This chapter explores the interaction between cultural tropes and the socio-economic dimension of globalization. To understand the representation of masculinity in contemporary Hindi cinema one must explore the cultural tropes prevalent within the field of globalization. I explore such representations through two films which deal with the issue of masculinity. This chapter engages with two issues. First, how culture is addressed within contemporary intellectual field and secondly, how representation of masculinity explores the intersection between culture and socio-economic aspect of globalization. The first section explores the socio-economic and cultural dynamics of contemporary era which is the theoretical mooring of this chapter. It explores the features of globalization where economy and culture works together and complements each other. In the second section I would go through a close reading of two films Dil Chahta Hai (Akhtar: 2001) and Zindagi Na Milegi Dobara (Akhtar: 2010). Here also I would say close reading of two films will be more productive than citing various films. To be precise, I consider textual analysis as a more effective measure than quantitative analysis citing numerous examples. The reading of these two film texts would explore my theoretical concerns.

Culture as a Trope to understand Contemporary Globalization

To understand contemporary globalization and its cultural offshoot postmodernism one needs to engage with the monumental text “Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism” (Jameson: 1984) by Fredric Jameson. Here the significant issue becomes whether there is any fundamental change or break between modernism and postmodernism or is it just a mere change in fashion. Jameson argues that the difference between modern and postmodern is a temporal difference. Jameson further argues that the question of break is not simply a matter of culture but the arrival or continuity of a certain form of society. For Jameson postmodern culture is rupture and repetition at the same time. It is rupture because it is different from modernism per se; it is repetition because we arrive to postmodernism through assimilating the modern itself.
Jameson argues decentring as a specific feature of postmodernism - thus historically limiting decentring which is a philosophical issue. Thus we have to explore the tropes of rupture/repetition and their relationship with decentring. Thus Jameson proposes postmodernism as a cultural form which is not only a part of today’s multinational capitalism but the logic of contemporary capitalism. According to him the formal change in aesthetic reflect the change in the dynamics of the capital itself. The problem seems to be that the formal description appears as the logic of the late capitalism. Jameson further proposes that he is offering a periodization and not a mere stylistic description in a moment when historical periodization, the linear history itself becomes problematic. He argues that the notion of period heavily depends upon a notion of homogeneity. To challenge such a notion he argues ‘postmodernism’ as a cultural dominant of late capitalism which means there are various other cultural forms which are subordinate to this dominant feature.

Here we see Jameson consider mass culture as a component of contemporary capitalism. His understanding of mass culture can be further juxtaposed with Theodor Adorno’s (Adorno: 1991) notion of mass culture. We must posit Adorno’s position both at par and in contradictory terms with respect to Jameson’s understanding. Both Jameson and Adorno link mass culture with capitalism. They are concerned with the economic aspect of cultural practice. For Adorno mass culture is related with capitalism but Jameson considers mass culture to be an expression of late capitalism. According to Adorno mass culture is not only linked with capitalism but also proposes the ideology of capitalism. It not only reaches out to the people but also controls them. Thus it is through mass culture that the ruling class manipulates the mass. Here Adorno uses the word ‘culture industry’ which “fuses the old and familiar into new quality. In all its branches, products which are tailored for consumption by masses, and which to a great extent determine the nature of that consumption, are manufactured more or less according to plan” (Adorno: 1991, p98). He further says “The culture industry intentionally integrates its consumers from above” (Adorno: 1991, p98). Jameson is sceptical towards such a role of mass culture. He links mass culture with contemporary capitalism and proposes that in the contemporary era mass culture does not control the masses. According to Jameson now mass culture is disseminate and fragmented. Thus it cannot control the people any more. He is aware that mass culture cannot be posited outside capitalist ideology itself. To be precise, the capitalist ideology has been dissipated in contemporary era. Opposite to this, Adorno considered mass culture as a centralizing process. For Adorno, mass culture as a component of enlightenment produced uniformity. Here a
unity is proposed within variety, whereas Jameson proposed a kind of explosion within cultural field. We would eventually see how Jameson engaged with the heterogeneity of cultural field.

