CHAPTER 3

Objectives/Methodology and a Review of Existing Literature.

For a long time women were 'hidden from history' as so aptly described by Sheila Rowbotham. One of the first aims of feminist scholarship, which has gained such momentum in the past few decades, has been to render women's situation and experience visible. As a consequence of the feminist movement, many issues affecting women's lives have become important areas of discussion and study, which have produced far-reaching developments in intellectual work. In a nutshell, the earlier phase of feminist scholarship tended to concentrate on the male domination of women in keeping the latter largely confined to the domestic sphere and their consequent exclusion from the male world. The newer phase of feminist scholarship, however, has become a far more diverse body of thought. It has come to emphasize the special and distinctive nature of women's roles in both the 'public' and 'private' spheres of life. Media, and how women are represented in media, form one important aspect of such studies.

Academic discourse, debate, and research have been plentiful in feminist media theory and women in media research in recent years. Media has been described as “technologies of gender, accommodating, modifying, reconstructing and producing, disciplining and contrary renditions of sexual difference.” Media 'texts' as they are called, such as advertisements, television programmes, films, magazines, etc., provide an area of observation to see how such technologies function and provide meaning. These help in throwing light, as a starting point for further analysis, on issues such as the tensions in a struggle between tradition and modernity; the alternative, and at times, conflicting meanings encoded in such texts; the symbols of reality and fantasy in such models of communication; questions of gender, ethnicity, sexuality and power in the construction of femininity, etc.

Objectives of the Study

Drawing upon such polysemic media 'texts', this study will attempt methodological and theoretical approaches to deal with such data and address the sort of questions outlined above, and any others, which will help form a linking point for discussions (discussed later in this study). The following two methodologies have been current in such research so far. One has been the concentration on the 'reception' or 'consumption' side - the interpretation, acceptance/non-acceptance of such portrayals, the position of the intended (and non-intended) audiences and consumers in relation to such texts, ethnographic studies of consumption, interpretation, resistance, etc. This
becomes inevitable when one recognizes the multiplicity of meanings in media
texts and the multiplicity of ways that audiences make meaning of such texts.

Another has been to concentrate on the 'production' side - the study of
the media product itself, either by content analysis or semiotic analysis. In an
interpretative research strategy the one can complement the other. Two
related points for a broader linking of discussions need mentioning here. One,
feminist scholarship has inevitably tended to make gender (as expressed in
questions dealing mainly with femininity) an important component of
research. However, this has led to a backlash, since by definition; gender
needs to focus both on women as well as men, on questions of femininity as
well as masculinity. Thus, without strictly adhering to the title of the study,
this thesis deals with theory, notions of masculinity and male sexuality in the
construction of gender discourses, as also the new meaning that Bombay
cinema has brought forth in past few years. Geographical boundaries are not
demarcated for the purposes of this study as Hindi cinema has an all India
character. Since feminist film theory has it's geneses in the Western world, it
was necessary to examine such theories in relation to the films analyzed here.
What is of importance is to examine how different theoretical frameworks and
approaches are applicable to the examination of such issues. The word
'images' brings to mind 'representation'. Representation is of crucial political
and cultural importance. By focusing on media, the study will look at how far
women are able to articulate their own perspectives and demands. How do
women represent and re-present themselves through media? Representation
also finds immediate reference, to many of the important questions regarding
culture and politics on the academic agenda. Cultural self-expression
(through mass media) is a way of campaigning for political leverage. Not only
does it lobby for social and legal changes beneficial to women, it also
challenges cultural preoccupations concerning femininity and gender. The aim
of study is also to see that discussion and debate on such issues will lead to a
broad cultural critique and raise further questions for future research.

Analysis of the four films selected for the study will try to locate the
various forms of gender violence and try to see how people are active
participants in the making of culture, with a particular focus on the making
and reception of Indian popular cinema, colloquially known as Bollywood. One
will look at how women who have been traditionally objects of the male gaze
have chosen to present themselves in films for consumption for diverse
audiences, academic and non-academic. The Indian cinema industry has been
long overlooked by film critics and scholars and most studies lacked empirical
evidence. Today, writing about Bollywood movies is serious business. It's
distinctive formulae and aesthetics with it's staple of song-and-dance
sequences, melodramatic narratives often with family dilemmas, and 'heroes'
and 'heroines', 'vamps' and 'villains' played by a pantheon of celebrities have made the product a very distinctive brand. This popular media contrasts with the other main genre of Indian cinema, commonly called art, middlebrow or new cinema with their doses of violence needs a new interpretation.

In order to study films representing violence against women a textual and historical approach will be taken. Textual will consist of conclusions derived from film texts. A focus on content analysis with a view of uncovering the ideologies which dominate the text which in turn represent the hidden desire, myths, rituals and thought processes will be taken into account. This study will make a conscious attempt to avoid the scope by not confining it to any one ideological approach, feminist or naturalist, structural, semiotic or psychoanalytic because popular films are multi-layered and their effects are a lot too many.

The breadth and inclusiveness of its methodological sweep kept aside, Indian cinema history is marked by an attention to historio-graphic detail which, if not as unusual at the time as we might now think, was certainly not then at the height of fashion within Film Studies. Indian film scholar's distinctive approach to the study of cinema--especially the history of cinema--consolidated itself in the late 1980s with the publication of a number of books on Bollywood. But to return to film history at this time, it (as opposed to the social history of cinema, a distinction which continues to separate film specialists from cultural historians) still concerns itself largely with the film industry/film production side of things. It's worth reminding ourselves, too, that a good deal of groundbreaking research in the industry/production area has focused on people--individuals working in the film industry.

While this tendency has been productive across the board, it has been so in quite distinctive ways within feminist film history; in work inspired in the first instance by a 'lost-and-found' approach--to use Lauren Rabinowitz's phrase referencing the bringing to light of forgotten or historically neglected women directors, screenwriters, and other industry personnel. Indian scholars, however, seem to have been more willing directly to tackle the historical audience--ordinary cinemagoers: a slightly unshaky venture, it might be said, given the lack of historical source materials. Contemporary data on audiences' responses to films and cinema is rather thin on the ground, though the avid researcher can track it down.

This study will also explore the large domain of Bombay Cinema in order to unearth the hidden secrets of our socialisation with the help of psychological and sociological tools. These methods involve psychoanalysis (Freudian and post-Freudian), phallic phase, positive Oedipal phase etc. Fetishism, voyeurism, exhibitionism, scopophilia and certain other socio-
psychological methods, distance, point of view of camera, style of editing, discourse etc. semiological concepts and other sociological tools. The images of woman in Indian cinema indicate the position of women in a patriarchal society, which has defined their roles, limits, and functions. Due to male Oedipal complex men are always afraid of the threat of castration. To remove that threat women are relegated to marginality through (a) male gaze (which is more powerful than the female gaze due to sociological reasons) and (b) fetishism [a kind of perversion of male in which they imagine certain object (for example high-heeled shoes, low-cut tops etc.) in a womens body as male sex organ.]. This way dominance-submission pattern is established. In Indian films erotification and objectification of women is done in order to reduce the threat of castration.

Fetishism also helps to eliminate that threat. Indian films use the Ego and Id and acts in the subconscious mind of male and female audience in different ways. The process of repressing women is present in almost every film. Patriarchy always tries to control woman so that they cannot violate the norms set by it. Indian cinema is continuously engaged in reinforcing that. Still why Indian women love to watch them? Psychoanalysis can provide the answer. Psychoanalyses of different women have shown that they are basically passive recipients of male desire. The objectification, surrender and assault provide the female audience masochistic pleasure while the same things offer the male audience sadistic pleasure. (Man gets sadistic pleasure because the sense of control and domination gives him satisfaction of punishing women for being castrated).

From erotification of women - representation of women as a sexual object, men get voyeuristic satisfaction and women, exhibitionistic pleasure. Apart from the major genre ‘family drama’, other two important genres of Indian cinema are ‘romantic cinema’ and ‘action cinema’. In most of the action films, the roles of the heroines are ornamental. In some of them, they play the role of principal protagonists where it is generally shown that a close person of the heroines is murdered brutally or she herself gets sexually assaulted. She takes revenge. She wears male dresses; she uses the gun, which acts like a phalrus. But actually, she loses her feminine character - she becomes masculinised. The world of Indian Cinema shows the war between male and non-male where inevitably the males win. The dominance-submission pattern remains intact, only the gender identification alters. It also gives lessons to the Indian woman about their position in the society. The ‘romantic films’ take the hero, heroine and the audience away from the dominant patriarchy to an hallucinatory pre-symbolic realm (Lacanian film theory which utilizes both psychoanalysis and semiology) where dominance of patriarchy, repression of
women are not present. The picturesque background helps to create this hallucination.

The image of woman as mother is shown in Indian cinema as an asexual object and who is not a threat to the patriarchy because her passive acceptance to patriarchy or ambivalent attitude towards it. Technical perfection in Indian cinema is increasing and distance, camera angle (point of view), editing, camera movement etc. are changing the connotative meanings to what 'she' signifies to man. Her different postures and activities are treated as icons, symbols, or codes. The audience identify themselves with the heroes or heroines. The montage of their fetishised bodies through close-ups, eliminating other characters from the screen interacts with the audience directly and gives them voyeuristic, exhibitionistic and scopophilic pleasures. Most Indian films sympathise towards the problems of women but seldom try to resolve them. However, the pattern of dominance-submission model remains intact. None of the four films could suggest or attempt to suggest any other alternative social structure or mode of existence possible.

Methodology

As a researcher focused on the sexual- psychological themes of violence present in popular Hindi films, an extensive reading of each of these films was sought, by examining and documenting any evident themes of violence, victimization, isolation, and alienation to uncover strong parallels in the larger society. The research proposed a series of questions to aid in determining if events and images portrayed in commercial Hindi films closely determine our own images in the society.

Does the manner in which popular Hindi films present women in film provide the spectator with insight into culture specific thoughts, fantasies, or values? Are women, through the process of film production, represented as products of the industry's male fetishistic and voyeuristic desire?

How are the narrative events/sequence, plot, visual symbols, cinematic text composition, camera's positioning/angles, sequencing of shots, and various elements of mise-en-scene useful in revealing how production houses choose to represent women in film? Do textual and visual representations of women's exploitation and subordination, if at all apparent, serve primarily as the basis of a director's aesthetic expression, or are these instances rather reflections of his/her own attitude towards women?

The method is dictated by the research questions posed and the selection of the artifact / document (Foss, 1996). Following Foss (1996), one
could argue that the best method suited for the current purpose is narrative
textual analysis that uses the tools of ideological criticism, taking a
structuralist-historical approach. The analysis of the movie has to recognize
that the narrative of the film is constructed by structuring the constitutive
elements in certain ways (the 'grammar' of the movie). There is a long tradition
of the use of this type of method in the literature that deals with ideology,
culture and identity in the movies and television (Eco, 1985; Fiske, 1987;
Foss, 1996; Metz, 2004a, 2004b; Mitra, 1999; Prasad, 1998, 2000; Turner,
1999; Sieter, 1992). Metz (2004) has argued that cinema is a semiotic system
Cinema is a multilayered and complex text, it has all the elements: visual
image, written language, and audio (voice, music, and sound effects) (Metz,
2004). And cinema, like every text, relies on a "semiotic convention" in the
construction of its signification (Eco, 1985). Through a representation of
different discursive and material practices it carries contesting ideologies and
constructs identities. Every signification in a movie is a negotiation over
meaning and is a struggle between the ideological 'points of view' of the
producers and the audiences (Hall, 1982).

In his study of cinema, Metz (2004) called for
ideological/narrative/textual analysis using a structuralist-semantic approach
to explicate the denotative and connotative structures in the narrative and
textual qualities. Scholars have argued that filmmakers make deliberate
choices while editing of a film, connecting frames using syntagmatic and
paradigmatic codes that constructs the desired/preferred meaning (Fiske,
1987; Metz, 2004; Prasad, 1998, 2000; Seiter, 1992). The narrative is
constructed with the use of cultural and ideological codes (Hall, 2002). And as
Barthes (2002) argued the narrative is anchored, the text is structured in
such a way that it leads the reader to receive the signifieds. Every text has its
preferred reading (Hall, 2002) that is determined by the hegemonic ideology
(Foss, 1996). It does not mean that audience cannot avoid the preferred
signifieds, but such an oppositional reading is difficult and assumes that
hegemonic ideology is external to the text. Mitra (1999) argues that the codes
in films are rooted in cultural, social, economic and political practices, and
they cannot just be seen as aesthetic codes (for example, in this case the use
of songs and dance as an essential element of Bollywood movies).

Discussing ideological criticism, Foss (1996) identified structuralism as
an analytical tool to undertake a systematic analysis of the relationship
between the different elements that construct the 'grammar' of an artifact, in
this case the movie. The grammar of the film gives clues to its ideology, rather
ideologies, as "multiple patterns of beliefs and ideologies" that are embedded
and manifested in the artifacts (Foss, 1996). Out of these multiple ideologies,
some dominate and emerge as hegemonic. The hegemonic ideology is renewed
and reinforced in the narrative and discursive practices represented in the
artifacts. To answer the questions posed by the paper, the hegemonic ideology will be identified within the text, and for this purpose the method of ideological critical analysis is well suited. Some of the hegemonic ideological elements that have been identified in the literature on Bollywood movies are represented by discursive and rhetorical practices depicting cultural, religious, family, and gender values (Gokulsing, 2004; Chakravarty, 1993; Nandy, 1998; Nasreen, 2001; Prasad, 1998).

