/03/12/coventry-ritz-cinema>>

⁶¹ Kaushik Bhaumik, *The Emergence of the Bombay Film Industry, 1896-1936*, D.Phil thesis, Oxford, 2004

⁶² Yorkshire is central to the Bollywood project, with the district business associations and the Leeds Metropolitan University building ties centred on film location shooting, award shows and tourism. For information about this, see the online business magazine to promote Indian and European film ties, <www.iefilmi.com> *Yorkshire Forward* and the website of the Leeds Metropolitan University highlights local economic interests in 'Bollywood'.

Hindi cinema, often known as Bollywood and formerly as Bombay cinema, is the Indian Hindi-language film industry based in Mumbai (formerly Bombay). The term is a portmanteau of "Bombay" and "Hollywood". The industry is related to Cinema of South India and other Indian film industries, making up Indian cinema—the world's largest by number of feature films produced. Bollywood definition is - the motion-picture industry in India. 1969, in the meaning defined above. History and Etymology for Bollywood. Bombay (Mumbai), traditional center of the Indian film industry + Hollywood. Keep scrolling for more. Learn More About Bollywood. Share Bollywood. Post the Definition of Bollywood to Facebook Share the Definition of Bollywood on Twitter. Time Traveler for Bollywood. The first known use of Bollywood was in 1969. See more words from the same year. Dictionary Entries Near Bollywood. bolly gum. Bollywood. bolo. See More Nearby Entries. Statistics for Bollywood. Look-up Popularity. Cite this Entry. "Bollywood." Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary, Merriam-Webster, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/Bollywood>. Bollywood is the Hindi-language sector of the Indian film industry. There are several other film sectors within India, such as those of South India and Tollywood, but none are as big as Bollywood. Where is Bollywood actually located? The epicenter of Bollywood is in Mumbai (formerly Bombay). Why is it called Bollywood? The term Bollywood is a riff on Hollywood + Bombay, much like other global film markets such as Nollywood and Chinawood. Bollywood style is defined by expressive visuals and elaborate song and dance routines. But over the years, Bollywood has become an industry with diverse stories with global appeal. Notable Bollywood Movies. Mother India (1957). Special Feature RAVI VASUDEVAN The Meanings of "Bollywood"™ One of the dominant senses of our contemporary times is a massive sense of change in Indian urban life. Several nodes of transformation have been identified as the source of these changes, especially those of economic liberalization and globalization. 9 Bollywood, Mark 1: The transformation of the Bombay film economy One of the remarkable features of this transformation is the emergence of the category "Bollywood"™. Nowadays, this term is used as if it had always existed. It is used profusely in trade magazines, television shows, and popular periodicals, and it is used retrospectively.