Jameson also argues for a notion of radical difference in postmodern cultural field which does not match with his earlier formulation of the cultural dominant. The notion of the cultural dominant proposes that the heterogeneity of cultural practices is not an expression of random difference. There is a norm in spite of such heterogeneity. In the following pages he celebrates the heterogeneity and points out the sheer discontinuity of the work of art. This work of art which is now considered as text should be read by the trope of differentiation and not by unification. The theories of difference stress disjunction to the point that the material of the text can be reduced to elements which are randomly separated from each other. Jameson argues that this trope of difference can be productive to understand contemporary cultural practices. To be precise this new mode of relationship through difference can produce new ways of thinking and perceiving.

According to Jameson postmodernism in culture is generally linked with a new type of society which is designated as a post-industrial society, consumer society, media society, information society so on. These coinages reflect that these new societies are distinct from the classical capitalist society which depends on surplus value produced by industrial production. In this article Jameson argues that culture is dominant within transnational literacy and economy remain as visible under the eraser. We will later see that Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak talks of economy in a much nuanced way. According to Jameson postmodernism is not simply a matter of culture but the reason behind the economic system of late capital. Postmodern is the dominant form of culture in the era of multinational capital which is also the force field of very different types of cultural idioms.

The diverse forms of cultural features and practices are part of the contemporary culture but are subordinate to postmodern cultural idioms. Postmodern cultural features are the cultural dominants of contemporary period and Jameson argues that some sense of cultural dominant is required if one does not want to consider the present epoch as “sheer heterogeneity, random difference, a coexistence of a host of distinct forces whose effectivity is undecidable” (Jameson: 1984, p57). Jameson expresses the constitutive feature of postmodernism as ‘a new depthlessness’ which is both explored through contemporary ‘theory’ and a new culture of
image. He also points out another feature which is the effacement of history, both with the public history of present time and also of ‘our private temporality’ (Jameson: 1984, p58).

The other feature of postmodern culture that Jameson explores is the waning of affect. He compares this postmodern feature with modernist cultural practice explored through the painting of Edward Munch. *The Scream* by Munch expresses “the great modernist thematic of alienation, anomie, solitude and social fragmentation and isolation, a virtually programmatic emblem of what used to be called the age of anxiety” (Jameson: 1984, p61).

According to Jameson such a notion of anxiety seems to have been vanished at least within the cultural dominant of the postmodern era. He also cites the reason for such effacement. These emotional expressions presuppose a split, a notion of inside and outside is required within the subject. The internal emotions/feelings are externalized through some gestures. According to Jameson this notion of inside/outside or the depth model is jeopardised in the postmodern era. According to Jameson such models have been stigmatized as ideological and metaphysical. These models propose some eternal truth as its foundational principle. He argues that “the very concept of ‘truth’ itself part of the metaphysical baggage which post-structuralism seeks to abandon” (Jameson: 1984, p61). Jameson then explores other forms of depth model and argues that these notions of depth are replaced by single or multiple surfaces which can be expressed as a model of intertextuality. He also argues such depthlessness is not simply metaphorical but can actually be experienced physically and literally.

Jameson next analyses the notion of euphoria which is a characteristic of new cultural experience. The modernist notion of alienation of everyday life in the city is displaced by a new hallucinatory exhilaration. According to Jameson the modernist trope of alienation of subject is annihilated by the fragmentation of the subject. Such a notion of fragmented subject is precisely associated with the notion of the “death” of the modernist bourgeois subject. Jameson further argues that not only is the issue of human expression associated with the “concept of subject as a monad-like container” but also the concept of individual style(Jameson: 1984, p63). Thus the ‘expression of emotion’ and ‘uniqueness of style’ presupposes an individual monad. But the paradox remains that such an individual monad is self-sufficient and a closed realm, shut from the external world. Within the postmodernist field ‘the end of psychopathologies of that ego’ (Jameson: 1984, p64) not only proposes a waning of affect but also the end of personal style. In contemporary society we are not only liberated from anxiety and alienation but also from any emotion in general. But we are not
devoid of feeling altogether. Feelings or ‘intensities’ according to Jameson are now free-floating and impersonal. Following the logic of decentring and effacement of subject-hood Jameson proposes a celebration of a sense of spacelessness which is grounded nowhere. According to this, waning of affect is coupled with waning of the modernist thematic of time and temporality. Jameson tells us our epoch is dominated by space rather than time. To be precise, one can characterize the modern period as diachronic and the postmodern period as synchronic.

