

Phv

December

184

THE CINEMA SITUATION

a symposium on
the struggle for
a genuine expression

symposium participants

5 SEP 1977

DOCUMENTATION CENTRE

THE PROBLEM

A short statement of
the issues involved

MYTHS FOR SALE

Kumar Shahani, film maker and winner
of the national award for the best Hindi film
of 1972

THE SUCCESS FORMULA

Shyam Benegal, documentary
and feature film maker

COMMUNICATION

Mani Kaul, film maker, winner of
the national award for direction of 1973

MONEY POWER

Adoor Gopalakrishnan, film maker, winner of
the national award for the Best Film of 1972

THE PARALLEL STREAM

Dileep Padgaonkar, Assistant Editor,
'Times of India'

FURTHER READING

A select and relevant bibliography
compiled by Devendra Kumar

COVER

Designed by Dilip Chowdhury Associates

The problem

India's film industry has manufactured and peddled over many decades a distinctly unique commodity to a wide and unsuspecting audience. Based primarily on fantasy, it has mocked at every value in a richly diverse culture. Mock heroism, mock sex, mock dancing, mock singing, mock religion, mock revolution — the lot. In its end product, it has shown the degree of degradation to which a transparently synthetic approach can lead. Its influence on society has been startling — in dress, styles of living, methods of working and, most shatteringly, in the dreams and aspirations of a deprived people. The bizarre world of the screen is the world to reach for. Unfortunately, this commodity faced no challenge of any stature until the arrival of the new Bengali film under Satyajit Ray. His *Pather Panchali* showed that films could be made with little finance, and no stars, and with integrity. Since then, there has been a gentle struggling, a push here, an upsurge there, a raising of more authentic voices, the slow birth of an indigenous cinema. But, it is beset with problems. Finance, distribution and, infinitely more serious, that of communicating in a medium which is not mock fantasy any more. For, the audience has come to regard the film as synonymous with a particular breed of song, dance, vulgarity, burlesque, violence, crudity, escape, often under the mush of misleading progressive situations — rich man poor girl, rigid father growing son, erring husband devoted wife, etc. Is it ready, even in small measure, to receive a new experience from a familiar medium? If not, then how can the struggling new cinema survive and break through an obvious initial rejection. For one thing, far too much money is at stake. Then, the way of compromise propagated by some is also no solution because authenticity cannot be compromised; it changes and becomes what it is not. Neither is seeing a film an instant busi-

ness. You cannot read a book unless you learn the letters of an alphabet. And you cannot develop discrimination unless you read a wide variety of literature, unless you are constantly exposed to the medium. The cinema requires an equal input if not more. It also requires constant exposure which costs money, a quantum of money beyond the reach of the non-smuggling-backed producer. And this money can pay no dividends unless it communicates at once — which it cannot. So this is the circle of the contemporary cinema situation out of which the new producers have to cut a way of survival and progress. They must be able to establish some point of communication with an otherwise addicted audience, they must know that this will be a slow and painful process, and that no glib passing the buck to the industry will do. A film or a play or a book has not only to find its audience but also be sustained by it, however specialised or restricted. This fundamental cannot be excused away either. On the other hand, there is no reason for undue excitement over the Film Finance Corporation's funds being spent on films that ostensibly have not been able to sell. The breakthrough of an indigenous Indian cinema is going to require much greater effort than that at this early stage of experimentation. Any denial of sustenance now will be disastrous. In fact, the FFC has every reason to be proud of its performance in the last few years. Support to the new producers must now be extended to the field of distribution so that at least they can show their films, otherwise where will this very slow motion confrontation between the overpowering, established industry and the emerging new take place. This issue of SEMINAR is an attempt to capture some aspects of the battle that is joined.

Myths for sale

KUMAR SHAHANI

THE cinema for us is the most important of all the arts. The mechanical reproduction of physical reality—after centuries of frustrated tentatives—should have, once and for all, freed us both from its narrow fixed perspective and from the nebulous otherworldliness of art. Instead, here, as elsewhere, it has delivered the twin enemies of the people: a barely masked elitism and the naked force of an under-developed market. Hitler and Leni Reifenthal discovered that the triumph of the will could be engineered through the lie of the camera. Here, we have made of photographic verisimilitude the medium of lumpen fantasy. The logic of 'mass communication' and its opposite, 'elitist withdrawal', both borrowed from a country which controls 70% of the world's resources, is supposed to extend across a nation that has yet to electrify more than 60% of its villages. We want to communicate with a 'mass' after having cut off all contact with the people—confirm the audiences in their repressed consciousness, continue to use the language developed

through centuries of oppression, made more powerful by technology.

A local monopolist, and others who envy him—including coffee-house militants—ask grandiloquently, for whom does one make commodities (films)? The answer should be obvious, especially since those who ask the question seem to amass the fortunes themselves. A surplus is extracted from the masses with whom they claim to communicate. Innocently, left intellectuals join the chorus, demand instant messages—the plan of a struggle without the prolonged process of arming the people with consciousness and weapons.

On the other hand, artists engaged in the moral pursuit of the 'finer' things, with obvious access to the country's resources, condemn the committed to heroic suicide. People who did not know that the CPI(M-L) existed consistently held up the examples of so-called 'Naxalites'. The distortions of the bourgeois press are unblushingly used by those who wish to produce objects of mass consumption or objects d'art. We seem to be moving to the mystery

of the commodity form before establishing the relations of production that produce it. When we look at ourselves in the image of the West, we associate Indianness with products of feudal hands and feudal minds. The western man's notion of India is derived from handloom fabrics, the sitar and 'transcendence' in various forms. The object d'art and the 'mass-movie' alike alienate men from themselves—to invest their creativity in a totality outside.

For good reasons, therefore, we continue to congratulate ourselves on our myth making capacity. Our ancients often chose to disguise their knowledge in religious myths. Today, as religion is replaced by other forms of culture, new myths are made so palpable that they can replace actuality itself.

The basic contradiction of the cinematographic form arises from its capacity of replacing the object of its 'contemplation' by its image. The commercial cinema has used it to create not only dreams that substitute reality, but its commodity gods known as stars. Even montage has, with the best of intentions, led to the necessary juxtaposition of icons or signs which totally replace reality instead of evoking or analysing it, thus creating a structure close to myth with all its falsehood. The avant garde experiments, borrowing a syntax from the other arts, have merely been attempts at achieving a kind of respectability for the cinema.

Well intentioned as these experiments may be, they are a repetition of failures demonstrated earlier on in Europe, particularly towards the end of the silent era. But in our country, literariness or painterliness and, surprisingly, even theatricality, when compared to the normal orgies of the vulgar imagination, still pass for good cinema. The cinema has indeed incorporated into its language elements from all the parallel arts but only after having transformed them into its specific means (of spatializing time and temporalizing space). In fact, after neo-realism, it had gone through a complete phase of re-

jecting all syntax—as a reaction, undoubtedly—to achieve a kind of savage lyricism. Onomatopoeia was not a cinematic device for the French New Wave. It was its vocabulary. Its syntax—where it had articulated any—was that of the American 'B' film.

The theory that there exists a Cartesian polarity between arbitrary (aesthetic) signs and total realism necessarily led to quantitative conclusions and meaningless oppositions: the proliferation of detail as against metaphysical truth (where quality cannot be seized), the fluidity of mise-en-scène as against the metre of montage, the existential tension of suspense (Hitchcock) as against the tragic release from pity and fear.

The terms of reference were purely idealist: the human being unsocialized and nature untransformed. Or, when socialized and transformed, superficially so. This attitude necessarily tended either to exclude syntax progressively (realism) or to impose it as totally arbitrary structures, which could therefore yield only transcendental or socially insignificant meaning. If in practice some of the East European avant-garde adopted the same methods, it may not necessarily be a reflection of their societies but the apathy into which materialists are driven by the bombardment of questions posed ahistorically.

The 'dialectic of pure reason' necessarily led to the belief that in the cinema, nature would imitate art (André Bazin). The intervention of the artist had to be asocial and, therefore, there is the intervention of God (derived from Bresson) or revealed by minimizing the intervention (derived from Rossellini). What started as a healthy reaction against facism (particularly in Italy), because it spoke in terms of abstract morality, had to degenerate into a passive acceptance of the evil by proposing metaphysical solutions. Here is proof of the fact that facism is but a logical extension of the bourgeois ethic. Morality, linked to the abstract rights of man rather

than the concretizations of specific historical freedoms, has to lead to notions of natural superiority (of a race, caste or a class) and can, at best, be benevolently merciful to lower beings who have however to continue to perform their original functions!

When, however, montage—or the juxtaposition of 'linguistic' (arbitrary) elements—was discovered to be inevitable at every stage of film making, an attempt was made to reconcile the materialist dialectic of Eisenstein to the anarchic flux of nature. This resulted in fruitful changes, gradually ripening into a break with passivity. But, so long as it remained rooted in philosophical speculation, it could at best express impotent moral indignation and, in the absence of any concrete solution, offer suicide or undirected violence as an escape from the human condition. Goddard's trolley shots, as he claimed, were acts of morality as they exposed characters in the process of living, or of tragic lyricism as they went past landscapes (*Vivre, sa Vie*). To explore essence through existence. It is only after he had stopped 'clowning for the bourgeoisie' (said in an interview to *Le Monde*) that he discovered the significantly commentative use of movement—the dehumanization in a large, impersonal department store. (*Tout va Bien*).

Formal considerations have to be linked not merely to immutable, perennial ideation or subject matter nor to naturalistic detail, but to specific historic circumstance. Otherwise it will have no content. It will be a narrative of events (with some rhetoric thrown in for appearing 'left', if found necessary) or a juxtaposition of empty abstractions, meaningful in a period gone by. It is not surprising that even directors with predominantly 'spiritualist' pre-occupations should abandon them for a more material life. Rossellini moves towards the didactic and shows how the bourgeoisie collaborated with the monarch to imprison the aristocracy (*La prise du pouvoir de Louis XIV*). Bresson admits sociology

not only into human relations (*les blousons noirs* in *Au Hasard Balthazar*) but into form itself (the scene at the Museum of Modern Art in *Une Femme Douce*.) Godard makes a complete break with his 'clowning' and almost with the visual image. With his newly found commitment, he wants to learn the cinema all over again and is as awkward as a child taking his first steps.