Therefore following Foss (1996), researchers and film scholars must take responsibility for understanding and informing themselves about the complexity of debates that surround issues of women's images in the postcolonial world. A deeper and more rigorous kind of contextual analysis is essential to protect against simple, unreflective, and naive strategies that invariably harm more than help those who are victims of such negative portrayal on our screens. One of the basic assumptions of film studies is the apparently tautological notion that it is the study of films. That is, studies of film tend to assume that films present an unambiguous, uniquely differentiated and enduring object of study. Certainly the dominant approaches to the study of cinema in India over the last several decades have mobilized the metaphor of text in constituting film as an object of analysis. However, the general emphasis on internal 'textual operations' and 'narrative structures' have made it difficult for the study of cinema in India in getting beyond the films themselves. Even when scholars argued that Indian films must be understood in relation to their social contexts and cultural traditions, the substance of their arguments concerning the articulation of society and cinema usually came down to an analysis of 'narrative structures', 2(Chakravarty 1989 and 1993), or reduced to a 'reading' of specific film texts (Nandy 1998). No matter how well one tries to read between the lines, the social existence of a film cannot be read solely from film texts. Even when film studies scholarship employs the broader category of the cinema as 'institution' or deals with the larger issues of film stars, genres, modernity, nationalism or politics, the basic units of analysis are films themselves. This raises the problem of how to enable the study of film (defined as textuality) to consider its relationship to larger social and historical settings (Vasudevan 1995; Klinger 1997).

Gaps in research themes

From its early beginnings in the late 1960s to the present, feminist film criticism has evolved both as developing its own niche of many theories and attempting to remain within the 'mainstream.' In these ways, it has attempted to be both a reformist ideology and remain accessible as an entertainment resource. Some studies have emphasized the divisions between feminist critics
of the west and east side of the Atlantic Ocean; between an emphasis of theory and history; between the images of film or 'what' is presented and 'how' or the 'cinema apparatus' of film production; and finally between the relationship of 'culture' as a mirror or representation in film and the 'signification' or signs and symbols on spectators of film. Especially in recent years, the feminists' discussion, theories, and debates about women in cinema have included theories of Freud, Marx, Neo-Marxists, Foucault, Derida, and others; and thus included the approaches and ideas of psychoanalysis, semiotics, poststructuralists, and deconstructionists.

Many seem to find these theories, constructions, and deconstructions about women in film too strident, intellectual, or elitist. The study of women in film remains pulled by the two poles of general film studies and of feminist film studies. The problems remain -- that the general film studies are often not specific and women film studies are often too oriented to women's issues, without clear insight on film issues and end up tracing references from these issues. Nevertheless film studies, as such, rely mainly on 1) reference guides, 2) indexes, 3) reviews or filmographies or catalogs or surveys, 4) biographical sources, and 5) miscellaneous sources. There are very few or valuable handbooks, almanacs, yearbooks, and encyclopedias. The same is true for reference sources in women in film. Anthologies of essays on women's film criticism dominate in the reference works in this field of study; along with some filmographies and directories (mainly of directors). One would hope that publishers might soon fill these gaps of women in film with reference guides, more indexes, and some almanacs, yearbooks, and encyclopedias.

Most of us enjoy going to the movies because we derive pleasure from the experience. This statement is true, yet deceptively obvious and commonsensical—it masks the complexity of cinematic pleasures. Cinematic pleasures, hence, are not as uniform, homogeneous, or monolithic, despite what box-office trends seem to suggest. A study of their diversity, multiplicity, complexity, and even contradictory nature can reveal who we, as consumers of cinema, are as individuals and as social, political, and cultural beings. Therefore, this study begins by complicating our query as to the nature of these pleasures through the concept of cinematic form and the notion of violence:

- What structures of cinema and ways of viewing enable these pleasures, which are violent and yet send happy messages to audiences?
- What do we understand about the cinematic gaze and the forms of (mis)identification that produce these pleasures?
• How do we relate these visuals of violence against women and their stereotyping to our understanding of self, community, culture, and nation?

• How does cinema affect us through its violent yet pleasurable (to some) notions of identity, particularly in the context of gender, sexuality, and political ideology? Patriarchal institutions and gender power play in these films will be a prime focus.

• To revisit the genesis of Bombay cinema in order to comparatively analyze the position of women in cinema and the varying degrees of violence against them.

Violence against women is just not physical violence that we see on the screen but has deeper roots in patriarchal attachment and social norms that are meant to undermine women in general. Through the four films analyzed here, these structures will be examined to explain the portrayals of women on the silver screens and its wider meanings.

First, the thesis will look at theories, which give an outline of the feminist epistemological framework of the stalwarts in film theory. Furthermore, it will also place the different theories into a broader overview of diverse feminist theories and epistemologies. Doing so we will also take an overview to show how feminist film theorists are reacting on specific notions within certain feminist scholarship and how the latter has developed further out of this; hopefully this will make clear how necessary this shift also has been for feminism as it then was bound to get stuck in some essentialistic ideas.

The Culture of Indian Popular Cinema: Academic Interventions and Thoughts.

Bollywood, over the years has attracted a kaleidoscope of academia rehabilitating it from being regarded as mere kitsch oddity placed somewhere on the peripheries of popular film culture to occupying a central placed on the film studies curriculum. Alluring enough, for anthropologists to Indologists alike to view it as a site of an authentic folk culture. For years the only critical work in English was Erick Barnouw and S.Krishnaswamy’s Indian Film (first published in 1963, appearing in a revised edition in 1980) as it significantly represented a convergence of Western and Indian scholarship that continues to be apparent in the recent plethora of publications. In a few years later, however, there has emerged a small but growing body of critical writings which situates the popular institution in a modern political-economic context, national as well as global.
Chidananda Das Gupta’s *The Painted face* (1991) and Sumita S. Chakravarty’s *National Identity in Indian Popular Cinema* (1993) are two books which discuss a comprehensive understanding of Indian popular cinema. Das Gupta describes his book as an “exploration by a critic committed to art cinema of the mind behind the Indian popular film."³ He justifies the rise of actors turned politicians to the power of cinema over the masses adheres to the safe model of cinema-as-myth, and regards Hindi cinema as trash that is worrying about. He employs Sudhir Kakar’s and Ashis Nandy’s ideas about the Indian psyche, mythology, etc. but identifies popular Hindi cinema with a ‘primitive’ mass operating at the core of Indian society.⁴ Sumita S. Chakravarty deploys some of the metaphors and discourses used by Das Gupta but most interesting relocates the discussions of Indian cinema within the context of the modern nation-state emphasizing its “eminently on contemporary modes of expression.”⁵ Her study was an eye-opener, which made a radical shift from traditional accounts of cinema where the ‘myth’ and the ‘Indian-psyche’ based interpretations dominated with their over-emphasis to reveal the truth about Indian films. These actually help to contain the Indological myth; the myth of the mythically minded Indian. To maintain, as Chakravarty does following Stephen Heath, that ‘no film is a document of itself and of it’s actual situation in respect of the cinematic institution’⁶ is not simply to opt for a better approach to Indian cinema but also to assert the radical contemporaneity of the time we live in, the determining effect of the synchronic structure of modern India on all our memories of the past.’ But her study fails to acknowledge the metaphor of ‘imperso-nation’ as a linking device and ends up binding generic differences, to the questions of form and address, and the history of audience segmentation, as a weakness reflected, for instance, in the old suggestion that new cinema was addressed to ‘rural and or urban working class audiences.’⁷

In his introductory essay in “Indian Popular Cinema as a Slum’s Eye View of Politics”, Ashis Nandy employs the urban slum as his defining metaphor. Here the slum as the ‘unintended city’ is configured through two tropes that have parallel resonances within the popular film narrative—‘the remembered village and the compacted heterogeneity of stranger-neighbours with the former often providing a frame to cope up with the latter.’ His attempts were to explain the complex dynamics of negotiation of the traditional and the modern, which is an essential ingredient in all-commercial Bollywood turnouts. But neither does the popular cinema serve as the poor man’s political scientist nor his visions of the slum play a dual role as a receptacle and an active proselytizing agent. At the same time, he incites readers to think about “cinema and the politics of culture in less conventional ways, unencumbered by formal film theory and trendy hermeneutics of the
kind that, for reasons of academic correctness, sucks all from one of the most vigorous expressions of the selfhood of the Indian caught between the old and the new, the inner and the outer, the local and the global."9

Nonetheless the anthology The Secret Politics of Our Desires: Innocence, Culpability, and Indian Popular Cinema), 1998, which Nandy edited, is a primary source criticism concerning films. This book attempts to establish ‘an alternative, non-formal frame of political and social analysis’ for popular cinema and the culture of politics in South Asia.

Also his vision of the slum (constituting 25 per cent of the Indian population) in its dual role as receptacle and active proselytizing agent vis-à-vis India’s political culture and popular cinema perhaps continue to open up avenues for academic research. However, none of the other essays save Anjali Monteiro’s refreshing chapter on official television and the spectator-subject can claim to promise such durability. This can primarily be attributed to the fact that most of the essays in the course of formulating an argument completely disregard notions and processes of spectatorship. One would assume that any exploration of the ‘popular’ would have to be moored at some level to a concept of the ‘populace’. The textual analyses discount the subjectivities inherent in the act of experiencing the cinematic spectacle and assume that the spectators constitute a homogenized polity.

Ziauddin Sardar and Rajni Bakshi’s ‘highly personalized narratives’ on the life and times of Dilip Kumar and Raj Kapoor respectively are hagiographical accounts masquerading as anecdotal histories that are imbued with an overwhelming sense of nostalgia coupled with a cynicism toward the immediate future of the popular cinema, which mires any extended analysis they may have to offer in relation to the political climate in India in the post-independence era. Sardar occasionally takes the moral high ground and posits the popular cinema as part of the larger malaise afflicting the nation state: ‘Contemporary Indian cinema is not the only culpable criminal but it is guilty of denigrating the cultural excellence that its society can bring forth.’10 Both these essays are predicated on the premise that art only refracts a sense of social reality and are largely unconcerned with ideological structures at play. Conversely, Fareedudin Kazmi’s essay, ‘How angry is the angry young man?’ has as its pivot, the mechanisms of the ideological state apparatus. In relation to the Bachchan phenomena he propounds the ‘safety valve’ theory where the state advocates certain tropes of proxy vigilantism through cinematic representations which portray ‘a form of dissent in leash’ working in tandem with state mechanisms to further the discourse for a legitimate authoritarian regime.
Ravi S. Vasudevan's book, *Making Meaning in Indian Cinema (2000)* is another important book as it poses an agenda for interventions of the political implications of Indian popular cinema, theoretically as well as methodologically. Theoretically, there is an underlying assumption that the failure of Indian cinema lies in its failure to be realist and character-centered culminating to achieve modern procedures of narration. He looks into the investment of the local traditions of narratives as contrasted to its Hollywood counterpart. Ashish Rajadhyaksa's article on *Democracy and Viewership in the Cinema*, traces its genealogy to culture studies intervention in film theory from the early eighties in the West. His work created the space for the audience to negotiate resistance and even oppositional meanings to those apparently structured into the text and went on to problematize the male gaze, a concept popularized by Laura Mulvey. Although his reduction of Mulvey's theory is somewhat crude, relegating the viewer's freedom to make/or not to make identifications with the text of the film. Rajadhayaksa writes, “at moments when viewers are most involved in what they see, the first look suddenly pops up... a more reassuring realization that one is only watching a film.”

Lalitha Gopalan rediscovers the sadistic impulses in Indian cinema opening up possibilities for cross gender identifications. *Avenging Women in Indian Cinema* is a discussion of the female rape-revenge thrillers, which rang the box-office coffers in the 1980's (*Insaaf Ka Tarazu/Scales of Justice, Zakhmi Aurat/Wounded Woman*). These films looked into the perennial fascination of studying physical exploitation versus empowerment. Although articulated in respect to Hollywood cinema by Carol J. Clover, in *Men, Women and Chainsaws; Gender in the Modern Horror Film*, 1992 and Jacinda Read, in *The New Avengers; Feminism, Feminity and the Rape-Revenge Cycle*, 2000; what becomes important that it exhorts us towards cinephilia rather than film criticism. Cinephilia draws ‘attention to a system of signs beyond the central narrative-gestures from the actors, *mise en scene* details and even throws away shots-that the obsessive film viewer reads as special signals from the filmmaker’. She quotes Paul Willemen approvingly; ‘The relationship between psychoanalysis theory and film theory has been reversed; instead of using random bits of psychoanalytic theory to generate readings of films, now bits of films are used to introduce readers to psychoanalytic theory itself.’

She puts a spotlight on action movies in the *Cinema of Interruptions: Action Genres in Contemporary Indian Cinema*, 2002 and uses this metaphor to categorize the narrative structure of Indian popular film- 'In contrast to the internally coherent narrative form generated by Hollywood genre films,' she asserts, 'genres in Indian popular generic formulations that are akin to pre-
classical cinema, especially several extra-diegetic sequences or sequences of attractions." The book also looks at how global and local conventions combine in Indian action cinema, to produce a reconfiguration of the original archetype. Gopalan argues that the narrative form of Indian cinema is subject to three kinds of interruptions, namely, censorship regulations, "the interval," and song and dance sequences. *Cinema of Interruptions* discusses how the first of these "re-routes the spectator's pleasure" in the "avenging woman" films of the early 1990s, while the interval modifies films (such as those by J.P. Dutta), celebrating masculine bonds in a manner that makes them more than just copies of Hollywood westerns, gangster and war films.