Jameson proposes for an aesthetic practice which randomly cites and juxtaposes various styles from past. This ‘new spatial logic of the simulacrum’ has a significant effect on our understanding of historical time. In the postmodern moment the past has been reduced to a collection of fragmented images or sheer spectacle. Thus the linear progressive history is being challenged within this parameter. In Jameson’s own words “the past as ‘referent’ finds itself gradually bracketed, and then effaced altogether, leaving us with nothing but texts” (Jameson:1984, p66). We can propose an example of how postmodern culture is the force field of history itself.

Jameson argues that the aesthetic change of postmodernism is most prominent in the realm of architecture. The architecture of high modernism proper represents itself with such vigour that it destroys the fabric of the traditional city. Postmodern architecture on the other hand explores populist rhetoric as its fundamental rhetoric. It cites various architectural styles from different periods. There seems to be an effacement of the division between high culture and mass culture. It produces a new kind of culture which infuse various and contradictory forms, categories that modernist aesthetics would have denounced. This new culture incorporates everything from kitsch, TV serial, advertising, B-grade Hollywood movies to popular biography and murder mystery.

In a Marxist sense technology is the result of the development of capital and following Ernest Mandel the development of capital can be split into three phases. These three stages are market capitalism, the stage of imperialism and the post-industrial or the era of multinational capital. These three stages of capital are simultaneous with or constitutes three stages of technological development. These stages are: the production of steam-driven motors since 1848, the production of electric and combustion motors since the 90s of the 19th century and finally the production of electronic technology and nuclear-power since 40s of the 20th
century. This periodization is followed by Jameson’s own cultural periodization of the phase of realism, modernism and postmodernism. Such a division is not beyond criticism. Jameson argues that capitalism of our own time destroys the pre-capitalist enclaves that were both tolerated and exploited in the earlier phase. Moreover, contemporary capitalism colonizes both Nature and the Unconscious. It destroys the pre-capitalist third world agriculture through Green Revolution and it gives rise to media and advertising industry.

Jameson outlined the notion of postmodernism as a historic phenomena and not simply a stylistic feature. Postmodernism as cultural feature can be approached in two ways. First postmodern is a style among many other and second, postmodern is the cultural dominant of the multinational capital. Jameson would of course agree with the second position. The moral evaluation of postmodernism also falls into two sides. One is the celebration of this new aesthetic field of post-industrial society. Another is the rejection of postmodernism as trivial from a perspective of ‘high seriousness’ of modernism. According to Jameson through transformation of older realities into sheer images postmodern culture not only replicates but intensifies the logic of late capital. He brings this issue of morality while discussing the position of the critic in today’s world. The old fashioned notion of ideological critique is not feasible today because of the absence of critical distance. He explores the Marxist notion of dialectics and historical development. According to Jameson, Marx insists that we think the development of capital and bourgeois culture in both positive and negative at once. Along with the negative features of capital, there are liberating possibilities embedded within the dynamics of capital. Thus I quote Jameson “capitalism is at once and the same time the best thing that has ever happened to the human race, and the worst” (Jameson: 1984, p86). Jameson suggests thinking of both the positive and the negative sides of capitalism at once. We will eventually learn that such a position in relation to capitalism is not politically productive.

Jameson lays out his understanding of economy as a prevailing trope in another essay “Notes on Globalization as a Philosophical Issue” (Jameson: 1998). For Jameson the structural possibility of globalization depends on two different elementary logics. One can choose culture as the primary force of globalization but one can also choose the economy as a primary force of globalization, and thus globalization operates through both economic and cultural impetus. If one chooses culture as the primary force of globalization then cultural pluralism and diversities are prioritized. Thus postmodern culture is celebrated within the
terrain of globalization. From this perspective the free market economy is the field of cultural choices. According to Jameson there is a possibility to choose economy as the primary force of globalization, which brings out a gloomy picture of our world. Here the liberal economy of free market appears as homogenizing and standardization of the production process and labour market. It threatens the autonomy of the national market and the subsidy of the welfare state. From this perspective culture cannot sustain its heterogeneity and therefore, Americanization becomes the fate of the entire world culture. For him not only does the third world face the cultural imperialism of the first world but Western Europe is turned into a museum of high culture of modernism and becomes the cultural colony of America. According to him the theory of post modernity affirms a gradual de-differentiation of both economy and culture. It seems that the economic itself gradually becomes cultural, while the cultural gradually becomes economic. Today no enclave of material world is beyond commodification. Here we should be clear that the term commodity is not limited in economic sense but it has cultural moorings. The interesting point about American mass culture is that it appropriates various indigenous forms of world culture for example from Latin American music to Thai food.