Have we made our first steps, one wonders, towards a cinema that could lift itself from the morass of underdevelopment. One can say with some pride that there have been instances where one has glimpsed far, open horizons. But, by and large, the stranglehold of the commercial cinema still has a suffocating grip. Even on those of us for whom 'economic viability' is not a primary condition. Those who speak in terms of compromise—or its denial—are being cynical or choosing not to recognise the objective situation.

Individualism always requires the support of false idealism and morality. If freedom is the recognition of necessity, to speak of 'absolute' truths, dialectics reduced to formal principles, or a perennial humanity is to fetter oneself with the same ideology that the ruling classes use in their more savagely naked forms—the artistic objects of mass consumption. The Dara Singh mythological may be reserved for the rural and semi-urban markets. But the other classes need their own icons to worship. We have already observed how a set of cinematographic signs, even in far more developed societies, can degenerate into mythical constructions in which the container of content takes the place of what it contains (the thing signified). Thereby it becomes sufficient unto itself, content becomes transcendental, the argument tautological, the action ritualistic. Such forms are needed for upper class consumption, the classes who are most at home when they speculate—at the stock market or on the universe.

The less sophisticated myths of sentimental alleviation are designed

for the consumption of the working and lower middle classes. Since they most need the cinema as a substitute for life—their conditions of work being the most dehumanising—the bulk of investment goes into films that can successfully distort their fantasies of sex and violence. One is almost certain that, if left alone to their real fantasies, they could be far healthier. Perhaps they would recognize the actuality of the violence daily practised on them and the constant denial of human contact to which they are subject—inclusive of the emotional, of the sexual and of the increasing possibility of collective co-operation. But the fight sequence is as necessary to divert one from the fundamental nature of violence in society as is the voyeuristic cabaret to degrade at least half of humanity. Combine this with a rebellion against authority which ends up in the humanising of the parent-villain or the employer-villain without changing the nature of the exploitative relationships.]

Censorship policies which have tied down the members of the Board to seemingly absurd irrationalities help, in fact, to sustain this obscenely unreal world. An anti-communal film could easily be denied a certificate for fear of arousing religious passions among the majority. Allusions to the caste system are permitted only if the lower castes are not mentioned by their generic name. Even if you wish to condemn the orthodox reactionary bigot who can only refer to the lower castes as 'shudras', you will not be allowed to use the pejorative word. You may however use the appellation 'brahmin', taken from the same heirarchical structure! Such contradictions can only exist in a 'secular democracy' which allows you to swear by the *Koran*, the *Bible* or the *Geeta*.

"That the song divine is sung for the upper classes by the brahmins, and only through them for others, is clear. We hear from the mouth of Krsna himself (G. 9.32): "For those who take refuge in Me, be they even of the sinful breeds such

as women, vaisyas, and sudras." That is, all women and all men of the working and producing classes are defiled by their very birth though they may in after-life be freed by their faith in the god who degrades them so casually in this one. Not only that, the god himself had created such differences (G. 4.13.): "The four-caste (-class) division has been created by Me"; this is proclaimed in the list of great achievements.' (From *Myth and Reality* by D. D. Kosambi.)

These texts may indeed be worthy of study. As are Pericles' 'Funeral Oration' or Aristotle's 'Politics'. But to revere them is to suggest deviously that democracy will be achieved through slave labour or that a modern society could realise its goals through inequality. The children of God (not shudras), will inherit the earth so long as their masters inherit its wealth.

Censorship confirms the extension of assigned social roles not only along caste and class lines but along the lines of family functions and sex as well. The heights of feminine heroism are still found in a bovine version of motherhood. Even as the country starves. It is far removed from the vitality of Kali or the other fertility goddess images.

The docile heroine must look like a whore but must neither bare her body in its raw splendour nor show her human desire. The censorship laws allow cabarets which fragment the female body into cut-out objects for male acquisitiveness. The nude, however, is dangerous, for she can be a whole person with her own subjectivity. When will we learn, once again, to take pride in ourselves as human beings? If not like the athletes of the city-state, can we not restore the graceful line reserved for our goddesses of Elephanta and Bahrut to the humans in whose image they were made? Before we can do that, we will have to change our ideology transmitted through myth. Because ideas of masculinity and femininity in these metonymical constructs are also worked out in irreconcilable opposites.

Contradiction without a possibility of actual synthesis, since it denies change, movement.

According to the mythical system, the female has to prepare everything for consumption, including food and herself. And the male has to produce. Men have to project and women withdraw. Right down to the last detail where masculinity may allow smoking and femininity forbid it. When such detail—or in the more sophisticated films, formal elements stand irreversibly for concepts—replace meaning itself, one does not have to wait for ideas to degenerate into ritual rather than praxis. The language of myth by its very nature of replacing the symbol for its content spreads false consciousness: the more vulgarly sensate form in the commercial cinema and the more abstract ahistorical form in the 'art' cinema.

The dichotomy between commercial and art cinema is as spuriously created by the exploitative system as is the one between public and private money. One feeds the masses with opium and then one complains that art is inaccessible to them. One extracts the surplus value of labour and then divides it arbitrarily into public and private money. Recently some 'socially committed' critics have called the few worthwhile experiments sponsored by the F.F.C. a waste of public money. Radicals in this country often do not seem to recognise how capital is amassed or profits made. They seem to be concerned more about the taxpayer's money than about how he made his money in the first place!

The government itself has been sufficiently pressurized into believing that the F.F.C. is behaving like Oliver Twist. In recent times, it had dared to ask for more. The F.F.C. and its Board of Directors may not resemble the emaciated Oliver. But if the present stagnation continues (it has financed one film in the last eleven months and may well be in the process of rejecting scripts which have potential artistic merit without being 'safe', commercial propositions),

the hopes that it had raised by its courage may fall. The reasons for its short-lived dynamism may be found in the half-hearted reformism of our ruling classes. Pushed back from this reformatory, therefore, the cineastes will go back into the underworld of smuggling Fagins who have built India's comprador cinema upon its major port towns.

A confirmed plagiarist speaks of some of F.F.C.'s significant products as third-rate copies of third-rate foreign films. A globe trotting socialite whose sole claim to be a critic is her access to people and places (and who ecstasizes over Manoj Kumar's 'Shor') aids the big sharks by her learned associations. A self-confessed amateur, applauded for his bold themes, speaks of films as 'formal exercises' when they are not in his own blundering idiom. Others disguise their concern for financial return (on both 'public' and 'private' money!) in terms of mass communication. Yet another old hand at bringing humanism to the box office in outrageous costumes advises the government to nationalise cinema houses before it finances films which make an attempt at speaking a radical language. Utopian ideas always subvert their own declared purpose. Even in the unlikely event of nationalisation, given the honesty of our bureaucrats and the socialism of our system, one can visualise what new monsters will emerge. Some of these suggestions and comments may, indeed, be well-intentioned, made by 'innocents' who believe in the image that they project, but it is becoming increasingly difficult to sift out the cinema's enemies from its friends.

The atmosphere is ridden with opportunism. Gossip and facile opinionating, not analytical criticism, is the order of the day. Theoretical debate is possible only in organized forums free of fear and personalised mud-slinging. We have not even begun to come together to solve our practical problems. The State governments have yet to exempt films of artistic merit or the cinema houses that screen

them from entertainment tax. A film-maker who conceives in colour has to sign bonds of over a lakh of rupees with the Ministry of Trade and Commerce to be able to make prints. In this regard, I. K. Gujral has made an encouraging statement of policy. When it will be implemented is anyone's guess.

In the meantime, a wage freeze is expected to bring down prices while black money circulates freely. A Marxist film maker speaks of poverty being the same through the ages and depicts an antagonistic contradiction between the lumpen proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie! We pass from gimmick to gesture. Red is the favourite colour of rhetoric. Nostalgia for unity, albeit heirarchical in form and matter, is the over-riding content. We move from long shot to close-up around stars or other idols and mandalas. Cezanne may have dreamt of the cinema when he shifted view-points or wished that his canvas could reach humbler folk. Eisenstein may have realised his dream among the Soviets. While we move ahead and up the Himalayas from our tryst with destiny. Like Yudhishthir, anxious to know and preserve the truth, we may ask why Arjuna had to suffer so much even after the great battle. Krishna's answer was as usual evasive and capable of all kinds of imaginative interpretation: the hero's cheek bones were too high. Draupadi resented this slighting reference to the beauty of her loved one. But she and the other heroes and heroines are falling by the way-side out of exhaustion and starvation or shot in the back for desperate acts of courage. And we will continue to pursue the truth with our faithful dogs: mass communication, perennial subjects, medieval Indian aesthetics, unchanging poverty. Or the more sensate forms of myth: Eurasian rubber dolls in ballets of violence, orgies of fragmented sexuality, the magical change of heart in the prodigal son, or authoritarian father; the change of image in the sex object into a lactating machine.

The success formula

SHYAM BENEGAL

THE Hindi film business in India consists largely of working out the equations to make commercially successful films and then to work out a strategy of publicity and distribution to rake in the largest profits possible—a vast, speculative activity that begins with formulating and analysing the success of any one or more films running at any given time in terms of what makes them tick, which usually means the right mix of 'ingredients' such as stars, songs

and music, the plot innovations and a generous helping of what are known as production values such as enormously expensive sets and property, lavish public relations' devices like parties replete with cabaret items in five star hotel suites.

There are storywriters who will produce on call several plot lines lifted from successful films, mainly from Bombay and Hollywood as well as from popular western writers like James Hadley Chase to

produce a biryani of a film all ready to be hogged by the film-going public for 50 weeks or more in cinemas all over the country. There is a huge demand for well-known stars to act in these films and for music directors to turn out their lilting songs, and for dancers to give new, sexy turns to their cabaret items.

The directors who direct them are recipients of paens of praise for their originality. The producers are the happiest with their success and end up signing up more and bigger stars for their next ventures as distributors willingly take even greater risks by committing larger sums of money for each territory. The pattern of business points to an industry that is happily and profitably stewing in its own juice.