According to the Gopalan, "interruptions" rule the narrative of Indian films: "Song and dance sequences work as a delaying device; the interval defies resolutions, postpones endings and doubles beginnings; and censorship blocks the narrative flow, redirects the spectator's pleasure towards and away from the state." These interruptions -- instead of ruining the viewer's experience -- actually offer pleasure, much as continuity does in classical Hollywood narrative. An example of censorship's influence on cinema, for instance, is what the author refers to as "coitus interruptus", a term used to describe the ways in which Indian filmmakers negotiate obscenity codes to "finally produce the female body on screen." This technique, familiar to Indian viewers, involves the withdrawal of the camera just before a steamy love scene, which is then represented symbolically by shots of waterfalls, flowers and other natural objects. Gopalan stresses that the Indian film industry, "despite its laments about state control, has been preoccupied with the withdrawal-of-the-camera technique as a crucial source of surplus pleasure."

The escalation of violence in contemporary Indian cinema is considered by many to have originated from the state-of-emergency imposed from 1975 to 1977. Following the success of N. Chandra's *Pratighat* (1987), the early 1990s witnessed the growing popularity of avenging women- themed films in Hindi cinema, such as *Sherri*, *Khoon Bhari Maang* and *Kali Ganga*. These rape-revenge dramas, characterised by sexually violent scenes, are actually an acknowledgement of the indispensability of state censorship regulations, according to Gopalan, who reads these narratives as representations of "aggressive strands of feminism."

Her work is worth to be referred to because it is a carefully and closely argued textual analysis of films. Her consideration of the Indian film genre of the 1980's and 1990's as adapting the local idioms of rape-revenge thrillers and gangster stories are the two most popular generic formulations and is a window to analyze the degrees/manifestation of the different types of violence...
in films. It is also worthwhile to note that Gopalan premises her readings on some crucial features in Indian cinema. On the chapter dedicated to women, which becomes important for this study, follows the puzzling strategy of conceptualizing violence in Indian cinema, historicizing censorship and then in her analysis of the variety of films that fall into the category of rape and revenge overturning these categories.

The narrow focus on recent examples of the action film that are far less familiar to Western films with the movies of the past negate the role of the woman as the center of the narrative without her having to inflict on her the indignity of a rape-revenge plot, (like "Fearless Nadia" of the 1930's: Hunterwali, Miss Frontier Mail, Diamond Queen, etc) makes it an incomplete and somewhat generalized assumption. And although Gopalan's prose contains it's share of film studies jargon-in the author's own words 'the book modulates reading strategies inflected by psychoanalysis and narratology' it is nonetheless important for students of film studies to interlink films with the same.

I think young people are neither idiots nor geniuses. I assume they want to be entertained for three hours and at the end of it, want to think for ten minutes. It could be anything. Their families, their nations, their own lives. I know what I do is not literature but neither is it a war on the minds. Shahrukh Khan

Rachel Dwyer and Divia Patel’s book Cinema India: The Visual Culture of Hindi Film (2002) looks into the main “attractions” of Hindi films which include the ‘sets and costumes, action sequences (‘thrills’), presentation of the stars, grandiloquent dialogues, song and dance sequences, comedy interludes and special effects.’ They provide an insight into how cinema uses its own unique style through its sets and costumes. These have set off trends among our youth about what to wear and what to buy. As filmmaker Tanuja Chandras says, “Fashion, insists that your presentation must aim at ruffling hormones.” Cinema India emphasizes on how style is integral to Bollywood films, be its individual personality. The visual clues, which come alongside with this presentation, are alien to the Western audience because of the lack of cultural competence to decode such signs. But a physically violent scene, especially when targeted against a woman transcends all territorial/cultural barriers. Dwyer and Patel map the paradigm of tradition and modernity through the role of costume onto gender representations. The authors jointly write the first chapter, which is an excellent survey of the history of Hindi cinema and the development of its various elements. The next chapter, by Rachel Dwyer, is an exploration of two aspects of mise-en-scene, the setting and the costume. She looks at locations (the city, the village and so on), sets and spaces where the main action takes place (nightclub, kotha, log cabin,
staircase, domestic and religious spaces, courtroom and so on), dream
domestic and religious spaces, courtroom and so on), dream
sequences, clothing (the sari - wet and otherwise - the swimsuit, designer
sequences, clothing (the sari - wet and otherwise - the swimsuit, designer
sportswear and so on), and fashion, and outlines, in broad strokes, the
sportswear and so on), and fashion, and outlines, in broad strokes, the
changes these have seen over time.
changes these have seen over time.

Rachel Dwyer's overview itself is useful and charts out a hitherto
Rachel Dwyer's overview itself is useful and charts out a hitherto
unmapped territory. She admits that "the audience is not so naive that it fails
unmapped territory. She admits that "the audience is not so naive that it fails
to notice" that "the settings shown in Hindi films are not necessarily presented
to notice" that "the settings shown in Hindi films are not necessarily presented
in a realistic way", but concludes: "The films' appearance arises from the
in a realistic way", but concludes: "The films' appearance arises from the
function of melodrama, which makes settings show inner feelings and
function of melodrama, which makes settings show inner feelings and
emotions and which places characters socially and hierarchically." This
emotions and which places characters socially and hierarchically." This
conclusion is unnecessarily narrow, since it does not recognise Hindi cinema
conclusion is unnecessarily narrow, since it does not recognise Hindi cinema
as a site that projects fantasies of consumption by a very small class. Indeed,
as a site that projects fantasies of consumption by a very small class. Indeed,
Rachel Dwyer herself, in her analysis of Dil to Pagal Hai, comments: "The
Rachel Dwyer herself, in her analysis of Dil to Pagal Hai, comments: "The
setting allows the audience to enter into a lifestyle of the super-rich and enjoy
setting allows the audience to enter into a lifestyle of the super-rich and enjoy
vicariously the pleasures of conspicuous consumption."21
vicariously the pleasures of conspicuous consumption."21

Patel also looks at the influence of Raja Ravi Verma as to how these
Patel also looks at the influence of Raja Ravi Verma as to how these
images have helped the construction of star images and defined male and
images have helped the construction of star images and defined male and
female sexuality on screen. She also looks at the work of some artists who
female sexuality on screen. She also looks at the work of some artists who
have commented or drawn upon the visual culture of Hindi cinema in their
have commented or drawn upon the visual culture of Hindi cinema in their
work.
work.

In the context of the criticism leveled at Hindi cinema that it objectifies
In the context of the criticism leveled at Hindi cinema that it objectifies
the female body, Divia Patel argues: "The images of Ravi Verma ... emphasised
the female body, Divia Patel argues: "The images of Ravi Verma ... emphasised
the physicality of the female form... The mass production of his work led to
distortions of his original paintings and resulted in a vulgarity defined by an
distortions of his original paintings and resulted in a vulgarity defined by an
excess of colour, a flattening of depth and crudely suggestive female figures,...
excess of colour, a flattening of depth and crudely suggestive female figures,...
and a strategic emphasis on swelling breasts and hips beneath layers of
and a strategic emphasis on swelling breasts and hips beneath layers of
drapery... A consequence of the realism of these images and their proliferation
drapery... A consequence of the realism of these images and their proliferation
through mass reproduction has been their increased accessibility to the male
through mass reproduction has been their increased accessibility to the male
gaze that implies a sense of possession of the subject. It is because of this that
gaze that implies a sense of possession of the subject. It is because of this that
sexual objectification becomes the defining characteristic within these
sexual objectification becomes the defining characteristic within these
images."22
images."22

The role of costumes has also played an important part in stereotyping
The role of costumes has also played an important part in stereotyping
women actors in sequences of song/dance and scenes of physical abuse.
women actors in sequences of song/dance and scenes of physical abuse.
Women's characters become visible through their onscreen attires, which also
Women's characters become visible through their onscreen attires, which also
speak about their personalities on the screens.
speak about their personalities on the screens.

"You can reflect a quiet sexiness or you may want to ooze it, your tilt may
"You can reflect a quiet sexiness or you may want to ooze it, your tilt may
be well towards flicking away all modesty like the ash off your cigarette- but
be well towards flicking away all modesty like the ash off your cigarette- but
ruffle you must. Or else you will find yourself slowly turning invisible." Tanuja
ruffle you must. Or else you will find yourself slowly turning invisible." Tanuja
Chandra.
Vijay Mishra’s *Bollywood Cinema: Temples of Desire*, 2002, underpins the methodological relationship between films and the social context. He sees cinema in terms of the ‘biography of the nation-state’. The strength of his work lies in the plurality of critical perspectives and his ability to synthesize them into a critical whole. Mishra argues that the role of creative agency in Indian cinema lies with the director or the star, asserting that, in India, only auteurs who were stars as well circulated as auteurs in the popular imagination. While he states that Amitabh Bachchan’s films changed the nature of heroism in Indian cinema; the violent anti hero became the folk hero of the 1970’s, the same can be said our glam doll heroine’s triumph over the vamp’s role consuming it by sheer testosterone power. He also shows how Indian cinema is becoming incorporated into the global culture of the West.

The appeal of Indian cinema for Westerners seems to lie in the sheer otherness of its cinematic codes – the melodramatic narrative, the song and dance routines, costume and mise-en-scène. Yet not without certain condescension: Indian cinema is seen as a camp diversion, a droll mutation of cinema form, not to be taken seriously. The tortured pun, which has become the hackneyed epithet by which it is now known, says it all: “Bollywood.”

Vijay Mishra brings together both his personal involvement with Indian cinema and his scholarly training as a literary critic to explore and explain Indian film as a form of cultural expression, for example in his analysis of filmic manifestations of the tenets of Hinduism, but also to utilize the conceptual apparatus of European film criticism to do so. He thus has produced an important contribution to the study of what he calls “the preeminent art form of modern India”, which, for all its cultural dominance and massive output, “shows critical or scholarly investment inversely proportional to its size.” He notes, incidentally, that in spite of its North Indian, Hindi-speaking, male orientation, the commercial cinema of Bombay that is called Bollywood is virtually synonymous with 'Indian cinema' as a whole, not only for its being the model for the popular regional cinemas, but also for its elaboration of transcendent myths of national unity and belongingness at the level of a “pan-Indian popular culture”. However, while he draws upon the whole corpus of film criticism stemming from *Cahiers du cinéma* and *Screen*, the strength of his approach is in its detailed readings of particular films, rather than in any theoretical regime brought to bear on them.

He begins with explaining the continuities of Indian cinema with older cultural forms, notably the character types and spiritual principles found in the *Mahabharata* and *Ramayana* epics, as well as the legacy of Parsi theatre.
and the British proscenium, and the painting of Ravi Varma. He then traces the emergence of the Indian cinema through the key works of various directors, beginning with the founding father, Dadasaheb Phalke in 1913.

Like other genres in popular culture around the world, the Indian film is characterised by its melodramatic narrative form. Mishra reminds us that a 'melodrama' originally meant a theatrical performance with song and music, and the genre has certainly been true to its origins in that regard. He presents a chapter on the "Melodramatic staging" of the Mahabharata, including Peter Brook’s stage and television versions of it, and the sub-genre of the "Indian gothic". Mehboob Khan's 1957 epic Mother India is given a chapter to itself, giving rein to an analysis of the title role of the woman actor Nargis, especially within the "deep structure" of the discourses of gender and nationhood which Mishra finds in the film, but also in the ideological appropriation of Nargis's iconic status by Indira Gandhi.

European auteur theory provides the framework for a further chapter on director-stars Raj Kapoor whose film is included in the thesis and Guru Dutt, respectively for their "quite explicit manipulation of the spectator as voyeur" and "self-conscious aestheticizing of the Bombay romance."26

Finally, Mishra turns to what Bombay cinema means for the estimated eleven million Indians who live outside of India, formed by both the colonial and postcolonial diasporas. Rather than in "temples of desire", these audiences consume films on video and via satellite and cable television. Diasporic consciousness has become incorporated into Indian cinema, Mishra concludes, but once again, in a mythological distortion: "the diaspora becomes sites of permissible (but controlled) transgression while the homeland is the crucible of timeless dharmik (religious) virtues."27

Raminder Kaur and Ajay J. Sinha's Bollyworld, 2005, with contributions from a range of international scholars, analyses the transnational networks of India's popular cinema in terms of its production, narratives and reception. The first section of the book, 'Topographies', concentrates on the globalised audio-visual economies within which the technologies and aesthetics of India's commercial cinema developed. Essays here focus on the iconic roles of actors like Devika Rani and Fearless Nadia, filmmakers such as D. G. Phalke and Baburao Painter, the film Sant Tukaram, and aspects of early cinematography.