Jameson’s writing can be juxtaposed with Slavoj Zizek’s “Multiculturalism, Or the cultural logic of Multinational Capitalism” (Zizek: 1997). Jameson and Zizek both agree on the point that globalization is a manifestation of late capitalism. But for Zizek the only logic for globalization is cultural, which is multiculturalism. The economy of the late capitalist enterprise is definitely an elementary aspect and manifestation of globalization but not the logic itself. According to him any universal ideological notion depends on some particular content which is its stand-in. Through this particular content the empty universal concept is related to actual experience. What is interesting in Zizek’s argument is that he gives adequate importance to representation. For him ideology is a form of appearance which is the formal distortion/displacement of non-ideology. The appearance is not merely an appearance to him. It has socio-symbolic value which has real effects. The demands to cut social spending, health care and the dismantling of welfare state are the real effects of the global capital flow. The notion of friction-free-capitalism where the last trace of material transaction vanishes is not particularly an economic manifestation but is the blurring effect of the distinction of culture and nature. The concept of market and society as living organisms is the obverse naturalization of culture and when life itself is conceived as a set of self-reproducing data then it is considered to be the culturalization of nature. What is interesting in this reading is
that the economy and culture both are clubbed as culture which is the opposite of nature. Thus the privilege of culture or economy in Jameson’s argument has little value here. Jameson argues that the American culture became standardised through its export to various other cultures. According to him consumerism is the linchpin of our society which is not only an economical aspect but also a cultural one. Jameson argues that the Hollywood film industry is an ideal commodity which functions both as a cultural and economic product. Jameson’s critique of the liberal democrat is limited to the homogenization of world culture and penetration of the American market to the extreme interior of the planet. According to him Americanization destroys local cultures without offering any alternative. Only religious fundamentalism has seemed to offer an alternative which is not politically viable for the radical left. Zizek on the other hand brings out the inherent contradiction of liberal-democratic world view by reading its symptom. Symptom is the very ambiguous terrain which is a logical element of a particular ideological discourse but also overflows the conceptual closure. Thus symptom is something which is within the conceptual terrain and also beyond it. Then for Zizek it becomes easier to show the limitation of liberal ideology which argues that we have left the stage of immature political passion and reached the final stage of post ideological universe of mature rational administration. The rise of human rights movements and mature civil society all over the world is the evidence of such political foundation. According to Zizek the triumphant comeback of racist hatred of the Other is the symptom of multiculturalism of late capitalism. The multiculturalist ideology works through a concept of universality. Thus the concept of universalism has a specific relation with the process of globalization. The question of universalism is limited in unification and standardization of culture and market in Jameson’s writing. Interestingly universalism and multiplicity, the apparently opposite term is negotiated within the terrain of globalization. The flow of global capital works within this diversity.