There are several kinds of success formulae. Each one is specifically categorised, such as social drama (meaning poor boy/rich girl or vice versa), family drama (lost child, suffering widow, large doses of amnesia), action movie (good man-turned-bad dacoit-turned-good man), historical (now not much in vogue) or mythological (generous helpings of sex relating to gods and goddesses). In each category, the need is for the biggest star or stars. If you can afford it, you would have all of them together. The music director is chosen according to the size of his contribution to the latest hit songs (do I hear a resemblance between his tunes and the top-of-the-pop in London?). Similarly, the ace writers. Writers, of course, do not really write. They sit in posh hotel suites and narrate scenes for the next day's shooting.

It is an expensive and serious business. Very expensive. And films flop. Despite or, perhaps, because of this, the Indian film industry ticks. Flop is a relative term. Very few films are known to fail altogether. The only thing that might happen to a film is that it may recover its cost over a longer period of time.

But this is still the more superficial aspect of the Hindi film industry. The serious problems that

beset the industry are the highly inflated rates paid to the marquee names in the film—the stars, the music directors and, recently, the music directors. There are stars who sign up for as many as 50 films at a time. Logically, it would take him or her about ten years or more of work every day to complete so many films, but they are signed up nevertheless. Similarly with music directors.

The chances are that a lot of money spent on such films will prove to be irrecoverable because the films are not likely to see the light of day. And whatever is spent in signing up to start the film will be lost forever. This constitutes an enormous waste. Then, again, there is the matter of dates. It costs a lot of money to set up a shooting schedule. In this situation, if a star cannot give dates the entire expense in mounting the schedule is lost. The stars themselves under these conditions tend to develop an inflated sense of their own importance. They feel no obligation to keep to their schedules, nor do they feel the slightest compunction to break appointments—a bit like successful politicians. They appear to follow no normal set of rules.

Again, there is a reason for this behaviour. Most producers have no money to begin with. They trade on the names of stars, music directors and writers to raise money. The stars are generally very insecure, never sure that any of their films are going to be completed. They cannot possibly take the risk of signing just one or two films. If the films do not get off the ground and get stuck mid-way, they are out of jobs. Nothing is worse than an actor without a job. The other problem is that of being idle. Like everybody else, a star would hate to be idle. If he signs up 20 or more films he can be more or less certain of working at least 20 days of the month for a period of at least two or three years. You notice here a vicious circle of events.

The producers speculate on stars to finance their films. The stars are

valued on the number of films they have in hand. So the dates they give are few and far between. Even productions that are certain to be completed take much longer and, therefore, cost more money. The quality of performances deteriorate. It would be physically impossible for any one to be shooting two or three shifts a day in different films playing different roles. The general feeling of uncertainty all round makes for a lot of unhappy practices such as mutual blackmail. A star can hold a producer to ransom half way through the film. Producers can try and cheat on payments. In this set up, distributors are the ones who appear to be more secure. In fact, they take the largest, calculated risks. The people who do best of all are the exhibitors. In most cases they take no risk at all. More on this later.

The distributors who market films have defined their films as those meant: (a) for the masses, (b) for the classes, (c) art films that will attract no audiences. The films that are likely to be the biggest successes are the ones made for the 'masses'. They could be defined as films that are utterly naive in their story content, with non-existent character development and two dimensional emotional and intellectual attitudes. The plot lines would be incredible. The actors would have the choice of playing either 'goody' or 'baddy' roles. The quality of acting is judged on the basis of certain stereo-types associated with them which repeat themselves in film after film. Imitators tend to develop the same. Similarly, styles get set in other areas like stories, music and direction as well.

Films that will fetch the highest prices are the ones that have the largest number of stars, a storyline replete with what are now essential—thrills and chills, rape scenes, dance numbers and cabarets, choreographed fights and comedy (there are specialists who are known as 'thrill masters' apart from 'fight masters' and 'dance masters'. Soon one expects there

will be 'rape masters'). Brilliant colour and sharp cutting is a must.

Most films, if not all, have to be pre-sold to distributors who will advance the money necessary to complete the films. The distributor, therefore, has a great deal of power over the kind of film that is made. He is often the person who will determine the pattern of the film whatever the story content, because he is in the know of which film will run and which will not. This appears logical as the distributor is the only one who has the feed-back from the box office. In recent years, distributors have strengthened their hold over the exhibition channels by creating large circuits. It is not unusual for a distributor to have a chain of 80 or 100 cinemas all over the country. He works out the potential audiences for various categories of films in different territories and releases his film strategically to get either the maximum profits or to reduce the loss to a minimum. The film meant for 'classes' has a much smaller market and the situation is not quite as happy for the distributor.

A producer who wishes to distribute a film himself is at a great disadvantage. He has to pay exorbitant rentals to exhibitors and often cannot benefit from the other methods that are in operation if he sells to a distribution chain. The methods are: (a) minimum guarantee: which means the producer is paid a certain sum of money for a territory whether the film does well or not. If the film makes a profit, he gets a share. This is the safest kind of sale. (b) The percentage basis, where the producer shares the profit with the distributor. (c) The percentage basis, where the producer shares a percentage with the exhibitor.

In dealing with the exhibitor (apart from paying him a rental), he is responsible for the entire publicity. Add this to his production cost and you notice that his cost liabilities increase considerably. The interest rates being very high, he has to work out a strategy that ensures quick and substantial earnings. To be able to do this,

he must spend more on publicity and make more prints so that he can simultaneously release the film in several cinemas in a single centre. This costs even more. The rentals of the theatres can often take away up to 60 or more per cent of the total sum earned on a full house. The producers' share may be about 15-20%. This with a full house.

It has often happened that in spite of full houses, with four cinemas running the film for four weeks, a producer has earned only enough to cover his publicity costs. Obviously, this points to the fact that if a producer has to survive, he had better follow the prevailing system and make his film in conjunction with the distributors. They will buy his film even before he has completed it, otherwise he may be faced with the situation of being liable for the entire production sum, holding a film that he has to hawk, with the distribution chains at best indifferent to his effort and at worst working against him.

The new or alternate cinema, known in the business as an 'art film', has to be seen in the context of all that has been mentioned above. When a small budget film is produced, whatever its category, a large investment is made. For instance, if a film in colour costs about 5 lakhs of rupees to make (black and white films in Hindi will not sell at all), a minimum of about 10 prints would have to be made for modest release. This would cost another 2 lakhs. For each territory, the minimum publicity needed would cost no less than about 65 to 70,000 rupees. There are seven territories in India for Hindi films. As one can see, to break even, the film would have to earn about 12 lakhs of rupees. It seems unlikely that it would be possible under the present circumstances, besides the odd exception or two.

The films of the 'new cinema' that started with the backing of the Film Finance Corporation do not stand a chance of being bought by conventional distributors unless they have the 'ingredients'. Since most of them don't, they are left to lan-

guish in cans. What is worse, any film produced with the help of the FFC forces the liability for the production costs on the producer/director, with very little chance of his being able to sell the film. *If we are serious about developing an alternate cinema, the FFC would have to develop a distribution circuit that is able to compete for audiences with the regular so called commercial films.* In addition to this the cost liability for the production would have to be borne by the FFC. This is only fair.

The system in the commercial business is very similar where the distributor takes over the liability of the production cost. If the FFC feels that the motive in making such films is not profit, they could pay the producer/director on the basis of the work involved in the film or allow one territory as payment. At the moment, even when the FFC has gone into distribution, the producer continues to be liable for all expenditure, past and present, up to the time the entire loan is recovered. If anything could be a disincentive to producing films with FFC funds, it is this.

It should not surprise one that Indian audiences lap up a lot of what is served to them. Commercial Hindi films offer to the audiences enjoyment of the 'good life' vicariously, something they can never hope to have, the escape route which is complete with the cream on the top. It does not force attitudes of social responsibility, make people conscience-stricken, it does not demand action of any kind nor does it force people to think on problems that are either difficult to comprehend or difficult to tackle.

Of course, there is a challenge to the film maker too. The film industry has constantly to think in terms of offering slightly more or different sense stimulators each time as the audiences reaction may have got jaded by more of the same. So each new film that succeeds will have a new sensational twist, a new gimmick that will serve to stimulate the senses. So,

whatever the industry does it will be forever on the lookout for such commercial 'ingredients'. Variations on the sex/violence formula have so far seemed quite endless and can probably carry on for a great length of time. The audience has been oriented to Hindi cinema for several generations.

A change from this is not likely to succeed so easily. The audience itself has increased astronomically in the past 45 years. [Before Independence the cinema in India was not merely restricted largely to the middle-class but also to urban India. In the 30s and the 40s, films were made essentially for the middle classes. New Theatres and Prabhat provide good examples of the kind of movies they used to make, particularly New Theatres. They dealt with the problems and aspirations of an emerging urban middle class.]

The increase in the number of cinemas, greater urbanisation as well as the growth of cinemas in semi-rural areas, brought a much larger audience and, to some extent, a more important audience—the working class and peasant audience to the cinema. Also, a larger proportion of non-literates. Films started to be made for a lower common denominator. This has made for the cynical attitude on the part of the film establishment who feel that the audience has a low intelligence level. (This, unfortunately, is a universal feeling among most communicators all over the world.)

[Apart from the escapist mode, social attitudes became ritualistic rather than real and, more important, whatever the film showed and said, the *status quo* was not to be disturbed and controversy was to be studiously avoided. Because of this, they tend to reinforce the worst prejudices of the audience and encourage the development of the most superficial values.]

A more insidious development in films has been caused by outside factors. Paternalistic and strait-laced censorship has made film producers increasingly irresponsible. As we all know, authority of a certain kind often creates an irres-

ponsible attitude in those who are under it—they expect to be corrected rather than correct themselves. This has become so acute, that many films only attempt to push in directions in which the censor board is likely to be heavy-handed, only to check out how far they can go. Often, the only innovation in a film comes in the techniques to project 'soft' pornography or violence that would catch the censors napping. This has led to the making of films which encourage ugly social attitudes, particularly between men and women. They are done with such crudity that one wonders whether those who see such films come unscathed out of them.

It is well known that with cinema, particularly when it happens to be the only entertainment medium, life starts to imitate film. We have only to look at those parts of the country where film is the only entertainment medium to see that this is true. The way boys regard girls, the way they dress themselves, the kind of music they enjoy most, the speech they use—and with the new-rich—the kind of interiors they have, replicas of film sets.

Yet, with all this, a different kind of film also runs. Audiences will see films that reflect social realities. All that it requires is the kind of distribution which the commercial industry provides. The movement has already started. What is needed is the infra-structure that will make it self-generating.