The second section, Trans-Actions, argues that the 'national fantasy' of Indian commercial cinema is an unstable construction. Essays here concentrate on the conversations between Indian action movies of the 1970s and other genres of action and martial arts films; the features of post-
Commenting on The Encyclopedia of Indian Cinema, Sumita Chakraborty says, "This book is a marvellous gift to the world of film scholarship and a commemorative event in these years of centenary celebrations of the birth of cinema that may well signal a coming of age for Indian film studies. Ashish Rajadhyaksha and Paul Willemen have undertaken what can only be described as a labor of love, given the enormous difficulties of information retrieval and archival research pertaining to what is still considered an ephemeral art in India." 28

The Encyclopedia is divided into three main sections: a 'Chronicle' that provides a year-by-year account of historical and political developments from 1896 to 1992; a 'Dictionary' in which entries on film directors, actors and studios (with complete filmographies) as well as some literary and cultural movements and genres are presented alphabetically; and a 'Films' section, organized chronologically, which provides production information on a fairly large number of films, followed by plot summaries and critical commentary. Suresh Chabria, director of the National Film Archive of India in Pune, edited this volume which consists of mostly of an updated compilation of 1313 films. This record of Indian silent era, which stretches from 1912 to 1934 (although the first Indian talkie was screened in 1931), might be acknowledged as a decisive step away from "speculation" about India's filmic past, as Virchand Dharansey points out in the short introduction to his most accurate filmography. 29 In India, only after Independence was the need felt to preserve this part of her cultural heritage. What the National Film Archive of India, founded in 1964, could save from physical destruction are but seven more or less complete features, and about twenty film fragments, including shorts and documentaries, of an estimated number of more than 1300 feature films.

This sad state of affairs makes the silent era so vulnerable to speculation. Ashish Rajadhyaksha, focusses on Indian cinema, and its neglected silent period contributed an article on "India's silent cinema: a viewer's view" 30 including the controversy about "the father of Indian cinema", Dhundiraj Govind Phalke, who made the first full-length Indian feature film Raja Harischandra (1912, released 1913), became a target for heated debates. Some film theoreticians, including the veteran critic and filmmaker Chidananda Das Gupta, seem, according to Rajadhyaksha, to add
misinformation to an already too-heated debate about "national film-culture" and its role within the recent Hindu-nationalist historical arguments. Rajadhyaksha's analytical "viewer's view" offers a clue to reconstruct films and film fragments from India's earliest cinematic traditions according to specific categories. His argument about "The (female) icon and mise-en-scene," for instance, develops arguments about the archetypal woman figure as an icon of resistance to colonial oppression, a most important aspect within the socio-historical discourse on nationalist struggles in India today.

On a more conceptual level, this volume's 'ideological-critical' framework also claims to be slightly over-zealous and self-congratulatory. For instance, the editors state that general entries on political and social issues are intended to signal 'the need for cinema to be seen as a specific discursive form inextricably intertwined with a wide and complex network of industrial, institutional and cultural histories. One knows of no serious study of the cinema that can afford to presume otherwise. Nor is this a real issue at this stage of film theory and cultural studies. Questions of political economy, of ideology and nationalism, of social and historical factors such as gender, race and class have been addressed for many decades. Besides, what would have been pleasure was to have some more explicitly 'cinematic' entries in the general section. Indian cinematic form (certainly in its mainstream versions but also in more avant-garde works such as those of Ritwik Ghatak and Kumar Shahani) can hardly be understood without some sense of the role songs and music play in it. The Encyclopedia unfortunately missed an opportunity to effect precisely the kinds of intersections it values - the imbrication of social and political history with artistic and technological factors - that such explorations can yield. Missing also were,explications of any specific 'theories of film' articulated in the regional film literatures. One is aware that from the 'Chronicle' section that a large number of film journals and magazines have appeared over the years. Filmmakers have also often taken to writing to elaborate their philosophies or working methods, mostly in their native languages. One wonders what insights these might provide for alternative histories of filmic practice. These omissions point to a terminological ambiguity that the editors self-consciously evoke but are unable to resolve. Both the Preface and the Introduction stress the theoretico-critical discourse (nationalism, colonialism, post-colonialism) within which the editors locate their work. Anxious to avoid the taken-for-grantedness of certain constructions of India-as-nation, they are yet unable in their methodology to propose much more than a state-sponsored model of a healthy and balanced pluralism.
Thus the volume fails to address the very theoretical considerations (of nationalism versus regionalism, linguistic versus cultural identity) that the editors had sought to inscribe in the first place. Where the various cinemas of India intersect or comprise the 'Indian cinema' of the book's title is ultimately too complex a question for even this ambitious volume to tackle.³²

Fareeed Kazmi's delightful book, *The politics of India's conventional cinema: Imaging a Universe, subverting a Multiverse* (1999), looks at the choice of themes, the sets of concerns, the specific problems articulated, even the structures of the films keep on changing so as to adapt themselves to changes in the larger society. From the mythologicals, to the historicals, to the socials, to the romantics and then to the post-'70s films, the changes in conventional films have closely followed and reflected the changes in Indian society itself. However, amidst all these changes, one thing that has always remained central in all these different genres has been some notion of injustice, of exploitation, of suffering, always shown from the perspective of the victim. Cutting across genres and crossing the time barrier, this is one consistent thread, which provides continuity in Hindi conventional films. Right from *Raja Harishchandra* (1913), the focus has always been on some form of injustice, of exploitation and more often than not, the problems of those in the subordinate sector have been highlighted. If *Taramati* (the female protagonist) in *Raja Harishchandra* suffered injustices, her modern counterpart *Satyavati* in *Jai Santoshi Ma* (1973) goes through worse trials and tribulations. If the tender love of Salim and Anarkali was thwarted in *Mughal-e-Azam* (1960), so also was that of the young couple in *Ek Duuje ke Liye* (1983), *Qayamat se Qayamat Tak* (1988), *Dil* (1990), *Dilwale Dulhaniya Le Jayenge* (1995), *Raja Hindustani* (1997) and *Ishq* (1997). If the mother of *Mother India* (1957) faced immense problems in bringing up her children, so also did the mother of *Deewar* (1973) and *Baazigar* (1993).

If the success of a film depends upon the extent to which it has been able to interpolate the audience, it is obvious that the higher the level of interpellation the greater its chances of succeeding. This explains why there is always a multiplicity of interpellations contained within the structure of almost every conventional film. The top grossers of the last 25 years incorporated within their diverse structure elements whereby they could interpolate the audience on many different levels. Thus more often than not the familial, religious and political elements are all subsumed within these films. In fact, in the highly successful films, each and every scene including the songs and dances, the dialogues, the fight, the décor and the dresses are used and structured in such a way that they constantly keep on
interpolating the audience. This explains the tremendous success of a filmmaker like Manmohan Desai, who is a master in the art of using such multiple interpellations effectively. This also explains why sex films (Main aur Tum, Kacchi Kali, Jawani ki Pyas), or films which contain fights just for the heck of it, never go on to become top grossers at the box office.

Even within the religious genre the focus is never on the purely devotional aspect but on highlighting the trials and tribulations of an ordinary individual (Taramati in Raja Harishchandra, and Satyawati in Jai Santoshi Ma) or the problems faced by the saint himself before his teaching is accepted e.g., Sant Tukaram (1936), Sant Dyaneshwar (1940). Even in the stunt films of Homi Wadia like Hunterwali (1935), the protagonist, fearless Nadia, as she was called, was always shown rescuing and helping the weak and underprivileged. This also explains why in a film like Kismet, which was dealing with something entirely different, nationalistic concerns were incorporated in the film in the form of a song which went like this: Aaj Himalaya ki parvat se/Phir humne lalkara hai/Door hato, door hato ai duniyawalo/Hindustan hamara hai (Today from the peaks of the Himalayas/We have again given a call/Go away, go away, ye aliens/For India is ours). Or Kalpana, an overtly musical film, incorporated the theme of national integration, 'Ek ho, kyon ki tum log ek ho' (Unite, for you are one).

After Independence, as India developed into a more fully capitalist society and its contradictions started surfacing, the forms of interpellation also changed. A capitalist society is essentially one in which the dull compulsion of profit making is the predominant element which characterises it. As a result it is dull, drab, unheroic, and from a certain viewpoint, even unethical.

It is a society made up of atomized, isolated units, which, either through force or fraud, ruthlessly pursue their own selfish interests. Thus the basis of such a society is cut-throat competition, where those who succeed are revered and worshipped, while those who fail are swept aside and forgotten. Compounding this is the fact that a lot of residual pre-capitalist elements are deeply entrenched in the super-structural consciousness of the people. Consequently, they are susceptible to, and hanker after, all these elements which are now lost to them. Hindi conventional films exploit this psychic need ever effectively. This explains why such pre-capitalist values such as honour, friendship, loyalty, sacrifice, valour and religion are crucial elements within the discourse of these films.
For instance, all the blockbusters of the last 25 years have highlighted and literally gloated over the strong male bonding between the heroes.

_Bollywood: Indian Popular Cinema_, with a foreword by Derek Malcolm, edited by Lalit Mohan Joshi, 2001, is yet another book on Bombay's film industry. The book shows how Bollywood is often used as a condescending term that refers to highly musical and melodramatic movies for the undemanding masses. In his foreword to this volume Derek Malcolm admits that Bollywood 'has produced some of the most feeble and repetitive films in the world.' Considering that India produces 800 films a year for an audience of over one billion after peaking in the 1940s and 1950s it is set for a revival. Whatever the quality (a very subjective and cultural value judgment in itself), Bollywood puts popular myths, folk tales and legends of India on the screen and reflects its own cultural beliefs and values. In the opening chapter the editor of this book, Lalit Mohan Joshi, looks at the evolution of Bollywood over the last one hundred years and some of its landmark films.

In his chapter on music in Indian films, Gulzar points out that it reflects the pace of life and that many film songs have become part of certain ceremonies and have even replaced some traditional folk songs. Lyrics and melody became an essential part of the film narrative but in the social turmoil of the 1970s he tells us that the _Golden Age of Melody_ faded. Nonetheless music remains a vital part of the Bollywood industry however much musical styles and fashions change. Pratik Joshi, well known critic and documentary filmmaker, talks about Bollywood's _Classics and Blockbusters_, "For the most part, blockbusters are pure entertainment. Some of them attain an aura of respectability if, over time, they continue to draw viewers. Classics make the audience introspective about life. Their innovative content or treatment may not necessarily be commercially successful." Pratik Joshi, well known critic and documentary filmmaker, talks about Bollywood's _Classics and Blockbusters_, "For the most part, blockbusters are pure entertainment. Some of them attain an aura of respectability if, over time, they continue to draw viewers. Classics make the audience introspective about life. Their innovative content or treatment may not necessarily be commercially successful."33 In the chapter _Heart Of The Movie_, Maithili Rao explains, "in the broadest sense, mainstream cinema meets the emotional and cultural needs of a people who may be divided by language and ethnicity, but are united in their addiction to the multifarious joys of the Hindi film."34 Shyam Benegal, who has more than 25 feature films to his credit, gives a fascinating insight into his personal story in _Making Movies in Mumbai_. "Popular cinema was seen as a hybrid, creatively dependent on the existing urban theatre for its ideas and plots. Although the medium was cinema, it resembled filmed theatre, complete with interludes of songs and dances. Its success with Indian audiences was undeniable."35

Deepa Gahlot, writes on _The Villains and Vamps_, the 'underdogs' of Bollywood cinema "Over the years, the hero in Hindi films has not changed much although the villain has changed his spots several times over. Good comes in just one shade of white, while there is a spectrum of black-to-grey..."
characters who have been challenging the hero from the dawn of cinema."\(^{36}\)
The final chapter deals with *The Next Generation of Bollywood* written by Madhu Jain, former senior editor with *India Today*, she has been writing on films for the last 15 years. "In this new school of filmmaking, the look of a film is all-important. The 1990s saw the emergence of a young crop of writers, musicians, choreographers, art directors, fashion designers, stylists, distributors, make-up men and publicists who could whip up sleek, good-looking films with airbrushed protagonists. They no longer needed to rely on tired, pirated videos of American movies for inspiration."\(^{37}\)

Nasreen Munni Kabir's, *Indian Cinema: A Way of Life*, 2003, takes a peek at the history of Bollywood, its magic potion for success and its expanse. Though lacking in theoretical rhetoric, it opens a unique understanding of Indian cinema, its culture and history and its energetic style. Although she does herself succumb to the immediate experience of watching Hindi movies, it is a work of a scholar who is not too proud to admit (to paraphrase Robert Warshaw) that in some way she takes all that nonsense seriously.

Geeti Sen's *Feminine Fables: Imaging the Indian Woman in Painting, Photography and Cinema*, 2002, looks into patriarchy as a mediating term, a weapon for the menacing representation of woman's lives in films. A severe feminist stand, this book however is an energetic adventure into the overpowering sexual and creative nuances in women. As her study is essentially on the visuals, her work stands out to be least symbolic in representing the idols/ideals and those who continually experiment with its frame.

*Nostalgic Longings and the Pleasure of Forgetting Women in Indian Society: A Reader*, 1988, edited by Rehana Ghadially says that Indian society has undergone many rapid changes in the relatively short time that has elapsed since the country gained independence. These changes have created their own pulls and pressures and the one segment of Indian society that has, perhaps, been most affected is women. While the rest of the world is changing, they are nearly always required to conform to age-old and traditional images and stereotypes.

This absorbing collection of twenty-one articles, some previously published and others especially commissioned, examines and challenges the various roles ascribed to women in the context of a rapidly changing society. There are two concerns that bind the essays together—first, that the reality of women's subordination can best be understood by traditional and mythical portrayals of women; and, second, that this understanding must be balanced by a sensitivity to the "immediate" context (for example, the present-day violence against a woman's person and personhood). The contributors to this
volume belong to a wide variety of backgrounds ranging from activists to academics. Between them, they provide perspectives from the grassroots and also the disciplines of anthropology, psychology and sociology.