The irony of contemporary globalization is that in spite of its preference for a homogenization of culture it celebrates the multiple primordial identifications. The rise of religious fundamentalism or regional separatism are few examples of such identification. Jameson and Zizek both argue that the multiculturalism of late capitalism is a Eurocentric world view. I have already said that for Jameson it is not specifically Eurocentrism but Americanization. But there are more important differences. For Jameson this Americanization is real but Zizek considers the Eurocentrism to be apparent. According to Zizek the multinational capitalism is thoroughly rootless which has cut its umbilical cord
with its mother country. For Zizek Capital is blindly running as a machine in a ghost. It reproduces itself and moves nonstop without any agent who controls it. Thus there is no possibility of preferring one country over others. All the countries in world are the potential colonies of multinational capital. Its treatment towards third world is same as its treatment towards first world. But the apparent Eurocentrism is very significant for Zizek. Even though the Eurocentrism is not the reality but at the level of representation it is real. Representation has crucial value in Zizek’s understanding. We further read the question of universalism according to Zizek’s perspective. The empirical un-realization of liberal principles is conventionally projected as an exception to global world order. For the liberals it is merely contingent to the universal system. For Zizek it is not something contingent to the global system but an unreason inherent in the reason of universality. This unreason is the symptom of the particular system. The liberal democrat considers themselves neutral through the trope of universality. This neutrality is the politically correct domain of democracy, citizenship and law. But this neutrality is questioned by the new populism of ethnic fundamentalists who are the rightist critic of liberal democrats. They argue that this neutrality is based on white elite upper middleclass world view. According to Zizek there is a third domain of the political, which is the position of the left. It questions the neutrality of liberal democrats and its universal claim. So far this third position is similar with the rightist discourse. The right wing critic of the universality paves the path for fundamentalist identity politics. For the leftist the liberal universe is negated for a true universalism to come. “True universalism to come” is not an expectation for a real universalism which will be truly neutral. Rather it is an impossible wish which is utopian. It is always yet to come, never will it come really. But this expectation is important for Zizek. Only this can give us a position outside the universalism of liberal democrats and their right wing critic. This is the distinctive contribution of Zizek. He thought of a possibility beyond the average poststructuralist critique of universalism and distinguishes the leftist critic from the reactionary terrain of right wing politics.

Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak in the chapter called “Culture” of A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Towards a History of the Vanishing Present (Spivak: 1999) explores the history of the present through the trope of culture. Though she is concerned with contemporary cultural politics she does not consider the economic trope of contemporary order as less important. She engages with a nuanced form of economy which has a complex relation with culture. For this she engages with the already discussed text “Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism.” Moreover, she tries to understand the situation of the third world through
the negotiation between the culture and the economy. Thus now I would engage with this particular text as Spivak reads it. Jameson argues that culture is the dominant trope of transnational literacy and economy remains as visible under eraser. According to Spivak to understand the contemporary era only the trope of culture is not productive. To understand the cultural domain one must engage with economy and economy cannot be reduced to culture.

Jameson proposes that the space is the dominant trope of postmodern cultural practice. According to Jameson “it is at least empirically arguable that our daily life, our psychic experience, our cultural languages, are today dominated by space rather than by categories of time, as in the preceding period of high modernism proper” (Spivak: 1999, p313). Thus in modernism the dimension of time is crucial while in postmodernism it is the dimension of depthless space. A space which is only surface. According to Spivak this change at the level of aesthetics is a chronological difference and not a conceptual one. Jameson prefers to distinguish the cultural trends between dominant and non-dominant. According to him the residual cultural trends and emergent cultural trends are both are part of the dominant. But Spivak wishes to differentiate such trends in more heterogeneous ways. For example she would propose the residual which follows the dominant and the residual which opposes the dominant (Spivak: 1999, p314). We already know for Jameson the current moment of postmodern culture is rupture and repetition at the same time. When Jameson argues postmodernism as rupture, he is appropriating deconstruction. According to Spivak “he shows us how deconstructive vocabulary can be put to political use if it is employed to describe the postmodern phenomenon. To do this, he must transform a philosopheme into a narrateme, transform what is logical into chronological”(Spivak: 1999, p320).

Thus the journey from modern to postmodern is not only a question of rupture and repetition but also a question of decentring. Jameson actually historically limits the issue of decentring. According to Jameson this is a specific feature of postmodernism- this decentring of subject is something historically new. Spivak argues that this is not correct. The decentring of subject was prevalent throughout all historical period. Though Spivak clarifies that the nature of decentring has changed. Today’s decentring of subject and the decentring that is prevalent throughout times is significantly different. Spivak writes “Jameson wishes to claim a whole new ‘experience’ for the postmodern, and forget Marxist moralism: become accountable for nothing… artists are celebrating this experience of derealisation that entail the decentred
subject in a postmodern society,” (Spivak: 1999, p324). According to Spivak, Jameson proposes that artists are celebrating something which is not grounded anywhere. But in reality it is the individual’s sense of spacelessness or controllessness and not a decentering of the subject itself. This trope explains the situation or postmodern condition to some extent.