[Indian film or, more particularly, the Hindi film, from its very origin has developed its formats from the existing theatrical forms. The songs, the dances, the main plot and its comic parody, have all been absorbed by the cinema. If the alternate cinema has to grow, it cannot ignore these factors.] An extension of these forms is needed rather than unfamiliar ones and a far truer depiction of social realities. Only then will it be able to seriously compete for audiences. Short of this, the new cinema will be guilty of producing films for the sake of a small cineaste elite.

P60

Communication

MANI KAUL

THERE is a kind of film-making being practised by a few film makers in India which, although having received critical acclaim within the country and without, has not been able to find any distribution outlet and has now seemingly reached an economic dead-end. This cinema, by acknowledging the true limitations of the medium was beginning to evolve newer relationships with other art forms. Cinema would not be any more merely parasitical on literature, theatre or music. A film based on a three act play, instead of destroying the complexity and limited settings of the original form, would retain its intrinsic sensuousness and, thereby, by paradox, would be forced to discover itself, i.e., what could be truly cinema in the filming of a play. The moment cinema can lay itself parallel to any other more established art form, it will be able to free itself into independence.

The fact that the realistic image (and not line, shape, colour or harmonic sound) is the idiom of cinema determines to a considerable extent the film maker's attitude towards life. A shot of a

wall in a film cannot be understood devoid of its social milieu—it must belong to a level of social living. As also in the construction of a scene, it is likely that a unit by itself may impart nothing quite significantly concrete. In Antoini's *La Notte* the solid geometric textured formation of walls occupying a major area of the format with a small moving human figure, form a social observation on the Italian urban situation. It should be stated now that when this observation becomes literal or theatrical it fails in cinema.

These new brand of films face the severest criticism on the ground of lack of communication. But it is insufficient to harp on communication without analysing first where other film-makers, preoccupied with communication, have been led and the past historical as well as future repercussions of films on social life. Is communication merely to be understood as something reaching out to an audience without being boring? Is this commendable in itself?

All commercial films for decades now have communicated in this sense, only to the detriment of

youth and values in this country. Their influence is so visibly apparent in the cheap hairstyles and 'hero' mannerisms of the young and the total apathetic frivolousness of the adult. In Tamil Nadu politics, for instance, the 'filmy' fiction of the hero on the screen has acquired a strange reality. The heroism on the screen of the character is completely identified with the actor (and political aspirant) playing the part. It is strange that the power of the cinema reflects negatively in obvious terms, whereas its positive contribution is not only limited but invisible.

Communication can only be assessed in terms of the *quality of experience*. The words 'quality' and 'experience' would imply that the one who communicates and the one to whom the communication is directed exist at different levels but that they fall within the bounds of a relationship. If the viewer fabricates a fantasy in his mind through contemplation on sensuous objects like the heroine's shapely legs (sexual) or the hero's imported car (economical) or the side-heroine's hysterical dilemma (moral), the cumulative effect of these titillations cannot be termed an experience. Neither can it be understood as communication.

All the Brechtian methods of alienation used by serious western film-makers are not meant to be startling gimmicks, but serve to warn the audience against identifying with the people and happenings on the screen. The characters and incidents instead of being an arrangement designed to invoke an experience, become, with identification, sensuous objects in themselves. Spurts of social violence do not necessarily emanate from the depiction of violence on the screen but, rather, they arise out of aspirations that cinema and life, under its present system, provoke but cannot hope to fulfill at any time to come.

Ideas also contain material energy. Ideas therefore can become purely descriptive of another reality or an idea by itself can become an object of sensuousness.

One is only a little better than the other. Description attempts to reconstruct reality whereas the material to be reconstructed which belongs to life, is so complex that it does not admit of the limitations of a word. The discipline of literature arises from universally understood meanings of words which are in themselves abstracted and not real.

The so-called realist evokes atmosphere or, much worse, a mood through details, completely giving up the entity of the word and thus fails to create a direct experience. The other extreme is where the word/idea acquires a sensuous identity of its own. Thus, ideas—sometimes even a progressive social idea—become like the legs of a slim or a fat heroine exposed for the consumption of the very class which the ideas themselves denounce.

Such ideas neither create a sharp-edged social consciousness that may bring about a change, nor do they lead life into an inertia where hidden internal contradictions grow unassuaged and may seek to resolve themselves in the progress of history. This is because the representation on celluloid is thoroughly romanticised through emotion as the only basis of a relationship.

At best, emotion is replaced by some form of intellectual sensationalism. Such ideas are successful quite obviously but such ideas are regressive in terms of social import. It is a strange truth that a really good revolutionary or social theoretician, when working at a time of no historical change, remains limited in his impact and that in more opportune times even ignorant, corrupt leaders flourish.

There is no need to lament the fact that a profound masterpiece of social comment like Picasso's *Guernica* can be reduced to a postcard; or that Godard should become a fad with the same rich European class that he himself holds in greatest contempt. This kind of contradictory relationship between socialist aspiration and decadent urbanism is not non-existent even

in India where the film maker's life is at complete variance with what is proposed on film where radical changes are suggested under the cover of symbolism.

What would be more truthful is to present with clear verisimilitude the actual conditions of one's own individual life and its contradictions and its conflict with contradictions present in the collective life of the people. To be able to see the present and the conditions arising out of it is to witness a fact without the interference of one's desires or memories. This is not to suggest that 'document actualities' (i.e., documentaries) are the only valid form of film making.

The difference between fiction and document, as between abstract and concrete realities, as between desires/memories and facts is significant. Both can and do exist side by side. Only where superimposition takes place does confusion arise. A fact cannot appear in the form of an individual's desire or a phase of one's memory. Once it does that, even though it maintains a factual appearance, it must be termed a memory or desire. The inverse, where a memory or a desire is presented as if it were a fact, creates another form of lie.

The fact deals with the present or a condition of the present. This is as difficult to express as to experience, both for the film maker and the audience. The question of communication has reached a bottle-neck here. The industrial tradition of mass media, where the ideas of a film maker living in an urban centre have to be communicated to the whole of India poses an insurmountable problem. The facile solution of averaging the present conditions and thus exploiting the collective memories and desires of the audience in order to communicate, is the field of commercial and semi-commercial film makers.

Art theatres cannot be a solution for the serious film maker. Even if an art theatre movement succeeds, it only produces a 'hybrid' class of 'arty' folk, who appreciate films in order to put themselves a

run above the 'masses'. Besides, the maintenance of an art theatre with all its staff and taxes and a smaller seating capacity generally provide insufficient returns to the producer of low budget films.

It should be clear by now that I have purposely led the argument to a dead end—the so-called successful film-maker who communicates, fails and the so-called unsuccessful film-maker, who does not communicate, also fails. The one who communicates survives either at the expense and ignorance of the very poor or, if he is 'conscious', by shifting his appeal from the vulgar to the intelligent. The one who does not communicate survives because of wide approval or disapproval of or, better still, a controversy between, the critical sections of the press.

To move towards a form, towards limitations that are the means and discipline of that particular form, towards a cinematic idiom, is to move closer to the realism of experience. In fact, realism in a film lies in the truthful relationship between the social/individual sensibility of the film maker and the cinematic idiom. A director from the urban milieu who wishes to make a film on rural life will be respecting realism when he looks at the rural details with his urban sensibility and thus exercises adequate restraint on his performers; rather than if he attempts to force his actors to emote as if he himself came from that rural set-up and tries to inject his film with rural 'exotica'. The second situation would create complete falsehood.

The question of a film maker's own sensibility can be explained in terms of other art forms more easily. For example, it is inconceivable that a serious urban artist could suddenly begin to paint like a folk artist. We are aware of quite a few examples of this false declassing. The results have been invariably just exotic or 'cultural'.

This is not to suggest that an urban artist or a film maker has nothing to understand from a folk artist but only that this understand-

ing should limit itself to abstracting principles from the other art form and reducing them to what is basic to human expression. Motif, colour, shape, line are particular to a very restricted area; in fact they are born out of a limited environment and its transportation can be hazardous. Paul Klee established modern abstract art through principles that were derived from Persian miniatures. Klee was so deeply inspired by Islamic art that he confessed that he would not be able to paint again as he had done. This kind of knowledgeable cultural exchange is essential for revitalizing the inertia-ridden historical art forms of a country.

It has been suggested that cinema belongs to the realm of mass-media, whereas painting (notwithstanding calendar/mythological art) and music (ignoring commercial film songs) and literature (not taking into account the cheap paper-back) can sustain themselves without a wide circulation, and therefore are capable of difficult experimentation.

The argument that immediately follows this stand is of economics. Certain highly placed film makers have stated that every film maker has a moral obligation to return the invested money to his financier. Even if the film fails financially, the film maker is exonerated if it is apparent that he has kept his financial obligations in mind while making the film. When the film has been financed by the government, the accusation has been even more strident that the tax-payers money has been squandered.

It is obvious that the anxiety to see a film as economically viable emanates from a morality which is in the interest only of a certain class. There can be no other reason why these same critics can accept the situation created by the commercial cinema—the worst of film is produced, a parallel black money system has been made prevalent and under the cover of entertainment, fantastic dreams, unreal sex/violence and perverted suggestions are dished out. In fact, it appears that for these moralists any inconceivable limit of providing distractions is commendable so

long as the product returns the money to the investors.

The questions here are: who has created this economics? Who has capitalized on the gains of industrialization which has caused art to move away from a limited folk environment to become a powerful mass media? In whose interest is it to bring out a monthly magazine full of lewd photographs and scandal? Why does cinema have to operate from three big commercial centres only and on such a large scale? Why do exhibitors and distributors run to buy films that combine vulgarity with frivolousness? Who stands to gain in allowing film stars to act in twenty films simultaneously and to quote fantastic terms?

Behind all these questions and more there is a businessman from the class of economically interested merchants who has turned the aspects of culture into sordid commerce. It is he who is repeatedly raising this question of communication and making it a matter of mere speculation. There are several well-meaning film fellows who wish to communicate but they fail, not because they are incompetent, but because the whole market is now only a matter of speculation.

A new breed of film makers and critics profess to believe in a semi-commercial cinema but they have been seen to end up invariably in a commercial mess. Some serious film makers begin to work with 'stars', some are compelled to enter into an outright commercial proposition to meet an immediate economic crisis. In short, the question of economics and communication does not really belong to the film maker and the seemingly absurd statement made elsewhere in the article would have to be restated—that a correct film would have to be unsuccessful.