The book is divided into five sections which cover (a) contextual, analytical and theoretical views of women; (b) empirical research organized around existing stereotypes about men and women; (c) an exploration of common forms of violence against women; (d) the way women are portrayed in diverse media (e.g., films and television); and (e) a description of the growing efforts to sensitize people to the inequalities between the sexes. Providing as it does a coherent analysis and fresh perspective concerning the issues and problems that affect women's lives in India, this book appeals to all those who would want to explore the position of women in Indian society, imploring us to understand their symbolic dimension. The book provides an important contribution to the development of alternative theoretical perspectives in feminism.

Madhava Prasad's book *Ideology of the Hindi Film: A Historical Construction*, 1998, is a contribution to the burgeoning area of Indian film studies marshals a panoply of Marxist, political, and film theories about ideology, the Indian state, melodrama, realism, and narrative form to trace the historical construction of Hindi cinema--often presumed to be in a "prolonged state of not-yet-ness." Prasad's project must be marveled at for the mesh of extraordinarily ambitious theoretical frames he sets up in the introduction: Indian films as an epiphenomenon of a (particular precapitalist yet capitalist) mode of production; form and aesthetic as a formal/real subsumption of precapitalist modes; the articulation of a modern Indian state (a coalition between the bourgeois, landlord, and professional class); and an interrogation of the dichotomous tradition-modernity metanarrative that frames Indian cultural theory.

Prasad introduces a Marxist framework to explore the economic-cultural border the Hindi film industry occupies by demonstrating how a non-centralized heterogeneous mode of production determines the narrative, the "feudal family romance"--a textual form that was stable between the 50s and 70s. Set against Janet Staiger's exposition of the Hollywood system, Prasad lays out the centerpiece of his thesis: whereas Hollywood production centers around filming a strong narrative where the story is the blueprint for centralized production, in the Hindi film the story does not subsume other elements--the song, dance, comedy, and "fight" sequences are all of equal importance. These elements produce variety within a "heterogeneous mode of production" paralleling the "putting out system" in capitalism, distinct from Hollywood's centralized production." Using secondary sources, Fazalbhoy's
Indian Film: A Review and Barnouw and Krishnaswamy's Indian Film, Prasad plots two opposing developments in the Bombay film industry's mode of production and narrative development: one, generic differentiation under the studio era was replaced by the emergence of a "supra-genre," the "social"; and two, a proliferation of producers displaced the studio system in spite of the growing stranglehold of the distributor-exhibitor nexus.

David Grimstead's description of early nineteenth-century European and American stage melodrama (in Melodrama Unveiled: American Theatre and Culture 1800-50, 1968), with its "excessive contrived speech," "idealized extraordinary world," and "moral absolutes," provides Prasad the grid to read Hindi cinema's feudal family romance. For instance, the 60s romantic love stories, he argues, create the illusion of the citizen-subject falling in love, only to discover the preordained marriage the family had set up. Melodrama in the Hindi film enacts the struggle between old and emergent forces, middle-class, democratic, capitalist, individualist, and "foreign" values that are pitted against aristocratic ones, and a threatened feudal family structure that "incorporates consumerism and other 'modern' features without much damage."40

Prasad's fourth chapter points to an interesting conundrum in Hindi cinema: the prohibition of kissing, an unwritten rule whose effectiveness is not a simple matter of residual Victorian prudery, since sexualized displays of the female body--a spectacle, an object of scopic pleasure--thrive on the Indian screen. Prasad reads it as prohibiting any representation of the private on a screen deemed to be in the public sphere. Paralleling the formal but not real subsumption of precapitalist modes in the service of capitalism under the aegis of the nation-state, the state allies with the premodern intermediate patriarch to reserve the scopic privilege of the private sphere to itself. On the other hand, "the spectacle of the female body poses no threat to this informal alliance that constitutes the Indian ruling bloc."41 If this is true, how do we explain the ban on nudity in Hindi films? Surely, some spectacles of the female body do pose a threat to the ruling bloc.

Through an analysis of several middle cinema films, Prasad demonstrates how tropes of female desire, sexuality, and political participation, central to the cultural issue of women's subjectivity, threaten to disrupt middle-class domesticity. Women's subjectivity, however, far from being the exclusive preserve of the middle class or cinema, is no less pertinent to other cinemas, especially popular cinema's Imaginary of the nation-state and mediation between the contradictory impulses of capitalist/precapitalist forces. In fact, gender as an analytical category is conspicuously absent in Prasad's overall framework.
If the range of concepts Prasad uses to frame a discussion on Hindi cinema are the book's strength, they are also its weakness: his deft textual readings do not map easily onto the theoretical edifice; his general theorization loses its grip on specific film readings. Concepts like state, history, ideology, precapitalist, modern, and traditional are not static, rather, they are shifting and mobile constructs. For example, Prasad defines the state as a coalition between the bourgeois, landlords, and professional class—an important entity to introduce to the territory of film theory. However, Prasad's conceptualization is slippery and the state assumes varying identities: Prasad invokes it at times as a monolithic body, and at other times as a stand-in for the rule of law or state machinery (bureaucracy, law, the army, etc.). As for Prasad's film analysis, while it is engaging, he does not specify his criteria for selecting or excluding films, raising questions about his methodology.

Bollywood dreams (2003), by Jonathan Torgovnik, is a professional photographer, spent five years in India taking pictures of the assorted deities and rituals of what he terms "India's common religion," popular cinema. The result is the stunning "Bollywood Dreams," a compilation of 100 photographs sparingly punctuated with text. This is Bollywood, purveyor sans pareil of the song-and-dance extravaganza in which music melds with melodrama, and truth and justice triumph before the closing credits. Torgovnik captures the gaudy exuberance of India's popular films in all their color, but what makes his work even more remarkable is his effort to go behind the scenes to provide glimpses of the real world from which Hollywood emerges and from which its audience escapes.

Reviewing the book in The Los Angeles Times, Shashi Tharoor says, Torgovnik's eye is keen and omnivorous. There are candid pictures of the technicians and workmen on the movie sets, of projectionists mending torn reels of film, and of the truck driver for a traveling cinema, their ordinariness a striking contrast to the formally posed portraits of movie legends Torgovnik also includes. "There are images shot in the teeming streets, of passersby dwarfed by movie hoardings, of queues snaking round the block for a matinee, of bicyclists looking up at the five-times-life-size painted cutouts of movie stars on a Chennai street, and even - can this Indian forgive him for, what?" The cliché? - of a man on an elephant at a street corner dominated by an enormous movie billboard. In one of Torgovnik's most arresting pictures, taken in the courtyard of a cinema theater, a boy reaches up to a gigantic billboard to try to touch the painted image of his favorite actress. The ground beneath him is mud and broken stones; as he stretches upward, the word "Arts" are all that is visible of the text on the poster. The actress' deep, dark eyes, 20 times larger than life, seem to reflect and justify his yearning. He
stretches upward to her. But her sultry swollen lips, slightly parted in the silence, are just out of his reach.

*Indian Cinema: The Bollywood Saga*, by Dinesh Raheja and Jitendra Kothari, 2004, documents this incredible story of Hindi films. The book takes the reader on a chronologically-charted odyssey through each epoch of this historic and dramatic journey, examining and analyzing the benchmarks of the vibrant changes that marked each passing era - the early silent years, the excitement at the introduction of sound, the gradual seeping in of colour into film images, the fashioning of eternal classics, right up to the post-millennial 'glitzkrieg' of mega-budget ventures balanced on the cusp of art and commerce. Few stories are as rich or as fascinating. *Indian Cinema: The Bollywood Saga* recaptures the romance of the past and the pragmatism of the present for all those who love Hindi films.

Jyotika Virdi's book makes an important contribution to the field of Asian film criticism, Indian film history, cultural studies, and gender studies. *The Cinematic Imagination: Indian Popular Films as Social History*, 2003, provides readers with valuable insight into the relationships between nation building, gender, sexuality, the family, and popular cinema, using post-Independence India as a case study. Jyotika Virdi focuses on how this dominant medium configures the "nation" in post-Independence Hindi cinema. She scrutinizes approximately thirty films that have appeared since 1950 and demonstrates how concepts of the nation form the center of this cinema's moral universe. As a kind of storytelling, Indian cinema provides a fascinating account of social history and cultural politics, with the family deployed as a symbol of the nation. Virdi demonstrates how the portrayal of the nation as a mythical community in Hindi films collapses under the weight of its own contradictions-irreconcilable differences that encompass gender, sexuality, family, class, and religious communities.

Through these film narratives, the author traces transactions among the various constituencies that struggle, accommodate, coexist uneasily, or reconstitute each other over time, and, in the process, reveal the topography of postcolonial culture.

"Cyclopaedia of Indian Cinema*, 2004 is methodologically based on primary and secondary sources; the author focuses his findings on many of the unexplored dimensions of Indian Cinema at one hand and cine-observer's views on the other. A pioneering work, besides a befitting introduction and conclusion, covers details on the history of Indian Cinema and its typology, psychological dimension of films, Government's policies and involvement, audience's viewpoint, socio-cultural realities that the films reflect new wave and regional films, impact of films on Indian society, its expanding horizons in
none other than the eve-teasing hero, a perpetual irritant in movies from time to time.\textsuperscript{43} 

Kakar's observations are however refreshingly original and wholly free of realistic hang-ups that often plague criticisms on Bollywood. Honed to perfection by actor Shammi Kapoor, the Krishna-lover is for Kakar 'the phallus humbling the pride of the unapproachable woman. Kakar then goes on to analyze the role of actor Amitabh Bachchan in his good/bad hero image which is 'neither overtly emotional like Majnu, nor boyishly phallic like the Krishna lover'; he is very much like the hero described by Faiz in his well known poem, \textit{Do Not Ask of Me, My Love}. Kakar's work throws up startling insights into the Indian psyche into the pressures and responses of development and modernization, which take place within Indian society. He thus reflects the psychological changes in a vast number of peoples who are located in a halfway house-in the transitional sector-which lies between a miniscule (yet economically and politically powerful) modern and the numerically preponderant traditional sectors of Indian society.

\textit{Kumar Talkies}, a documentary, directed By Pankanj Rishi Kumar, 1998, juxtaposes the reality of Kalpi, where poverty affects all facets of life, with the world of rebellion and romance on the silver screen. A small town in northern India where there is not much more than a dilapidated shed in the poorest section of town, the theater, Kumar Talkies, doesn't have any hits or flops - supply and demand doesn't apply here. Every day a few people come to see the film, irrespective of what it is.

The imaginary images of the impossible being made possible have become part of the collective consciousness in Kalpi. Cinema has become a vehicle that simultaneously conveys the urban imagination to the townspeople, while existing as a medium in which people expect their personal, local experiences to be captured and displayed. Kalpi takes shape in interviews with the townspeople and footage of their interactions with the film crew. In cinema-verité the village comes to life: quarrels for the best seats, conversations after the film, and political debates in the bazaar. It also explores not only the meaning of cinema and technology in Kalpi, but also the status of film in India, especially the relationship between Bollywood and its audience. It is also about the Kumar family's relationship with cinema. It was filmmaker, Pankaj Rishi Kumar's father who thirty years ago renovated an old factory he had inherited, creating Kumar Talkies. It won the 1999 Indian National Award for Best Audiography and a couple of other International Awards for a wise, witty and imaginative documentary ... the cinema gradually emerges as a metaphor for village life, where fantasy continues to play a central role in people's harsh lives.
This study will try to follow texts by which a problematic can be derived. Apart from these texts discussed above, mention may be made of writings by P. Bandhu (1992), V. Dhareshwar and T. Niranjana (1996), Ashis Nandy (1987-88), M. S. S. Pandian (1992), S. V. Srinivas (1996), Rosie Thomas (1987) and P. Willemen (1993), which evince a shared concern for theoretical advances in the study of Indian cinema even as they widely differ in their approaches. The writings of filmmakers of filmmakers like Ritwik Ghatak, Dadasaheb Phalke, Satyajit Ray, Mrinal Sen, and Kumar Sahani also are of theoretical interest.

Indian popular cinema is no longer a distant rumor, the private preserve of academic specialists or diasporic local communities. It has become readily available and can be experienced directly and on its own terms. The last few years have seen a flood of Indian film releases on DVD, aimed primarily at Indian viewers outside the motherland, but accessible to the Hindi-impaired because almost all are subtitled in English. That is perhaps why it is gaining interest from a worldwide audience, which includes the academia.

**Western Film Theorists: Studies in Feminism and Psychoanalysis.**

The west has a plethora of books on film theory, which is important for scholars of this subject to understand the basis of studying films. In, *Reinventing Film Studies* (2000), Yvonne Tasker argues that film studies always suffer from the double problem that there isn't any good reason for separating cinematically-released films from the other kinds of screen arts, and that it is usually centered around daft speculations about what a filmmaker might have intended, or other pointless 'interpretations' of films. Watching and thinking about films is an enjoyable and sometimes even transformative activity. But this shows how making an academic discipline out of it makes it a daunting task.

Tasker sensitizes us to the idea of 'evaluation'—deciding whether films are any good or not—something which academic critics almost always avoid. "Our exchange of reasons [for liking or disliking the film] gives every appearance of being committed to objectivity. We do not pound the table and shout 'But I like it!' We try to find objective reasons that will convince others that our assessment is correct." Overall this is a valuable collection, making a decisive effort to push film studies a few rungs up its developmental ladder.