Jameson suggests thinking of both positives and negatives of capitalism at once. But Spivak argues that this (to think of both the positive and negative) is a static position (Spivak: 1999, p326). This is neither aporia (where one follows logic and goes beyond that) nor dialectic (where through contradiction one is led to change). This is where two contradictory terms are held on to in a rather static way. Spivak writes, “Marx points out, not how to think well and ill of capitalism at the same time, but that one must work to sublate the good things in capitalism out of capitalism” (Spivak: 1999, p327). For Marx dialectics is the only way to get out of capitalism.

According to Spivak the concept of culture can be seen in two ways: “culture as a battle cry against one culture’s claim to Reason, by insider as well as outsider. Secondly culture is a nice name for the exoticism of the outsider” (Spivak: 1999, p355). Lyotard distinguishes pre modern, modern and postmodern in cultural terms. Pre modern classic is like a bank of tales from which the pre modern performer draws on and may spin new episodes to the tale. It is in the modern period that these tales received distinct closure through proper beginnings, middles and end. According to Lyotard again in postmodern time we have “vast impersonal ‘virtual’ memories” which are fragmented and scattered, producing a bank of tales. Thus in this telematic society one can operate like the pre-capitalist, pre-modern performer (Spivak: 1999, p368). Spivak is against such a separation. She believes in continuity, pre-modern is within the modern, modern is within the postmodern. When one considers pre-modern as layered or cyclical and modern as linear- one forgets that such binary is a modern trope. Thus Lyotard is exploring the pre-modern, modern and postmodern through modernist tropes (Spivak: 1999, p370).

Then she points out postcolonialism as a strategy of elite academia. According to her postcolonialism not only explores the difference between the colonial master and colonized but also between the elite and the subaltern. It is the elite who can represent the subaltern- they cannot be grasped in any other way. The problem is that, in the process they generally efface the subaltern (Spivak: 1999, p358). This elite section was the liaison of colonial
masters in the times of direct colonialism. In post colonial system they became native informants. The role of this native informant is to represent the subaltern in the first world. Through this representation they produce their new identity. But their representation is also helping in the process of effacement of the subaltern. Spivak points out that this is the only possible situation and she does not condemn this situation as such. She argues “I prefer to call this relationship complicitous (folded together) rather than symbiotic (living on/off one another). Folded together, we live on/off whatever lies on the other side, in the minute particulars of our living as in the broadest structures of policy. My own writing could not have been written or read without that folding together....Any bigger claim within the academic enclosure is a trick” (Spivak: 1999, pp361-62). Thus she is aware that anything more than this is not possible.

Spivak argues for a liaison with liberal multiculturalism and also acknowledges a sense of responsibility (Spivak: 1999, p396). According to her, Cultural Studies is a space for the new immigrant which is part of the logic of multiculturalism. Here, Spivak is negotiating with liberal multiculturalism. We have to remember the problematic side (racial domination) of multiculturalism which is dominant within the current geo-political order (Spivak: 1999, p397). According to Spivak the new immigrants came to the US for the justice they deprived of in their home country. The new immigrants had two options; they can forget their cultural specificity through disavowing their origin or they could museumize their own culture; and at times this second move seemed to be resistance to forgetfulness. There can be two possible readings, regarding the situation of native informant in US academia. She is confessing what she/the native informant cannot do given her position in American situation. Next, this limit became the source of agency as native informant. That is only what she can do given her situation. Following Marx, she actually rethinks the victims of exploitation as the agent of production. Thus she places the native informant as an agent and not a victim (Spivak: 1999, p357).

Spivak then thinks of any possibility of resistance through theology. Here she is critical of Christian liberation theology in resisting global capital. But she is inquisitive about the role of supra natural in Third world. She is also critical of the relationship between nature and ecology within the religious framework. According to her, liberation theology of the first world does not have any resisting role. But she is open to the possibility of fragmented and locally grounded liberating theological move (Spivak: 1999, pp382-83). The secret encounter
of the ethical singularity is possible only when the response flows from both the sides. Here both the sides mean who wants to do good and for whom the good (benevolence) is done. The response should be two-way. Spivak is aware of the unfinished nature of this response. Though both the sides want to reveal the whole, there always remain something unrevealed. There remains some excess which cannot be grasped by the concept (Spivak: 1999, pp383-84). Here she is talking about ecological justice prevalent within the pre national groups – for example Indian aboriginals. According to her there remains some residue of ecological sanity among these groups which we can learn from them. Here Spivak is proposing two visions of undivided world. One way to understand the undivided world is through non-Eurocentric ecological moves. One should learn this from aboriginal Indians. Second way to understand the undivided world is the third world women’s move against population control and reproductive health. Spivak argues that US feminism cannot understand the sophistication of third world feminisms. According to Spivak US based feminism has two tasks; they have to confront the organizations like World Bank and they have to keep liaison with third world theory (Spivak: 1999, p360). Spivak further points out the limitation of international feminisms. According to her the North is in solidarity with the South through its incorporation of women and not with race, class and empire. The new slogan is ‘Gender and Development’ and not ‘Women in Development’. Thus woman is an add-on with the general demand of development (Spivak: 1999, p409).