Under the feudal system, the artist was employed by a patron. The artist's expression was in tune with that of his master—what pleased him or what troubled him was his subject matter. In pre-historic times, art was magic. The cave man painted the bison, not because its shape or lines pleased

him but because it posed a threat to him and he wished to master it. The painting of the bison was a ritual, done to save the community from a collective hazard. Today, the artist is expressing his personal anguish within the discipline of an independent aesthetic.

The question of communication, which never ever entered the picture earlier, is the result of this personal anguish and its personalized expression. Any work true to this form must fail to communicate. Even if the anguish speaks of a collective dilemma, its personalized expression makes it impossible to communicate widely.

Some film makers do succeed and are totally honest at the same time. But their impact has not been of great brilliance. Great works acquire a certain preciousness of being masterpieces, are stored carefully and are highly evaluated. The fact that cave paintings were sometimes super-imposed upon each other by the works of later painters displays the vital functional quality of the act.

The negative contribution of cinema towards deteriorating constructive values of a society is not only felt but widely known and analysed. Students imitating the cheap tricks of the 'heroes', stagnating moral issues of the middle class, total anarchy and frivolousness among the poor, creating superfluous bad and good taste, and all other issues of such obvious import can be directly related—a straight connection between a commercial film and the varying mental levels and reaction of the audience can be established. On the other hand, one cannot inverse the process and hope to create positive values in an audience by investing the construction of a film in a positive manner and spouting positive ideas.

The fact of a film working negatively on the audience is not caused only by a lack of quality in a film and the educational lack in the audience. It is the power of a well-entrenched system that falls in between the product and the

consumer which determines the attitude towards the consumption of that product. A film with all credentials, in such a system, would have to fail by being ineffectual or inaccessible.

This system should be changed not by building art theatres and cultivating a 'tasteful' breed of cinemagoers, but by altering the system of exhibition. Art theatres would perhaps show better quality films but the problem to be tackled is the distance which separates the film maker from his audience. What the film maker should attempt is to form a more direct relationship with his audience.

If the audience could be made to participate in the making of a film, the resultant work would not be just a display of communication, but the result of co-ordination between them to handle and comprehend problems. The beginnings of such an experiment would have to be made in the field of documentary and the elements of fiction, as understood today, would have to be completely dropped.

The film would have to begin with an impersonal problem: let us say the introduction of cattle breeding in a backward area. By this we do not mean an urban class-room exercise with explanations given in numerical order. Nor a film made during a visit of a fortnight to a backward area—realism of the locale thrown into an arty form. In one, the performers would be behaving as if they knew all about cattle breeding and were now performing certain tricks for the shooting of a film. And, in the other, the idiom of expression would be beyond the audience.

Instead, the film maker and his crew should stay in an area for four to five months when experts on the subject introduce the topic to the people. Then they would proceed to record what is really happening—the first reactions, the effort to understand, the attempts to implement, etc. Now film making has become a ritual; the ritual of trying to understand, in

this case, cattle breeding. The ritual involves both sides, the film maker and the performers who are actually his audience.

The element of fiction would be nominal in such a work. Fiction involves the memories and desires of the film maker and it is obvious in this case that the personalized aspect of the film would be automatically restricted. Certainly the conventional fiction born out of the literary narrative would have to be forsaken and, indeed, must be forsaken in order to rid cinema of its complete dependence on literature. As also, cinema's dependence on theatre would be completely eliminated, as this cinema would not expect any performance from the people involved.

When the film is freed from narrative, be it chronological or a reaction against chronology (where time is broken into non-sequential units) it would naturally find release from the necessity of performance. Having abandoned this position of being cushioned by both literature and theatre, cinema would proceed to rely more directly on the essential qualities of the cinematic medium.

For example, the space/time relationship in theatre is restricted by the proscenium. Theatre requires the actor, by his performance, to break down the restrictive barriers and to carry the audience with his words and gestures into an experience of a different space and time. Cinema has reversed the need for itself. It begins with an endless space and endless time order. The linear movement of theatre is meaningless here. In fact, cinema requires the narrowing down or the re-organization of the endlessly particular and the varying space/time possibilities.

The word in literature is seen to connote more than its meaning—again the instrument (word) having been assigned a function (meaning) it is necessary that newer contexts create newer meanings. The word in theatre, on the other hand, belongs to the environment—it belongs to the openness of a lawn, to the noisy, closed up crowd of a

restaurant, to the intimate and restful quality of a bedroom and so on. When it belongs to the environment it belongs to the actor and to the moment of presentation.

The elements of a cinematic moment comprise all images, sounds, actors, walls, chairs, etc. Sounds comprise the words of a character, the sound of a distant plane overhead, the sound of a tea-cup being placed on a saucer, etc. Movement comprises the movement within the frame, the movement of the camera and movements caused by the intervals of editing. All these units by themselves, i.e., within their own particular space/time relationship, have a limited meaning. But juxtaposed with each other in a new space/time relationship, they leap from particularity into abstraction. This leap need not take place through the development of a story or characterization.

All this would not be possible if the film maker did not live for a length of time with the people with whom he would be making his film. To take up a concrete project, and follow that as the basis of recording a human reality, is also essential. Without this, the film would result in the usual impressionistic generalized bunk or it would perhaps lead to some embarrassing or enjoyable sensational realism.

When film making becomes a ritual like this, the film maker has discovered an actual relationship with his audience. The object of the film would not be to show a success or a failure but to show things as they actually are. The project may end in failure which would also be faithfully recorded. In the process of filming a certain problem (which provides the basic discipline) the film maker may diverge into other spheres of the activity of the participants. The film maker and the participants both have a consciousness. An exchange must take place and both must emerge from the project at least a little transformed. The situation of the film maker coming to a rural environment, as much a stranger as a man from another

planet, recording the rural details to sell in festivals abroad, and returning as soon as possible back to his urban environment, would no more be able to exist.

It has been learnt through newspapers that the government is making efforts further to widen the scope and activities of innovative expression in the field of the cinema—by perhaps building a chain of art theatres and by enlarging the functions of a body like the Film Finance Corporation.

It would be appropriate now to suggest a scheme pertaining to this matter. Apart from the fact that the building or converting of halls into art theatres would be expensive, its returns would be limited due to lesser seating capacity. Even if the impact of the films shown in these theatres gains momentum the more vital sections of society like the students, the industrial workers and farmers would be completely excluded or only partially exposed. If the money, instead, could be spent on thousands of 16 mm projectors, and if the government could subsidize groups prepared to buy these projectors, many organisations (especially schools and colleges) in all parts of the country could come forward and begin exhibiting films.

Initially, these organisations should be supplied only with the national and international classics of the cinema, i.e., films that have developed the potential of the medium. The basic gap between the education of the film maker and the audience could be considerably bridged by this process.

Film makers should then be encouraged to fan out to all parts of the country with specific projects; to live in areas for months; to work and live with the people there in the process of making a film. The films would then be supplied to the various organisations exhibiting 16 mm films. Thus, the film maker and the audience, instead of living in their own airtight compartments, would be able to discover an actual working relationship.

P40

Money power

ADOOB GOPALAKRISHNAN

WHEN it comes to the question of discussing Indian cinema, one wonders which Indian cinema one should speak about. Should it be the Hindi cinema that is taken for granted as the national cinema or the regional ones that make up the bulk of the nation's production? The riddle it seems remains unresolved.

Judged by their big budgets, the commercial vulgarities that go almost synonymously with and geometrically proportional to the big-money input, the all-India as well as the over-seas market they command, and their lack of any likeness to the life and culture of any particular region of the nation, at least three language cinemas qualify themselves to aspire to the status of a national cinema—the Hindi, the Tamil and the Telugu.

Apart from the contemporary Hindi cinema wherein sporadic yet well-meaning attempts, often dis-

astrous at the box-office, are made, one does not come across a single probing or any bold effort off the beaten track either in the Tamil or the Telugu cinemas. They are big-money business, and the mechanics of production operate strictly under their own unlawful laws of economics. Unaccountable money accounting for the investment, unethical exploitation of low public taste, unrestricted opportunities for those carnal pleasures peripheral to film-making—a scene of obnoxious oddities our big cinema business has become.

Well, all that for the large scale ones; axiomatically, the small scale 'creations' should, one would expect, be free from the corrupting influences of big business fraught with incorrigible anomalies. There you are mistaken. The low budget films of the regional cinema are no less free from the commercialised vulgarities and vagaries

of their big brothers. Aspirations they share in common, only the resources vary.

In a country where the whole machinery of production, distribution and consumption is virtually controlled by the clever manipulations of a few monopolists, it is but natural that the capital gains are given priority over social obligations of a medium that unfortunately wilds the greatest influence on the masses of our sub-continent.

A conscientious and apparently sound suggestion for a way out would be the nationalisation of all the sectors of the film industry by one single strong stroke of parliamentary legislation. It should be remembered here that even at the slightest hint of governmental supervision or censorial restrictions, the Movie Moghuls raise a loud hue and cry over the feared curtailment of their artistic freedom. When the utter lack of any artistic flavour in their cheap celluloid soap operas is even vaguely criticised, the very same guards of the artists' freedom are there to defend their commodities as the products of an industrial process made-to-order according to the strict demands of consumer taste. It may look paradoxical, but the sword they are armoured with is money-power and it is double-edged.

Any popular government would find the hurdles innumerable as well as insurmountable even in its very earnest efforts to effect the nationalisation of this industry which is vaguely and to a great extent irresponsibly treated as an innocuous, inconsequential 'entertainment-industry'.

Nationalisation may be a far cry. And there are of course misgivings in the minds of the people as to how far our unimaginative, inefficient, bureaucratic government set-up would be better equipped than the current incumbents to lead, direct and discipline a medium of such magnitude providing the right and ripe atmosphere for the profession and the practice of true, unhindered, unfettered artistic expression.

Even at the level of an industry that churns out entertainment 'rolls', it would be worthwhile for the government of a welfare State at least to be aware of the sub-human conditions under which the technicians, the 'underdogs' of this 'show whirl' work, while their sweat and toil make the stars glitter and glimmer attracting enormous fan-mail and astronomical figures in black.