Film theory was one of the twentieth century's greatest adventures in thought and since then it has shown every sign of flourishing. How have directors, writers, cultural thinkers and philosophers comprehended the
aesthetics, ethics, psychology and politics of this most modern, most popular and most loved of art forms? *Cinemas of the Mind: A Critical History of Film Theory, 2002*, reconstructs and intervenes in the fascinating debates that have pitted the history of thinking about film. Combining key extracts from the major works of film theory with in-depth analysis and trenchant critique, Nicolas Tredell mounts a sustained argument for a new understanding of the relationship of film to reality in the wake of postmodernism. What is the function of film theory in the age of digital culture? Both as an engaging history and an invaluable sourcebook, *Cinemas of the Mind: A Critical History of Film Theory, 2002*, examines a vast pool of thought:

The first hints of theory in the early days of film • Groundbreaking theorists like Münsterberg, Eisenstein, Arnheim and Kracauer • Andre Bazin’s seminal post-war journal Cahiers du cinéma, whose contributors included Godard and Truffaut • Auteur and genre theory • Structuralism, semiotics and post-structuralism • The challenges of feminism and of postcolonialism.

*In Cinema and Spectatorship, 1993*, Judith Mayne outlines the development of the study of spectatorship and explores many of the contradictions inherent in theorizing film viewing. In the introduction, Mayne distinguishes between what has been commonly considered in film studies as two oppositional types of spectatorship; 1) that which is critical of the dominant ideology (usually that of a white, heterosexual male-centered perspective) and 2) that which is complicit with the dominant ideology. She writes:

It will be evident in the following chapters that I think spectatorship is at once the most valuable area of film studies, and the one that has been the most misunderstood, largely because of the obsessive preoccupation with dualistic categories of critique versus celebration, or "critical" versus "complacent" spectatorship.45

Mayne asserts that her intention in writing the book is to point to the problematic nature of previous discussions of spectatorship in which this dualistic framework has been supported, to recognize the contradictions inherent in addressing spectatorship, and to expand the discussion of the subject. In addition to outlining the content and intention of her study, Mayne discusses the way in which she has chosen to limit her work, primarily by concentrating on commercial, mainstream film.

Mayne attempts to give an overview of the development of the study of spectatorship in film theory. She states, ‘the notion of cinema as an institution is central both to spectatorship as defined in 1970s film theory and to more recent reformulations.'46 Mayne suggests that cinema is an institution, which simultaneously acts upon the viewer and is shaped by the
viewer. In the attempt to define ideology, as well as to illustrate the concept of cinema as institution and the "cinematic spectator" as intrinsic to this institution, Mayne concentrates much of her discussion on the work of Louis Althusser and Roland Barthes. She is especially interested in Althusser's essay "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes Toward an Investigation") and Barthes's S/Z.

Mayne asserts that Althusser's work challenges the Marxist concept that ideology is a simple distortion of the economic infrastructure of a given society. Rather, ideology, according to Althusser, 'represents the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence.' Mayne emphasizes that Althusser's definition of ideology became the basis for much of 1970's film theory, from which emerged the study of spectatorship. She develops a discussion based on this concept of ideology as serving both an interpretative and obligatory function in society. Mayne applies Althusser's theory to cinema by suggesting that in terms of critical studies, both the film content and the act of film viewing itself need to be examined. Also applicable to cinema, Mayne postulates, is what Althusser has referred to as "interpellation," whereby film viewers recognize themselves as the subjects of the ideology put forth in the films viewed. Mayne writes, "study of interpellation, or the subject effect in film, then, was designed to explore how film-goers become subjects, how the various devices and components of the cinema function to create ideological subjects."

Developing her overview of the history of spectatorship studies, Mayne asserts that psychoanalysis is perhaps 'the single common denominator to all of 1970s film theory.' She emphasizes that cinema developed both at the same time as modern advertising and Freudian psychoanalysis. For Mayne, cinema and psychoanalysis are connected in how cinema draws upon the desires of spectators. She writes, "...cinema was assumed to possess a unique metaphoric quality. Going to the movies and seeking their pleasures were seen as activities that reflected deep-seated assumptions about what it means to be a subject in Western discourse." Even the very act of sitting in a darkened theater, according to Mayne, suggests the psychoanalytic emphasis on dreams and regression.

In her discussion of psychoanalysis, Mayne notes Freud's focus on Oedipal desire and his subsequent influence on film theorists such as Mulvey and Raymond Bellour. Mayne cites the French psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan as having been even more influential to the development of studies of spectatorship. She writes:

'Looking relations' are central to Lacan's revision of Freud, with particular attention paid to the gaze as a primary structure of identity and its
failures. The dual emphasis on identity and its failures is crucial to how Lacan was brought to bear on film theory, for central to the Lacanian notion of desire is a continuous process whereby desires are never satisfied, thus assuring an economy of desire which reinforces, in its turn, the wish to return to the cinema again and again.  

Mulvey explores the way in which the spectator is encouraged to identify with the male protagonist, acting out a combination of voyeurism and fetishism. Bellour emphasized Oedipal desire, which Mayne describes as the desire to become like the father, to take his place in the heterosexual and familial economy of Western, industrialized culture. Therefore, Mayne asserts, the fact that much of classical cinema if resolved with the formation of the heterosexual couple is not a mere coincidence, but rather works to maintain Oedipal desire as integral to the Western cinematic institution.

In tracing further the development of spectatorship studies, Mayne next delineates several models of spectatorship. She begins by examining the "institutional model." Mayne purports that virtually all of the major 1970s film theorists assume the institutional nature of the cinema in developing their work. Mayne characterizes the institutional model as totalizing and monolithic. Citing the intersection of what she calls the social and the psychic in addressing film theory and spectatorship, Mayne associates the institutional model with the work of Michel Foucault. She discusses Foucault's analyses of power and discourse; modern systems that function by creating a series of ruptures that are then reconstituted into what she terms "the dominant order." Referring to Foucault's work, Mayne writes, 'only by understanding the tenacity of the cinema as an ideological institution is it possible to explore the possibilities of genuine alternatives.' She reiterates that it is not opposition to the institutional model of cinema and spectatorship, which will bring about change, but rather the acknowledgment of the power of the ideological institution and the investigation of the interplay of many related factors.

In her discussion of apparatus theory and the institutional model of spectatorship, Mayne contrasts Mulvey's seminal essay, "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema" with the work of Baudry. Mayne concludes that apparatus theory as discussed by Baudry implies a monolithic structure regarding cinema and spectatorship. In comparison, Mayne writes that Mulvey's work has been criticized for assuming a totalizing interpretation of both male and female viewer positions and Hollywood's affiliation with patriarchy, yet actually opens up a critical space by acknowledging the many factors that work together to support the positioning of the spectator.

Mayne defines the empirical model as that which is dependent on research findings. She divides this model into the study of cognitivism and
ethnographies. Mayne writes, "The appeal to cognitive perspectives takes cinematic perception as its key point of departure."70 Citing the work of David Bordwell, Mayne asserts that the cognitive perspective conceives of a more active spectator than that of the institutional model. While the cognitive aspect of the empirical model is based on studies of perception, the ethnographic aspect centers on qualitative and critical observations of how individuals respond to film viewing. Mayne writes that film scholars interested in this ethnographic realm have been inspired by Stuart Hall's work on "encoding" and "decoding" - "on the relationship between the ideology contained within texts and the various ways in which individuals 'decode' or interpret that ideology based on their own social positioning...."51

Next, Mayne turns her attention to the historical model. This model takes into consideration the specific cultural and historical conditions of an audience and the way in which this consideration affects spectatorship. Some of the questions Mayne raises in the discussion of the historical models are as follows:

What did film going represent for historically different audiences? Do different film genres address spectators in radically different ways? How are the cinema and individual films contextualized in a given culture? What are the different texts and institutions that define how individual films, groups of films, audiences, and film-going patterns are defined? In short, the central question raised is two-fold: what are the histories of spectatorship, and what is historical about spectatorship?52

Finally, Mayne turns to a consideration of feminist models. She posits that feminist theorists are overwhelmingly concerned with accounting for the female spectator. While some theorists believe that classic Hollywood cinema fails to allow for a female spectator, others feel that many classical films do not cleanly fit into the boundaries of the male look. Mayne elaborates on the way in which feminist film theorists attempt to find a common ground between "real" women and cinematic representations of women.

Mayne's work helps to understand the contradictions inherent in the analysis of spectatorship. She begin this section by pointing to what she views as one of the primary paradoxes: "Perhaps one of the greatest ironies of contemporary film studies is that the obsessive attention devoted to the cinematic institution occurred at a time when there has perhaps existed more diversity than ever before insofar as modes of cinematic representation and address are concerned."53 Mayne asserts that spectatorship studies need to be vigilant in the recognition that diversity can serve as a smokescreen that masks rather than reveals and challenges the illusions in mainstream cinema.
Contrasting Mulvey’s analysis of Hollywood cinema with her own study of The Picture of Dorian Gray, Mayne writes:

“The mostly anonymous women who are framed in the film are done so in relationship to the position of the spectator of (not within) the film, i.e. not in relationship to the three male figures whose spectatorial activities function so centrally. Mulvey’s analysis of the classical Hollywood cinema assumes that the masculine film viewer is aligned in fairly unproblematic terms with the 'ego ideal' represented by the male protagonist, but in the case of The Picture of Dorian Gray, no such alignment exists. The woman framed in the doorway is an object of spectacle in spite of the looks of the male characters, not because of them.”

Mayne's work is complex in terms of both content and methodology. The convoluted style, one feels, follows from Mayne's expressed goal of avoiding the type of oppositional thinking inherent in spectatorship theory: one senses that Mayne is attempting to move beyond that oppositional thinking, which in turn, forces her into a somewhat awkward syntax.

Unfortunately, there are several other areas in which Mayne falls short. First of all, she does not clearly explain why she has chosen to limit her study of spectatorship to classic Hollywood cinema. Her explanation sounds like a more eloquent way of saying, 'well that's what all the other theorists do so I am going to do it too.' In addition, Mayne emphasizes a standard for theorists of spectatorship that she herself fails to uphold: namely the need for theorists to cite specific examples to illustrate general theories. In the first section of her book, Mayne primarily works on a broad level, citing the general theories of a number of people who helped to shape spectatorship studies. At this juncture, Mayne fails to acknowledge that the large scope of her intention, to provide an overview of the development of spectatorship studies, limits her ability to include specific applications to analyses of films.

These flaws are, however, slight in light of what Mayne has accomplished. Her work offers a thought-provoking look at spectatorship. Throughout her book, she addresses issues of feminist film theory in relation to spectatorship. Mayne considers the position of the female spectator by drawing attention to the work of Teresa de Lauretis, Laura Mulvey, Linda Williams, and others. Mayne is particularly concerned with the system of duality that has played a large role in the consideration of the female spectator on the part of feminist film theory.

Perhaps because other feminist film theorists have laid the groundwork, Mayne avoids a lengthy analysis of the contradictions, which are discussed in
other works regarding female spectatorship. For example, Mary Ann Doane also addresses the female spectator, but suggests more strongly the need for theorists to investigate a series of oppositions in order to expand the work of spectatorship. In her article, "Film and the Masquerade: Theorizing the Female Spectator," 1988, Doane writes:

The cinema is characterized by an illusory sensory plenitude (there is "so much to see") and yet haunted by the absence of those very objects which are there to be seen....It is precisely this opposition between proximity and distance, control of the image and its loss, which locates the possibilities of spectatorship within the problematic of sexual difference.55

Mulvey, in her article "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema," 1975, also sets up a series of opposing components of the psychoanalytic framework such as recognition/misrecognition, activity/passivity, and subject/object to consider women's position in the cinema, both as spectator and as traditional object of men's visual pleasure. Mulvey suggests that freeing film from the classical oppositional structure will liberate women from the confining role they had traditionally played in cinema. Mayne conversely argues throughout her book that the converse of the traditionally oppositional structure is not necessarily liberating; there already exists useful information between the dualities that the film theorist should consider in any examination of spectatorship. Mayne highlights the need for theorists to conceive of female spectatorship as including and moving beyond the classical system of oppositions. She ends her ambitious work with a call to theorists to avoid dualities and to look at the spaces in between:

Spectatorship usually remains locked into an either/or situation - a micropolitics where everything is a contestatory act, or a macropolitics where nothing is contestatory unless part of a globally defined political agenda... Instead spectatorship needs to be treated as one of those ordinary activities, and theorizing this activity can open up spaces between seemingly opposing terms, thus leading us to attend more closely to how stubbornly our pleasure in the movies refuse any rigid dichotomies.56

Vicky Lebeau's, Psychoanalysis and Cinema: The Play of Shadows, 2001, is a veritable and articulate inventory of psychoanalysis and cinema, both of which seek convergence in psychoanalytic film theory. It is the penetrative mode of interweaving film and psychoanalysis on the basis of their historical sharing which allows scholars of film studies to adopt a piecemeal approach. The book formulates the accumulative effect of the analyses rationalizes the easy shift of emphasis from psychoanalysis to psychoanalytic
film theory based on the nature of a historical sharing of the two. Lebeau fascinatingly broaches the central issues around the format of hallucination and hypnosis, wish and dream in productive association with sexuality and sexual difference within the modest context of modernity.