Next she outlines her plan of work which she says is less scholarly work and more empirical field work. This plan of work engages with contemporary Northern social dumping and the complexity of female child worker of garment industry. She reminds us, that the entire field of economy can be understood by culture is a risky proposition. Transnationality is the new buzzword for contemporary world order and Foreign Direct Investment and Trans National Corporation are the important role players. Foreign Direct Investment works in diverse ways and the specificity of Trans National Corporation is that it works across countries. Spivak next justifies her field of enquiry as Bangladesh. She proposes two reasons for her preference of Bangladesh. First, Bangladesh is a field for foreign direct investment and compared to India it is much futile field for FDI. Secondly she knew the language of this field which is Bengali (p413). Spivak here points out how Trans National Corporation works without any labour migration. She brings the issue of child labour in Bangladeshi garment industry. The issue of child labour gets importance in a context where Southern garment industry can be a threat for Northern garment industry. Southern garment industry produces garments at
cheaper rates due to cheap labour by child labourers. Hence it is a threat for Northern industries. According to Spivak we must not come to conclusion that child labour is considered good in Bangladesh and it is considered bad among northern nation –states. Rather she proposes that one should explore the specific context within which child labour emerges. Ban on child labour may not produce good results always. We have already discussed another flip side of TNC-the dumping and testing of reproductive technology over southern women.

The overall project of this article is the concern of how theory/abstraction and practice/empirical divide can work together and how economy is embedded within the trope of multiculturalism and globality. Spivak re-states the Jamesonian argument that one should not forget that the postmodern causality is also run by the trope of economy and not solely by culture. Jameson in “Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism” argues for a certain type of economy which according to Spivak is a trope constructed by those who wish to valorize culture. Spivak would argue that the relationship between culture and economy is more complex within the field of postmodernity. Economy should not be reduced to culture but economy is embedded within culture.

Jameson discusses the significance of culture in the postmodern era. For Jameson the term postmodernism is inseparable from some fundamental change in cultural sphere of late capitalism. According him the ‘semi- autonomy’ of cultural spheres which was the characteristic of earlier period of capitalism has been destroyed by contemporary capitalism. The cultural sphere may lose its autonomy but that does not mean they disappear. Rather we see explosion of culture – everything in our social life has become ‘culture’, be it economic value or state power. And this formulation goes well with the proposition that contemporary society is a society of image or simulacrum. At the same time such culturization of world order do not work through valorization of the term culture. Here we can engage with Butlerian formulation of ‘merely culture’ (Butler:1998). Butler engages with the notion of culture as a trope to understand contemporary social reality. Butler starts her essay with two claims circulated within contemporary academic field. One is the objection of a section of Marxists, to reduction of Marxism to the study of culture and second is the consideration of new social movements as solely cultural phenomena. These claims point out that contemporary leftist politics has focused on culture, hence abandons the materialist project of Marxism. And this turn of contemporary left is an effect of the poststructuralist intervention.
The attempt to separate Marxism from the study of culture is a field of contestation between leftist cultural studies and orthodox Marxism. And the claim that the new social movements are merely cultural is based on a presupposition that the distinction between material and cultural life is a stable one. Not only that the new social movements are considered as ‘merely cultural’, the cultural is considered as derivative and secondary. The distinction between cultural and material which the orthodox Marxism cherishes actually marginalizes a certain form of political activism. For example, the way Marxism makes the issue of sexuality and race secondary. Thus identitarian interest of these new movements is actually a response to the universality of older Marxist politics. These new movements rightly point out the Marxist notion of ‘common good’ had failed to understand the historical reality which gave rise to these movements. These new movements are not discrete entities but are overlapping and mutually determining bodies. These new social movements are particularistic and hence any effort to form a holistic movement will be possible through the erasure of such particularistic movements. Thus universality is only possible through certain abstraction and any effort to impose unity upon these movements from outside must be cancelled. The notion of unity is based on the exclusion of culture.