Our cinema is a top heavy industry founded on false grounds that belie and belittle all the codes of human dignity. And it should take only a shake of protest from below to be toppled down. But it remains a fact that from the floor-hand to the first assistant, every one of those 'mini-humans' are blinded and deafened by the colour and clatter of the dream-worlds they contribute to make. For them it is a way of life, the *fiat accompli*: the defiance, alas, has to be generated from without.

The infra-structure of the industry being what it is, our big studios are the last spots on earth where creativity would be nurtured. People with no understanding or involvement in the medium, mercenaries with no love, loyalty or commitment to the cinema crowd the floors as adventurers and fortune seekers. Peddlers in sex, sentiments and other saleable fare, they ruthlessly block the inlets to the new young generation of film-makers eagerly awaiting in the wings to grab at the first opportunity to explore the enormous possibilities of this least explored medium.

Will they ever make it? Or will they, in their long, impatient, tedious, demoralising wait, disburse their tied up energy and expend their passion?

The sad truth is that many have. Society has a moral responsibility to shoulder what it cannot disown. Here is a vital issue, much graver than the tragedy of frustrated personal ambitions; a problem of enormous social significance calling for immediate positive action.

PHO

The parallel stream

DILEEP PADGAONKAR

WHEN Mrinal Sen made *Bhuvan Shome* five years ago, the implications of the term 'parallel cinema' could be taken for granted without critical inquiry. The issues faced by the Indian cinema appeared to be fairly evident then. Of the 368 films made in 1969, not more than half a dozen films had managed to avoid the inanities of the commercial cinema. But even those handful of directors whose works were not geared to mass entertainment did not start a novel trend in film-making, let alone a movement along the lines of the East European or the Latin American cinema in the mid-sixties.

The parallel cinema was expected to reverse this trend. Bolstered by low-interest loans provided by the government, the director with ideas was to be given a free hand to choose his themes and styles. He could use his camera to explore the world around him. The idea obviously was to encourage him to violate the norms of mass entertainment imposed by the film industry. He would in turn try to initiate another idea of entertainment in the cinema.

It was a lofty ambition considering the powerful hold of the commercial cinema on popular

imagination. An average of 75 lakh people watch a commercial film daily in one or other of the 7,300 theatres in the country. Over 600 film-fan magazines are widely circulated, not to mention the hundreds of film songs broadcast from the national radio network. No other mass medium could ever hope to rival the grip of the cinema in a country where 70 per cent of the population is still in the fetters of illiteracy.

In retrospect, the parallel cinema appears to have gained impressive ground over the past five years. Nowhere was this more evident than in this year's national awards for feature films. The extraneous polemics that followed the jury's decision could not slur over the stringent rebuff received by the film industry. In previous years at least some of its products found a place of pride in the honours list. This year, nothing. The jury had abided by standards of cinematic excellence along Parochial, financial, ideological considerations were not allowed to shape its decisions.

Even in a negative sense—the rejection of the film industry—the 1973 national awards will be recalled as a watershed in the evolution of Indian cinema. The significance of this development can perhaps be better understood if one looks back at the seven decades since D. G. Phalke made *Raja Harishchandra* in 1912. In his monumental history of the world cinema, Georges Sadoul remarks on the 'artistic and technical' excellence of Phalke's works. They were lauded by Londoners at that time.

(It will be recalled, within parenthesis, that with the singular exceptions of *Fatehlal and Damle's Sant Tukaram* and the films of Satyajit Ray it was only the parallel cinema that received fulsome praise in the West. *Le Monde's* influential critic, Louis Marcorelles, hailed it as a 'mini-revolution'.)

Over the past seventy years, the Indian film, like its counterparts elsewhere, has been fashioned as much by economic as by cultural factors. Its financial and industrial

aspects came to be recognised as early as the twenties. Production was concentrated in Bombay and Calcutta. This concentration was of course illustrated by Hollywood. The organisation of the film industries in Europe also followed along the same lines.

In India, however, hardly any of the silent films boasted of formal or thematic qualities of enduring value. The Americans, during the silent era, gave the world *Intolerance* (Griffith), *The Kid* (Chaplin) and *Greed* (Stroheim). The French contributed to the nascent art with the films of Feuillade, *L'Accuse* (Gance) and *Entracte* (Rene Clair). The Germans threw up directors like Lubitsch, Murnau and Fritz Lang. The Swedes, Sjoström, the Russians, Vertov, Eisenstein and Pudovkin, not to mention the Flahertys, Dreyers, Dulacs and the Bunuels.

The growth of the Indian film became even more stunted with the advent of sound in the early thirties. The cinema had suddenly to cater to the demands of a multi-lingual market. It is in this period of crisis that the industry hit upon its now-famous *Formula*. Films were packed with songs and music. So were they in Europe and America. But these cinemas quickly shed this intrusion. Not so the Indian film.

Together with songs also spread the influence of the numerically important language—Hindi. The heterogeneous quality of the audiences indeed obliged the cinema to operate outside the framework of easily identifiable linguistic and cultural milieu.

During the war years the industry, thanks to the role played by speculative money, underwent a structural change. Its products changed character too. The star system became more deeply entrenched. The demands for mass entertainment witnessed a remarkable resurgence of the extravagant spectacles—dances, lavish sets, exotic locations. Films became more and more a-social. Realism was eschewed. The pattern grew more rigid after independence. The

industry responded only to market conditions.

Throughout this period, however, some independent film-makers did attempt at least thematic novelties. Delicate social themes were treated in films like *Achyut Kanya* (untouchability), *Duniya na Mane* (against arranged marriage), *Badi Didi* (plight of widows), *Padosi* (Hindu-Muslim relations), *Dharti ke Lal* (Bengal famine). But, by and large, the Indian cinema did not go through any of the aesthetic movements that convulsed the cinema in the west—the German expressionism, the formal innovations of the Soviet cinema, the American and French 'realisms', the neo-realism of the Italians, the New Wave of the French etc., etc. Nor did the Indian film, unlike its Japanese counterpart, draw its plastic and dramaturgy ideas from the country's traditions.

The reason, no doubt, was that Indian film makers have had at no time—with the possible exceptions of the freedom struggle and certain movements for social emancipation—to contend with the kind of dramatic movements that European politics, literature, the visual arts and the sciences had to contend with. There were no equivalents here of the Dreyfus case and Gide, Monet and Curie, of Sorel's *Reflection on violence*, Gorki, Picasso, Matisse, Debussy, Schoenberg, Einstein and Rutherford, of the Russian revolution, Cubism, Stravinsky, Proust, Mayakowsky or Freud; of Fascism, Le Corbusier, *Ulysses*, Brecht, of the Spanish civil war, Klee, Dali, Stravinsky, Malraux, Eliot, Sartre, Fleming (penicillin); the second world war, Mao Tse-tung, Hiroshima, Beckett or the Papal encyclicals.

To be sure there was the Gandhian revolution and its tragic denouement—partition. But the one inspired not a single film of merit while the other had to await 1973 (*Garm Hawa*) to be tackled on the screen. Besides the classics, contemporary literature however provided a source for the film makers: the works of Tagore, Bankim Chandra Chatterjee, Sarat Chandra Chatterjee, Munshi Premchand,

Bibhuti Bhushan Bannerjee, Sane Guruji were adapted at one point or the other, sometimes with success but very often without a search for cinematic equivalents of the literary forms. Not without reason even the so-called serious cinema in India never got beyond either realism or narrative dramaturgy.

How does the parallel cinema stand out against this background of the overwhelming presence of escapist entertainment, on the one hand, and, on the other, the isolated efforts of a Ray, Ghatak, Sen or an Abbas?

In theme and style the parallel cinema has without doubt broken fresh ground as would be evident even from the 1973 national awards. All the films that were honoured have certain characteristics in common. Film is used as a medium of expression and communication more than as an industrial product tailored to suit an all-India market. This fundamental difference with the commercial cinema can be seen to affect every other aspect of the parallel cinema.

Thus, all the films have rid themselves of the vulgarity and garishness of the average Hindi film. To be sure they depict romance and violence and sex but these are closely integrated into a coherent vision that the film maker seeks to put across. The coherence stems partly from the fact that the film is deeply rooted in an identifiable social and cultural reality. Partly, too, it derives from the director's foremost concern to provide social and psychological insights in the world around him.

The films made since *Bhuvan Shome* indeed reveal not only the richness and variety of Indian life but, perhaps in an even more important sense, a whole range of sensibilities that are otherwise numbed in the commercial cinema. Each film, in effect, not only explores the erosion of the caste system, feudal values, the grip of religious prejudices, change in a traditional society but the exploration itself is revealing of a mind at work. It is the sense of discovery

that accounts for the freshness of these works.

The evolution of Mrinal Sen provides an interesting case study. Before 1969, Sen's work was no doubt deeply rooted in the social processes of his native Bengal. After *Bhuvan Shome*—his one and only venture in Hindi, shot in Gujarat—he turned sharply towards an explicitly political cinema. The commitment to extreme left-wing politics became more pronounced with every successive film—*Interview*, *Calcutta 71* and *Padatik*. Sen is the only film maker in the country to use his idiom for an avowedly political end. His Marxism, however, has not led him astray into the desert of 'socialist realism'. In all his recent films he has attempted—not always with success—to break away from traditional narrative. His films include patches of documentaries, newspaper headlines and highly stylised sequences. This attention to form places his work nautches above the work of another leftist film maker, the veteran K. A. Abbas.

In Karnataka, Girish Karnad has fashioned for himself an altogether different sort of universe. Like Satyajit Ray, he is a compulsive story-teller but his social commitment is no less pronounced. Decay, degeneration, violence—all these have provided Karnad with inspiration. His *Samskara*—with its taut, austere quality—dealt with the disarray caused by the death of a Madhava Brahmin who had defied the tenets of his caste. The erosion of caste values in the face of secular education and urbanisation forms the core of *Vamsha Vriksha* while *Kaadu* (The Forest) handles violence—psychological and physical—with much more audacity—violence in relations between husband and wife, the elders of two rival villages, between master and servant and the worlds of adults and children.

All these relations have been handled separately by other film makers forming part of the parallel cinema. M. T. Vasudevan Nair's *Nirmalyam*—which won the President's gold medal this year—port-

rays the forces of change as they convulse a Kerala village. The story centres around an oracle reduced to destitution because the village no longer requires his services in the temple. His lucky break comes when the outbreak of small-pox puts him back into circulation, as it were, but it is too late.