Cinema remains a visual record of everyday experience of reality governed by the idealization and aggression aimed at the human body.57 Lacanian mirror staged as the imaginary from the start adds to the condition of cinema.58 The mirror appears as a screen in the imaginary of cinema against a void beyond the field of representation. The cinema ensures the unending desire to seek beyond the visible and the extreme of psychoanalytic shock.59 Zizek's account upholds an urgent extension of the break between an "early" (imaginary) and "late" (real/gaze) Lacan.60 "Imaginary" continues to play key role in broadening the scopes of Lacanian psychoanalytic film in association with Kleinian and object-relational approaches.61

Feminism intervenes in the idea of women -- settled by all the above convictions derived from psychoanalytic understanding of film by Metz, Baudry and Bellour. The range and diversity of feminist thinking address the problems of how and why the woman bears the burden of the image of "castration". The feminist discourse in psychoanalytic film theory has been under a double movement -- complicating the idea of pleasure and an expansion of the frame of reference tracking the concepts of imaginary, identification, disavowal, fetishism.62 Lebeau goes through the works of Laura Mulvey and Joan Riviere. Mulvey keeps a "world ordered by sexual imbalance" in her sights and opens a space for an interminable analysis of the dilemmas of female spectator. Joan Riviere's thinking, about the "womanliness as masquerade", helps trace the relations between feminism and the discourses of queer, postcolonial, black cultural/literary studies. The author actually promotes Riviere's discussion of fantasy and female spectatorship to that of cinema as a technique of aggression.

The relationship between cinema and psychoanalysis encounters blockage and impasse. The felt need of discovering new historical points of engagement leads to the representation of shock and trauma. Lebeau also exemplifies that the preoccupation of death might become another means of exchange between cinema and psychoanalysis.

Alison Butler's, Women's Cinema: The Contested Screen, 2002, is an introductory overview of the last 25 years of feminist film theory gives us insight into the issues which are perhaps are well known. They begin in the late 1960s with a 'split' among those engaged, which was clearly articulated by Teresa de Lauretis. On the one side, she stated, are those interested in political activism involving 'consciousness raising, or self-expression, or the
search for positive images', and on the other, are those interested in 'formal work on the medium understood as a social technology', for the purpose of disengaging the 'ideological codes embedded in cinematic representation'. The latter, in general, won out. Certainly even those questioning it have been obliged to address the issues it raised, and therefore, to some extent commit to the 'master' theory informing it.

While crediting John Berger with the concept of the 'look', Butler leaves behind his larger concerns with class in *Ways of Seeing*, even though they dovetail well with her eventual conclusions. Instead, she relates his line of reasoning closely to that put forward by Laura Mulvey, who endorsed avant-garde filmmaking as a model and insisted on the negation of dominant (Hollywood) aesthetics on the basis of the Male gaze and its objectification of women. Mulvey's thesis has a literal quality, based primarily as it was on psychoanalytic meanings of static images. But her stating of the three different looks involved in any cinematic enterprise (camera, audience, and between characters on the screen) and the way they function in Hollywood continuity editing (the first two being obliterated by the last) went far to suggest an alternative practice for filmmakers.

*Only Entertainment*, by Richard Dyer, 2002, is a collection of essays originally published in such esteemed journals as *Sight and Sound, New Statesman and Society, Movie* and *Screen*. Since this study is on entertainment, looking at this work becomes important in that sense of the term. Dyer presents his work as "disparate in topic and tone." However, it is clear that there is a theme running throughout these diverse articles, and that is the desire to understand entertainment on its own terms. The point here is that although we all know what we mean when we talk about entertainment, be it escapism, wish-fulfillment, utopia, the taking of pleasure, fantasy and excitement or the suspension of disbelief, the concept itself is often taken for granted without further scrutiny or debate. Therefore, *Only Entertainment* explores entertainment as entertainment, asking how and whether an emphasis on the primacy of pleasure sets it apart from other forms of art. The task, we are told, is to "identify the ideological implications – good and bad – of entertainment qualities themselves, rather than seeking to uncover hidden ideological meanings behind and separable from the façade of entertainment."

Therefore, in order to explore entertainment as entertainment, Dyer takes issue with those films, film stars and starring genres most associated with entertainment in order to argue that entertainment itself "is part of a common sense, which is always historically and culturally constructed". In the final chapter of the book Dyer asks whether entertainment as we know it is on the wane. What he means by this is that the basis for entertainment
through notions of wish-fulfilment and fantasy have "undergone such profound alterations in the past half-century that entertainment may now be ceasing to be a viable cultural category."69 After all, with the introduction of reality television and the recent Big Brother phenomena, the collapse of realism and entertainment means that entertainment is available anywhere, anytime and looks like everyone, which means that the dynamic of escape that Dyer sees as the foundation of entertainment disappears.70

Although one does not have to necessarily agree with Dyer's belief in the demise of entertainment as a treat, as something special to be savoured.

If the metaphor as Donald Davidson (1978) holds is the "dreamwork of language", then metaphor in film must be the driving force of the "dream machine," the film industry. Therefore, at first glance it seems trivial to question whether metaphors really do exist in film. Not only can we easily identify successful and remarkable metaphors in nearly any movie, we also can look back to a rich and long tradition in film analysis in which metaphor always played an important role.

This is what; Trevor Whittock's argument holds that, this question is not a trivial one, since the term metaphor normally is applied to language, not to visual images. Thus its transference to film might lead to a merely metaphorical meaning of the term once it is used to describe film images. Indeed, Whittock in his book, Metaphor and Film, 1990, challenges those literary critics and film theorists who speak against its application to film analysis in opposing their view, he articulates the central goals of his work:

"...this book will endeavour to widen the employment of metaphor by seeking to discover where and how metaphors may be legitimately attributed to films. It is hoped that this will provide insights into specific films, into the workings of 'film language,' and indeed into the very process underlying metaphor generally."71

As Whittock points out in his introduction, existing metaphor theories (in general) as well as accounts of filmic metaphor (in particular) often suffer from privileging single perspectives - either employing only rhetorical and linguistic approaches, or emphasizing mainly the creative and imaginative function of metaphor.

Therefore, Whittock's primary ambition is to lay out a comprehensive theory of filmic metaphor that comprises both a rhetorical and an imaginative account of metaphor, thus integrating the analysis of individual metaphors and the metaphorical process underlying the creation of meaning. Whittock's analysis of structures and functions of metaphorical film images is clearly
predicated on a romantic view of metaphor as well as of art. Correspondingly, his numerous analyses of metaphors within films focus mainly on classical narrative cinema; and his discussion of film theories favours those that see cinematic metaphor as an expression of conscious and rational creativity, rather than as a means for expressing surreal dreams and unconscious drives, or as a device for infiltrating and deconstructing the manifest discourse of film. Despite these limitations, it has to be emphasized that Whittock's book is one of the few that treats cinematic metaphor explicitly and centrally, whereas most other authors either regard it as a minor matter, or subsume it under a pre-given system. Therefore, and because of the broad scope of Whittock's metaphor theory, the book is of importance for scholars who deal with film analysis as well as those who study semiotic and philosophical aspects of metaphor.

In sum, it can be said that Whittock's theoretical approach provides stimulating insights into the rhetorical and imaginative function of metaphor in film. It is one of the strong points of the book that it deals with a lot of examples, thus never straying too far from its practical purpose, film analysis. The rhetorical typology, though it remains a bit arbitrary because of its lack of theoretical grounding, does a good job in identifying and describing individual metaphors. The imaginative account shows how individual metaphors are connected to the narrative network of a film, which they also simultaneously help to create. Whittock demonstrates this interplay between micro- and macro-level in his last example, the analysis of de Sica's movie *The Bicycle Thief*. Whittock thus overcomes the notorious problem of many analysts of cinematic metaphor, who too often remain at the micro-level of interpreting individual metaphors without connecting them to the whole. He achieves this advantage, however, at the price of making too much sense of the whole.

*Thomas Austin's Hollywood, Hype and Audiences: Selling and Watching Popular Film in the 1990's,* (2002) looks at the premise to combine film and cultural studies in order to gain an overview of the relationships between Hollywood, popular media and viewing audiences which can also apply to the Indian context in a number of ways. In particular Austin mines the theories of political economy, reception and empirical audience to examine the flows of influence between his chosen groups. In doing so he redresses oft-perceived imbalances of power between audiences and industrial and industrial Hollywood, as mediated by the popular media. Consequently the timely element of Austin's work lies in the inclusiveness of his research topic. By synthesizing these prominent theories, he is able to delve into the previously murky terrain of the circulation of Hollywood cinema in our own industry's case.
What makes his work interesting is the fact that he doesn't limit himself to theoretical debates relating to film studies alone and in fact provides a debate into several longstanding issues in film and more widely in cultural studies. As Austin puts it, "the dispersible film text must offer multiple invitations-to-view to a number of taste publics, even while commercial imperatives may privilege some market segments over others." Linked to films, Austin also uses this theoretical framework to discuss current issues in cultural studies such as taste, publics and gender.

Moreover Austin performs a complex analysis of violence in the media clearly implicating Hollywood in popular taste formations without falling into the trap of implying that these influences are hegemonic. In fact he gives a break through by ways of which, respondents to the film, position themselves within the discourses on violence initiated by popular film distributors and the press. In doing so he illuminates wider cultural trends around taste formations, challenging conceptions of the popular press as a tutelary body guiding and shaping the opinions of the public. Due in large part to the new theoretical emphases placed on the examination of films, Austin provides some useful tools for future work in film studies.

In Violence Against Women (1999), Steve Derne depicts how Indian films do more than depict violence against women; they eroticize such violence and ask male viewers to identify with heroes who use force to win the affections of their beloveds. Interviews with Indian men reveal parallels between men's understanding of ideal relationships between husbands and wives and the ideals presented in Hindi films. Moreover, participant observation with filmgoers indicates that the usually male-dominated space of cinema halls is an arena for the male sexual harassment that films show to be producing women's affections. Hence, popular films play a role in generating sexual violence in India.

Choice violence sells. The media industries say they are simply businesses responding to market desires, but when they are criticized for contributing to a culture of violence. If anything, media violence is more prevalent today than at any other time in the past. Yet, although scientific researchers have produced a strong body of evidence demonstrating that exposure to media violence harms society, that evidence has never been translated into practical and accessible ideas.

The 11 Myths of Media Violence, 2003, clearly explains why media violence has not only been allowed but also encouraged to escalate. W. James Potter challenges many of our assumptions about the relationship between
media and violence. He argues that these assumptions are the primary barriers preventing us from confronting the issue of violence in films, TV, and video games. While dispelling misperceptions and evoking emotions, each chapter identifies a myth, its origin, its acceptance by the public, and its growth in popularity. He analyzes the faulty nature of the myth and shows how it deflects attention away from the truth, presents "dilemmas" that challenge readers to reconsider their assumptions. This work also includes a list of indispensable references. *The 11 Myths of Media Violence*, 2003, provides an in-depth review of, journalists, and researchers contribute to the problem and raises important questions that place the reader at the heart of the conflict. W. James Potter takes a broad social science approach, presenting technical information in a direct, balanced, and very readable manner.

Over the last two decades, and especially during the 1990s, writers on film have reoriented the critical frameworks and revised the categories by which cinema generally and film violence specifically can be interrogated and understood. Christopher Sharret's edited book, *Mythologies of Violence in Postmodern Media* (2001) shows the richness of this deriving from a willingness to reexamine, question, and subvert longstanding assumptions underlying conventional accounts of film violence; concerns ranging from otherness and sacrifice to censorship, cultural specificity, and conceptions of violence itself have thus been reconsidered.

Collectively, the variety and quality of recent critical efforts have constituted a second golden age, after that of the late 60s and early 70s, of film-violence scholarship. During that period, of course, Hollywood paralleled the counterculture's challenges to traditional social standards and values by creating scenes of increasing violence that culminated in three films that are emblematic for many of the era's imagining of individual and social violence: *Bonnie and Clyde* (1967), *The Wild Bunch* (1969), and *A Clockwork Orange* (1971). While other films are sometimes added, with *Psycho* (1960) and *Taxi Driver* (1976) adduced most frequently as beginning and end point, it is the central trilogy that carries most of the cultural freight for the period. These works are central to our cultural imagination of violence, and merit continued study as precursors to the productions of our own time. A persistent question facing critics today is the extent to which contemporary cinematic bloodletting and that of earlier productions can be seen as continuous or discontinuous.

The section on "Gender Violence and Male Madness," raises still more directly the issue of historical continuity by questioning the evolution of recent contests over masculinity. These essays nicely trace the critique of
traditional gender paradigms—as well as gender-based violent behaviors—in recent cinema. Not surprisingly, nostalgia is a guiding, and often violence-provoking, discourse in these accounts. Mark Gallagher's well-rounded and historicized contribution on the action film accordingly acknowledges the tension between the traditional narrative structures of melodrama and the disruptive, anxiety-driven spectacles of excess masculinity, a paradigm which suits the ‘scheme of action’ in most Indian popular cinema.

Molly Haskell describes herself in the introduction of as a film critic first, and only secondly as a feminist. Her work, *From Reverence to Rape: the Treatment of Women in the Movies* is another important document, which states the feminist leanings of film theory. She even remarks negatively on an article about the movie *Husbands* that Betty Friedan wrote for the New York Times in 1971, saying that Ms. Friedan just used the movie to extrapolate on her basic message in *The Feminine Mystique*. Having said that, she goes through the decades of film from the silent pictures through to the eighties, and concludes that the basic use of film towards women has been to keep them happily in their place: that is, married, and at home and out of the workplace. She organizes the book chronologically and details the evolution of women both in the industry as writers, actresses and directors. She surprises us with the news that in the beginning, there were many women directors, and only as the industry blossomed did men enter the business and push the women out. Women, however, have had more luck in the film industry than in any other, she maintains, since writing, editing, costume design and especially acting, could be done without sheer physical strength being required. The power denied most women, derived from high incomes, was given in abundance to Hollywood movie stars and successful screenwriters such as Francis Marion, who earned $150,000 per year in the 1930’s!

Actresses, who played the classic roles of compliant wives and mothers for the most part, had power in their real lives that cost them dearly in their personal relationships. The book reveals the irony of real life personal power clashed with the image of womanhood portrayed on the screen, and how woman’s place has changed and how films are changing along with them.

*Screening Violence*, edited by Stephen Prince (2000), looks into political issues surrounding media violence, though; operate in a particular moral domain, at a remove from social reality and its attendant human conflict. He shows how fictional representations aside, violence remains an overwhelmingly visible and consequential component of human activity worldwide. Despite, or perhaps because of, the prevalence of real violence in human cultures, fictional treatments of violence and destructive spectacle
raise thorny questions of industrial responsibility and social reception. Academics in many fields have had much to say on the subject.

In addition to its breadth of viewpoints, the book provides a strong historical context, though it sacrifices currency to do so. The work also offers readers a useful overview of contemporaneous responses to films of the era, but it does little to advance current understandings of film violence. Popular film, the industry that produces it, and the cultures that receive it, have changed significantly over the last three decades. It also makes an attempt to attest the gradual shift in critical tastes and public attitudes toward violent media. The essays grouped in a section labeled as "The Historical Context of Ultraviolence" raises awareness about the gulf between critical perceptions of past and present.

Other pieces, in the book's "Aesthetics of Ultraviolence" section, show their age if applied to contemporary film texts. Sobchack's fine essay, which here appears with a new postscript, first appeared in 1974; Clover's contribution is a reprint of the 1987 Representations article that expanded into her influential 1992 book Men, Women and Chainsaws; the book reprints articles first published in the early- to mid-1990s. The book serves well as a historical collection or as a convenient compilation of disparate articles - it would make a versatile text for a college course on film violence - but it provides no new direction for those interested in the subject. The sociology entries are vexing for those approaching film violence from a humanities perspective, studying films as specific texts that both construct and distill cultural tensions, rather than as links in a tidy causal chain of violent representations and responses. Attention to social-science data necessarily aids film scholars in understanding media reception, but methodological differences generally impede academic cross-pollination.

While non-sociologists may hesitate to question the essays included here because of inexpertise with social-science methodology, a few concerns readily spring to mind. One of the pieces, originally published in 1984, cites previous studies as early as 1963, the present-day applicability of which seems questionable. Moreover, this study, by Leonard Berkowitz, resolutely ignores social causes for violent behavior, using "mass media" as the sole variable. More useful is Richard Felson's thorough review of numerous sociological studies of media violence. Felson's essay, which first appeared in 1996, effectively critiques inconclusive studies and calls attention to methodological shortcomings. The utility of both essays depends partly on readers' willingness to examine approaches to the subject from outside traditional film studies disciplines. Interdisciplinary dialogue ultimately will broaden the thinking of those in disparate fields, but the sociological material sits uneasily in this volume.
These two collections contribute nicely to the body of film and cultural studies work on popular, fictional representations of violence and action. Read in tandem, the two provide a historical context and theoretical frameworks for spectacular cinema's diverse appeals, effects, and technical properties. As often occurs with anthologies, neither leaves readers with an entirely coherent set of positions or shaping perspectives, but they do provide diverse resources for those who would explore the possibilities.

Laura Mulvey's poststructuralist feminism with its anti-essentialist assumptions first came to prominence in 1975 with her celebrated paper "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema." Her new book Fetishism and Curiosity is a collection that traces her "intellectual development with successive waves of British film theory." The basic thesis, as illustrated by this new collection of papers, is little changed: she believes that Freud's twin mechanisms of voyeurism and fetishism suggest that Hollywood narrative cinema is constructed from three basic "looks" that satisfy desire in the male unconscious. The three looks are the look of the camera, which she judges to be voyeuristic and essentially male, the look of the male figure who gaze at the woman within the film, and the look of the spectators who identify with the previous two looks.

What is new is Mulvey's seeming concern to integrate Marxist theory, in particular Marx's estrangement theories, with radical feminism's appropriation of psychoanalytic theory and the concept of fetishism. She suggests that the fetishism of the commodity is made up of spectacle and significance, and that the human imagination is always attracted to images. She quotes Freud's belief that the fetish object acts as a "sign" in that it substitutes for the thing thought to be missing, the maternal penis. Because films, commodities themselves, put other commodities such as the eroticised form of the female star on display, Mulvey suggests that this is "a reminder of the maternal body's place in Freud's concept of fetishism." So, she argues, "feminist film theory argues that the eroticisation of the cinema is a major prop for its successfully fetishised credibility."

Mulvey quotes other feminist writers, such as Mary Ann Doane, who seem particularly opaque when writing that "sexuality becomes the site of questions about what can and cannot be known. This imbrication of knowledge and sexuality, of epistophilia and scopophilia, has crucial implications for the cinema."

The third part of this collection, "Dollar Book Freud," was for this study the most useful. It demonstrates how Mulvey's theoretical approach is used in the assessment of such varied films as Orson Welles's, Citizen Kane,
David Lynch's, *Blue Velvet*, and Ousmene Sembene's, *Xala*. The only drawback of Mulvey's work is for those unfamiliar with feminist criticism, Mulvey's extensive use of feminist phraseology does little to clarify her arguments.

Since costumes play a pivotal role in analyzing women's characters on the screen, Sarah Street's book *Costume and Cinema: Dress Codes in Popular Film*, 2001, traces the different ways in which film studies aims to outline costuming which can be used to develop characterizations, symbolic events and convey latent ideas in films. It is concerned with the manner in which films employ symbols to portray certain structural oppositions and that the role of clothing can be functional in the description of such concepts as gender and identity.

In *Undressing Cinema. Clothing and Identity in the Movies*, Stella Bruzzi, 1997 takes on the complexity of the relationship between film and fashion. She further complicates it by adding gender and identity construction to the mix. In her analysis, Bruzzi approaches clothing and cinema interdisciplinarily: she draws from, challenges, and reconfigures theories of fashion and costume, gender and sexuality, psychoanalysis and film. Building on this diverse theoretical framework, Bruzzi discusses and evaluates costume in films primarily from the 1980s and 1990s, illustrating her assertions with films that push the boundaries of representation. The premise of *Undressing Cinema* is that "clothing exists as a discourse not wholly dependent on the structures of narrative and character for signification."73 The result of Bruzzi's efforts is a richly complex and inarguably thorough discussion of the ways in which gender construction is achieved by and through clothing; and just as Bruzzi develops her arguments from an interdisciplinary foundation, her work proves valuable insight into understanding the roles of costumes in Hindi cinema.

In "*Desire and the Costume Film,*" Bruzzi explores the fetish in relation to historical romances, and distinguishes the purposes of the clothing in these films: clothing is meant to be looked through or at. She asserts that period costumes conceived to be looked at symbolize eroticism and work to heighten sexual tension. Using *The Piano* as an example, Bruzzi explains that far from making her simply the object of male desire, Ada's costumes signify her desire for Baines and allow her to participate in the "clothes dialogue" he initiates. Further, Bruzzi uses *The Piano* to show that when the traditional male gaze is replaced with a female one, the desire to close the gap between the fetish and the desired sexual object increases. Again, Bruzzi supports her argument that costumes can create an independent dialogue with the spectator.
In the last chapter in Part II, "Clothes, Power and the Modern Femme Fatale," Bruzzi examines how the modern femme fatale uses clothing to challenge the notions that "power and sex in a woman is a destructive, mutually exclusive combination and that women who dress in anything other than a functional way do so with male eyes and a male audience in mind." The final part of Undressing Cinema, "Beyond Gender," continues the interrogation of assumptions about the connections between clothing and the body by exploring correlations between gender and clothing through two forms of transvestism in film: cross-dressing and androgyny. In "The Comedy of Cross-Dressing," Bruzzi uses mainstream depictions of cross-dressing, like Tootsie and Mrs Doubtfire, to show that although cross-dressing disrupts the correspondence between the body and social appearance, in some instances wearing the clothes of the opposite sex reinforces gender codes instead of undermining them. Bruzzi contrasts these films with independent films such as Glen or Glenda and The Adventures of Priscilla, Queen of the Desert, and argues that these films restore pleasure to the practice of cross-dressing and simultaneously use clothing to examine the tensions of sexuality bypassed by their Hollywood counterparts. These representations demonstrate the ways in which clothing powerfully provides signs and clues through which the body can be read---even in opposition to its "true sex." Her work is particularly important to understanding Bachchan's cross dressing in Laawaris.

Stella Bruzzi's examination of the intersections among film, clothing, and identity in Undressing Cinema produces a thoughtful and detailed conceptualization of the ways in which clothing works with and against the body to produce identities. In total, Bruzzi's analysis does more than undress cinema, it undresses psychoanalysis, clothing theories, and theories of gender and sexuality in the process. Bruzzi's strengths are the breadth of material with which she builds her theoretical framework and the relentless interrogation of the assumptions implicit in this material. Further, the films she discusses support as well as extend the theoretical frameworks she brings to bear on them. Overall, Bruzzi, in Undressing Cinema, convincingly demonstrates the ways in which clothing can work in film as a discourse--distinct and separate from characters and narratives.

Shelley Stamp's, Movie-Struck Girls: Women and Motion Picture Culture After the Nickelodeon (2000), is an intriguing study of women, film, and the post nickelodeon era, but perhaps more significantly, it illustrates a new lens for regarding "narrative desire." As the individual chapters focus on the role of the female spectator in a society impacted by the budding film industry, Stamp examines the prescribed roles of women during this period, while studying the films that ostensibly complicated such roles. "Movie-
struck girls," as the title indicates, represent the intriguing new position afforded to women through film. These "girls," whom Stamp refers to, constitute the group of women, young and other, who are invited to, and drawn toward, film. Naming them "girls" renders the female spectators more susceptible, more vulnerable, to the images flashed before them, as Stamp argues, and this idea of being "struck" illustrates the power of film as a medium over these women. Stamp's study helps to understand the role of women in Hindi films as they are represented and the potential danger (represented by the looming male figure) that it contains.

This mediation of desire and danger appears throughout Stamp's work. Stamp continually describes the dichotomous role of the woman. Stamp writes, alluding to significant alterations in "Cinema's visual grammar," "narrative paradigms," "industrial structure," "social standing," and "audience base" during this period. What emerges from this period of change, Stamp argues, is a redefinition of society through the new "cinema of narrative integration," a term Stamp borrows from Tom Gunning. As the film industry expanded technically, it also sought to build its female audience; new campaigns targeted middle-class women who "embodied the same respectability tradesmen sought for motion pictures: social propriety, refined manners, and impeccable taste." But this transition was far from seamless, as Stamp argues, "for women were not always enticed to the cinema by dignified, uplifting material, and once there, they were not always seamlessly integrated into the social space of theaters or the new optical pleasures of film viewing."75

Nonetheless, Stamp's work is excellent and provides an intriguing model for reading the era, its film, and female spectators. The "Movie-Struck Girls" and their desires shaped the film industry, despite and because of these dueling images of women, and Stamp's work is important to any study of film. Molly Haskell's, From Reverence to Rape (1987) is the first and the last word on women in the movies--perhaps the best book ever written on the subject. Most feminist film critics produce work that conforms to the academic discipline of cultural studies. Haskell's groundbreaking statement (first published in 1974 but with an added chapter that updates her theme through the 1980s) is accessible, serious, and pleasureable because its primary source is Hollywood cinema itself. Haskell draws on her amazing knowledge and understanding of American film to comment witheringly upon the ways producers, directors, and critics from the 1920s and onward have treated women.

Appreciations with this much sensitivity and vigor are as hard to find as a critic who can imaginatively process a lifetime of movie-watching experiences. Moreover, Haskell discusses the larger social significance of the male cinema and male criticism she often finds so infantile. At one point,
despairing over critics who either ignore actresses or transform them into love objects, Haskell bemoans the critics' immaturity as "one of the more common and less endearing manifestations of the eternal adolescence that hangs on the American male--who, by the time he is mature enough to appreciate a woman, is almost ready to retire from the arena. There are a few good years in which he can both appreciate and operate, but not enough (particularly with the current defections from heterosexuality) to satisfy the female population, which may be why more and more women are turning to each other, or to themselves." "In examining the goddesses worshipped by an entire nation, Molly Haskell reveals a good deal about our national character and our most cherished sexual myths. . . . Concerned with the deeply ingrained belief of women's inferiority, she analyzes movies as a social product as well as a social arbiter, and she effectively demonstrates how women are encouraged to impose limitations on themselves by fashioning those selves after flickering shadows in a darkened auditorium--sexual creatures who possess neither ability nor ambition beyond their bodies. . . . Both as an examination of film and as sociology, From Reverence to Rape is an important work to understand the culture of women's images in Hindi popular cinema.
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