The problems faced by a young couple in a low-middle class joint family were sensitively brought out in Basu Chatterjee's *Sara Akaash*. The woes of widowhood, in Kantilal Rathod's *Kanku*. The same director, in his recent *Parinay*, evoked the dichotomies of urban and rural living. Alienation in love, work or relations with parents were dealt with in Girish Vaidya's *Aakranti* and the late Awtar Kaul's *27 Down*. Caste intolerance was denounced in the Malayalam film *Gayatri*, religious intolerance in M. S. Sathyu's *Garm Hawa* and the havoc wrought by alcoholism in the Tamil film *Dikkatra Parvati*.

One need hardly stress the variety of themes explored by the young film makers. But the parallel cinema has also revealed two other impressive talents exploring altogether different frontiers. Both Mani Kaul and Kumar Shahani have, for the first time in the history of Indian cinema, broken away from all the props of the conventional cinema. Both have done away with the narrative form, with acting, linear plots, 'psychology' etc. Their efforts have been directed instead towards aesthetic research. In the line of Griffith and Dreyer, the early Soviet pioneers (notably Eisenstein), Ozu in Japan, Antonioni in Italy, Godard and Bresson in France, Kaul and Shahani have not dissociated an enquiry into the social realities around them from an enquiry into the nature of their medium. But there the similarity between their work ends.

On the face of it Kaul's trilogy—*Uski Roti*, *Aashad Ka Ek Din* and *Duwidha*—disconcerts a spectator who has been conditioned in the cinema by stories set in a realistic mould. But once he attunes himself to Kaul's style he discovers a most exciting mind at work. Contrary to what is held against him

his films certainly do not lack 'content'. The three films offer a lyrical meditation on the condition of the 'waiting woman'. Each film moreover deals with a conflict situation: between town and countryside (*Uski Roti*), court and valley (*Aashad Ka Ek Din*) and the worldly and the other worldly (*Duwidha*).

But, in each case, Kaul seeks a metamorphosis from one idiom to another—from short story, play and folk tale into film. He does not grapple with genres alone but with the specificity of each of these literary forms. It is only in this way that he manages to achieve something that is specific to the cinema itself.

All this is not to say that Kaul's work is not flawed at places. His refusal to lay emphasis on any one element of his films—hence the absence of a story, of acting, of anything in fact that would divert the attention of the spectator to any single aspect of his work—flows, to be sure, from his deep interest in Hindu metaphysics. Kumar Shahani, on the other hand, takes care to keep one foot deeply planted in the social processes around him. In *Maya Darpan* he does not only portray the boredom of a young, unmarried girl whiling her days away in a huge, decrepit mansion on the border of a small town. Nor does he console himself with showing the girl's quiet revolt against her authoritarian father. He goes much further. *Maya Darpan* is a film on an evolving awareness: the girl realises the close connection between her boredom and the social forces agitating the outside world. For its intelligent use of colour and its rich suggestiveness, *Maya Darpan* has yet to meet with a rival.

Ironically, the experiments of Kaul and Shahani have provoked angry polemics not only in the commercial cinema but also within the precincts of the parallel cinema itself. That four films which have not had a commercial run could provoke the ire of every director ranging from Satyajit Ray to the latest debutant in the business must surely point to their disturbing qualities. The films have

been called boring, slow, repetitive, difficult, academic, Bressonian, Antonionist, Godardian, Bergmanesque, 'not-relevant-to-the-Indian context' and so on. Many of these charges were levelled at Satyajit Ray when he made *Pathar Panchali* in 1955. Ray, like several other distinguished directors, had also acknowledged the influences on him—Soviet film-makers, Renoir, the Italian neo-realists—but hardly anyone then upbraided him for falling prey to 'foreign' examples. Likewise the accusation of wasting tax-payer's money seems, to put it mildly, quite amusing especially when it comes from left-wing critics. Tax payers money? But less than one per cent—the moneyed elite—pay taxes anyway!

It seems, on careful consideration, that Kaul and Shahani are not pardoned for having forsaken realism and 'stories' in their work. But realism *per se* is no virtue in the arts. It could be as misleading, perhaps more misleading, than the non-realist approaches. It is just one style among several others. Realism no doubt is better suited when the director's primary concern is to portray social issues. But any effort to be more ambitious—to attain a 'totality', consciousness, interiorisation, spirituality—must necessarily mean evolving new narrative structures.

The sharp polemics against Kaul and Shahani are indeed revealing of certain ambiguities in India's parallel cinema. At the time of *Bhuvan Shome*, as was mentioned earlier, the issues facing a young film maker were fairly obvious. These have got blurred along the way. One would be hard put to explain the differences in approach between Shyam Benegal's *Ankur* and *Avishkaar* made by the commercial director, Basu Bhattacharya; or what—apart from the novelty of the theme—distinguishes M. S. Sathyu's *Garm Hawa* from Gulzar's (another commercial director) *Achanak*. The directors argue, not without reason, that they have to make 'compromises' partly because the need of the hour is to draw audiences towards good cinema rather than to repel them

with formalist exercises. Partly, too, it is explained that films need to recover the funds invested in them—this again not without cause.

But by reacting angrily to the works of Kaul and Shahani, the parallel film makers can only run the risk of depriving the Indian cinema of what has been indispensable to every major cinema movement in the world during the last thirty years; viz., two or three directors engaged in formal innovation. Studies have shown that to ensure the health of any cinema—or TV for that matter—the 'aesthetic' and 'realistic' poles of creation have to feed off each other. The promotion of one to the detriment of the other leads to sterility and decay.

The root cause of the malady has again to be found in the economic structures of the film industry. The government has wisely helped young makers produce their films. But, once completed, their works have to fend for themselves for distribution and exhibition. It is no secret that both sectors are controlled by the industry and that no film that does not respect the current norms of mass entertainment can even figure in the distribution circuit.

The situation would no doubt be different if the government subsidised the exhibition of films as well. But there again care would have to be taken to think out alternatives to the present system. It would serve no purpose to think of production and distribution on the basis of profitability for individual works alone. Rather, a package programme that could include a film by Kaul, Benegal, Sathyu, Sen and Karnad could be screened. No one would be excluded. The Benegals and the Sathyus would try to draw the audiences of the commercial film to the parallel cinema. The audiences of the parallel cinema, in turn, would make efforts to appreciate the Kauls and the Shahanis. Only then can the parallel cinema fulfil its vocation—that of *democratising another idea of entertainment in the cinema*.

Further reading

BOOKS

- Abbas, Khwaja Ahmad.** Boy meets girl. Delhi, Sterling, 1974.
- Appleton, Marlon.** The Cinema, London, Macdonald and Co., 1974.
- Balcon, Michael.** Film Production and Management. London, British Institute of Management, 1950.
- Barnouw, Erik and Krishnaswamy, S.** Indian Film. New York, Columbia University Press, 1963.
- Barsam, Richard Meran.** Nonfiction film; a critical history. New York, Funk and W., 1973.
- Bellone, Julius, ed.** Renaissance of the film. New York, Collier Books, 1970.
- Boyum, Joy G. and Scott, Adrienne.** Film as film: critical responses to film art. Rockleigh, Allyn and Bacon, 1971.
- Burch, Noel.** Theory of film practice. New York, Praeger, 1973.
- Butler, Ivan.** The making of feature films: a guide. Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1971.
- Cameron, Ian.** Adventure and the cinema. London, Studio Vista, 1973.
- Casty, Alan.** Development of the film: an interpretive history. New York, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1973.
- The dramatic art of the film. New York, Harper and Row, 1971.
- Cavell, Stanley.** The world viewed: reflections on the ontology of film. New York, Viking Press, 1971.
- Clair, Rene.** Cinema yesterday and today. Magnolia, Mass., Peter Smith, 1973.
- Clarens, Carlos.** Horror movies; rev. ed. London, Panther 1971.
- Cowie, Peter.** A concise history of the cinema. London, Zwemmer, 1972. 2 volumes.
- Currie, Hector and Staples, Donald.** Film: encounter. Dayton, Standard, 1973.

- Curtis, David.** Experimental cinema: a fifty-year evolution. London, Studio Vista, 1971.
- Dadachandji, Rustom R.** Law of Copyright and movie-rights in a nut shell. Bombay, The author, 1955.
- Davis, Brian.** The thriller: the suspense film from 1946. London, Studio Vista, 1973.
- Dharap, B. V. ed.** Indian films, 1972. Bombay, Allied Publishers, 1973.
- Dickinson, Thorold.** A discovery of cinema. London, Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Faure, William.** Images of violence. London, Studio Vista, 1973.
- Fensch, Thomas.** Films on the campus. New York, A. S. Barnes, 1970.
- Ford, Richard.** Children in the cinema. New York, J. S. Ozer, 1971.
- Furhammar, Lelf and Isaksson, Folke.** Politics and the film; tr. (from the Swedish) by Kersti French. London, Studio Vista, 1971.
- Giannetti, Louis Daniel.** Understanding movies. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1972.
- Gifford, Denis.** Science fiction film. London, Studio Vista, 1971.
- Gottesman, Ronald and Geduld, Harry M.** Guide book to film: an eleven-in-one reference. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.
- Griffith, Richard and Mayer, Arthur.** The movies; rev. ed. Feltham, Spring Books, 1971.
- Hanson, Gillian.** Original skin: nudity and sex in cinema and theatre. London, Tom Stacey, 1970.
- Harrington, John.** The rhetoric of film. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.
- India, Enquiry Committee on Film Censorship,** 1968. Report. Delhi, Manager of Publications, 1969. Chairman: G. D. Khosla.
- India, Film Enquiry Committee,** 1949. Report. Delhi, Manager of Publications, 1951. Chairman: S. K. Patil.
- India, Indian Cinematography Committee,** 1927. Report. Delhi, Manager of Publications, 1928. Chairman: T. Rangachariar.
- India, Ministry of Law and Justice.** The Cinematograph (amendment) Act, 1973. Delhi, Manager of Publications, 1973.
- India, Parliament, Lok Sabha, Estimates Committee** (2nd Lok Sabha). Hundred and fifty-ninth report: Ministry of Information and Broadcasting—part 2. Films. New Delhi, Lok Sabha Secretariat, 1962 (3rd Lok Sabha).
- . Fourteenth report. Ministry of Information and Broadcasting: action taken by government on the recommendations contained in the 158th, 159th and 160th reports of the Estimates Committee (2nd Lok Sabha) on the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting: Film (4th Lok Sabha).
- . First report on Ministry of Information and Broadcasting: Film Institute of India, Poona. New Delhi, Lok Sabha Secretariat, 1967.
- . Second report on Ministry of Information and Broadcasting: Board of Film Censors, Bombay. New Delhi, Lok Sabha Secretariat, 1967.
- International film guide,** ed. by Peter Cowie, London, Tantivy Press, 1971.
- Jain, Rikkab Dass.** The Economic aspects of film industry in India. Delhi, Atma Ram, 1960.
- Jarvie, I.C.** Movies and society. Scranton: Basic Books, 1970.
- Kael, Pauline.** Deeper into movies. Boston, Little Brown, 1973.
- Kobal, John.** Romance and the cinema. London, Studio Vista, 1973.
- Lee, Raymond and Van Hecke, B.C.** Gangsters and hoodlums: the underworld in the cinema. New York, A. S. Barnes, 1971.
- Lewis, Jerry.** The total film-maker. New York, Random, 1971.
- Madsen, Roy.** The impact of film: how ideas are communicated through cinema and television. New York, Macmillan 1973.
- Maharashtra, Minimum Wages Committee for Cinema Exhibition Industry,** 1955. Report. Bombay, 1967. Chairman: Shankarrao Gedam.
- Manchel, Frank.** Film study: a resource guide. Rutherford (N.J.) Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1973.
- Marcoelles, Louis.** Living cinema: new directions in contemporary film-making. New York, Praeger, 1973.
- Mast, Gerald.** The comic mind: comedy and the movies. Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill, 1973.
- Matthews, J. H.** Surrealism and film. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1971.
- Mayer, Jacob Peter.** Sociology of film: studies and documents. New York, J.S. Ozer, 1971.
- Mellen, Joan.** Women and their sexuality in the new film. New York Horizon Press, 1974.
- Mitchell, Alice Miller.** Children and movies. New York, J.S. Ozer, 1971.
- Munsterberg, Hugo.** The film: a psychological study. New York, Dover Publications, 1970.
- Murray, Edward.** The Cinema imagination: writers and the motion pictures. New York, Ungar, 1972.
- Naremore, James.** Filmguide to psycho. Bloomington, Indian University Press, 1973.
- Oberholtzer, Elis Paxson.** The morals of the movie. New York, J.S. Ozer 1971.
- Perkins, Victor Francis.** Film as film: understanding and judging movies. Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1972.
- Perlman, William J. ed.** The movies on trial. New York, J.S. Ozer, 1971.
- Pratt, George C.** Spellbound in darkness; a history of the silent film; rev. ed. Greenwich, Conn., New York Graphic Society, 1973.
- Quigley, Martin.** Decency in motion pictures. New York, J.S. Ozer, 1971.
- Rangoonwalla, Firoze.** Indian Filmography. New Delhi, Book House, 1970.
- ✓ **Roberge, Gaston.** Chitrabani, Social Communication Centre, Calcutta, 1974.
- Robinson, David.** The history of world cinema. New York, Stein and Day, 1973.
- Rosenthal, Alan.** The new documentary in action: a case book in film making. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1971.
- Rotsler, William.** Contemporary erotic cinema. New York, Ballantine Books, 1973.
- Sands, Pierre Norman.** A historical study of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences. New York, Arno Press, 1973.
- Sarris, Andrew.** The primal screen: essays on film and related subjects. New York, Simon and Schuster, 1973.
- Seton, Marie.** Portrait of a director. Vikas, 1972.
- ✓ **Shah, Panna.** Indian film. West Court, Corn, Greenwood, 1950.
- Sitney, P. Adams, ed.** 'Film Culture'— an anthology. London, Secker and Warburg, 1971.

Steinrunner, Chris and Goldblatt, Burt. Cinema of the fantastic. New York, Saturday Review Press, 1972.

Stewart, Bruce. The world of film: an introduction to the cinema. London, Darton, Longman and Todd, 1971.

Thomas, David B. The origins of the motion picture: an introductory booklet on the prehistory of the Cinema. London, H.M.S.O. 1964.

Tyler, Parker. Magic and myth of the movies. London, Secker and Warburg, 1971.

———. Sex, psyche, etcetera in the film. Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1971.

Tyler, Parker. Underground film: a critical history. London, Secker and Warburg, 1971.

UNESCO. Film production by international cooperation: a report . . . by H. J. L. Jongblood. Paris, UNESCO, 1961.

Wolfe, Peter. Signs and meaning in the cinema; 3rd ed. Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1972.

Youngblood, Gene. Expanded cinema. London, Studio Vista, 1970.

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

- Abbas, K. A.** Film and society, 'Yojana' 15 October 1974: 4-6.
- . Kamasutra via Hollywood. 'Illustrated Weekly' 15 April 1973: 48-51.
- Asha Kishore.** A peep into the Film Institute. 'Lipika' February-April, 1973: 20-23.
- Balg, Ali Asghar.** Sixty years of Indian Cinema. 'Illustrated Weekly' 21 May 1972: 6-15.
- Barman, Ashis.** Film awards and standards of judges, films. 'Link' 7 May 1972: 32-33.
- . Towards a total design in Cinema. 'Link' 15 August 1972: 135-136.
- Bharatan, Raju.** New voices for old. 'Illustrated Weekly' 28 April 1974: 16-19.
- Bisaria, J.N.** Indian film technology: miles to go. 'Vidura' February 1974: 471-473.
- Boyd Brue Michael.** Film censorship in India: a reasonable restriction on freedom of speech and expression. 'Journal of the Indian Law Institute' October-December 1972: 501-561.
- Censorship; editorial.** 'Times of India' 8 October 1972: 4:1.
- Chopra, B. R.** Indian cinema. 'Illustrated Weekly' 13 August 1972: 61-65.
- Dinkar Rao, Adige.** Marketing Indian films. 'Hindustan Times' 17 June 1972: 5:4.
- A film policy; editorial.** 'Times of India' 25 March, 1973: 8:1.
- Film theatres; editorial.** 'Times of India' 2 September 1973: 4:1.
- Films—Bombay still on top.** 'Link' 26 January 1973: 82-85.
- Films for world markets; editorial.** 'Times of India' 6 August 1972: 6:1.
- Gold, Martin E.** India's motion picture industry. 'Indian Journal of Economics' October 1971: 143-157.
- Gujral, I. K.** Social correctives for a positive cinema. 'Yojana' 15 October 1974: 7-8.
- Hardgrave, Robert L., Jr.** Film and mass politics in the developing areas. 'American Behavioral Scientist' January-February 1973: 74.
- Hari, Atma.** Economics of film-making. 'Star and Style' 31 March 1972: 15.
- Indian cinema and black money culture.** 'Link' 15 August 1973: 101-103.
- Karanjia, B. K.** Financing films. 'Yojana' 15 October 1974: 9-10.
- Mahmood, Hameeduddin.** Saga of the universal Hindi film. 'Lipika' May-June 1973: 23-27.
- Malhotra, Inder.** Managing film imports: a remedy worse than the disease. 'Times of India' 13 September 1973: 4:3, 5.
- Malik, Amita.** Plus and Minus. 'Yojana' 15 October 1974: 17.
- Mathew, P. C.** Criteria for film censorship. 'Hindu' 14 June 1974: 4.
- Merchant, Ajit B.** The super princes. 'Yojana' 15 October 1974: 19-20.
- Merchant, Ismail.** What does a film producer do? 'Illustrated Weekly' 10 June 1973: 436-437.
- Mookerjee, Subrata.** Decline and recovery. 'Yojana' 15 October 1974: 37-38.
- Mushir Ahmed.** Documentaries. 'Yojana' 15 October 1974: 20-21.
- Nadkarni, Dnyaneshwar.** Who's afraid of the bureaucrats? 'Times Weekly' 16 January 1972: 8-9.
- Nag, Madhuri.** Film industry's problems. 'Economic Times' 31 October 1972: 15:1.
- National policy for cinema.** 'Filmfare' 11 August, 1972: 7 (editorial).
- New film policy making.** 'States' 28 October 1972: 11.
- Pal, Anjali.** Nefarious traffic in smuggled films. 'Indian Express' 21 May 1972: 1:1.
- Parthasarthy, M.A.** Sound financial base for Mysore film industry. 'Financial Express' 14 February 1972: 9:1.
- Rajendran, Girija.** The bold 'new-wavers'. 'Illustrated Weekly' 19 December 1971: 49.
- Raju, V.K.A.R.** Costing in film industry. 'Management Accountant' January 1972: 39-41.
- Rangoonwalla, Firoze.** Planning films: the dilemma of the producer. 'Yojana' 15 October 1974: 15-16.
- . Seventyfive years of Indian cinemas. 'Thought' 26 January 1974: 19-21.
- Ray, Satyajit.** The delicate balance of art and commerce in film making. 'Yojana' 15 October 1974: 11-13.
- Razdan, C. K.** Quality is the first casualty in Indian cinema. 'Organiser' 16 October 1971: 21.
- Russian Penetration in Indian films.** 'Organiser' 24 June 1972: 6, 15.
- Sen, A. K.** Film censoring. 'Yojana' 15 October 1974: 29-30.
- Shambuddin.** The social aspects of the cinema. 'Sikh Review' September 1973: 71-72.
- Shankar, L.** Children's films. 'Yojana' 15 October 1974: 21-22.
- Silver Screen; editorial.** 'Times of India' 2 December 1973: 4:1.
- Sinha, Shatrughan.** Villainy Film Institute style. 'Illustrated Weekly' 29 October 1972: 40-43.
- Speaking bluntly about our films and films awards.** 'Link' 7 May 1972: 34-36.
- Swaminathan, Anuradha.** The Cinema and social change. 'Illustrated Weekly' 18 March 1973: 46-49.
- Ved, Mahendra.** Film Journalism in India. 'Vidura' November 1971: 377.
- Violence on the screen; editorial.** 'Times of India' 12 August 1973: 4:1.
- Way the film awards went; better films just escape dumping; industry prevails in star selection.** 'Link' 7 May 1972: 31.