Butler explores the secondary status of culture through the queer politics which is considered as ‘the cultural extreme of politicization’ (Butler: 1998, p38 italic in original). She further points out the reason behind her engagement with queer politics. The politics of class and race are considered to be a question of economic redistribution and feminist politics deals with both economic and cultural issues, queer politics falls squarely into cultural. Thus ‘gender’ and ‘sexuality’ become part of modes of production not because they are constitutive of sexual division of labour but that they also reproduce the hetero-normative family which is the locus of sexual division itself. Butler then asks that how can the queer movement, which critiques such normative sexuality be placed outside political economy? Particularly when gay and lesbians are excluded from certain civil and economic rights, how come their movement against such oppression is limited to ‘merely cultural”? What she points out is that the notion of ‘gender’ and ‘sexuality’ are constitutive elements of contemporary distribution of legal and economic entitlements. If the mode of production is the constitutive force of political economy then sexuality should also be part of the political economy. It is impossible to produce the normative heterosexuality without considering homosexuality, bisexuality and transgender as sexually ‘abject’. Butler makes us aware that the distinction between economic sphere and cultural sphere are not conceptually produced
but are historically drawn. For example Marx himself argued that the pre-capitalist economy cannot be separated out from the cultural and symbolic world. The notion of economy as a distinct field is a product of capital itself. Althusser proposes that ideology always exists in both the apparatus and in the practices which should be considered as a material feature. Following this argument homophobia cannot be simply a cultural attitude but plays a distinct role in the construction of political economy in general ((Butler: 1998, p43). Feminists have combined the Levi-Strauss’s analysis of the exchange between women with Marxist critique of family. Thus the process of women’s exchange as gift cannot be reduced solely to either the domain of economy or culture. Moreover the issue is not that the exchange between women is cultural and economic at once but that they produce a set of social relations, communicating a cultural and symbolic value. The question Butler raises is if non-normative and counter-normative sexual exchanges can propose a different realm of cultural and material force field. The issue is how such sexual exchange conflates the distinction between material and cultural sphere. The queer politics challenged the presumed link between kinship and sexual reproduction and revitalizes the Marxist critique of family. Putting the entire domain of sexual politics into the realm of culture actually helps to colonize and subordinate them with respect to political economy. Thus denoting them as secondary. According to Butler to discount culture as secondary is another cultural intervention.

Following Butler we can argue that culture should not be considered as secondary and must be part of political economy. To understand the contemporary dynamics of culture one has to engage with the issue of Marxist notion of base and superstructure. The notion of the determining base and the determining superstructure is generally considered to be the key to Marxist cultural analysis. Superstructure is the area where all cultural and ideological activities should be placed. To understand how base and superstructure works, we may depend on ‘Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses’ by Louis Althusser (Althusser: 1971).  

15 Following Marx, Althusser argues that in every society there are two levels. First, it is the economic base and then the superstructure which is further divided into two levels. First level consists of the politico-legal attribute and the second is the domain of ideology. It suggests that the superstructures could not stay up if they do not rest on the base. Following this logic the floors of upper structures is determined by the base or the economic. But in the Marxian tradition there are two ways one can see the relation between base and superstructure. First there is a ‘relative autonomy’ of superstructure in relation to base. Second, there is a ‘reciprocal action’ of the superstructure on the base. In Marxian tradition the state is part of the superstructure which is conceived as repressive apparatus. It is through the mechanism of state the ruling class dominates over working class. What Althusser adds with this notion of repressive state apparatus is the Ideological State Apparatus. The Ideological Apparatus is on the side of (repressive) State Apparatus but should not be confused with it. Althusser
When Althusser says that Ideological State Apparatus functions by ideology, one needs to understand ideology itself. According to him Ideology is a ‘representation’ of the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence. Althusser argues when we talk of various ideologies: religious ideology, legal ideologies, political ideologies etc, they actually mean certain ‘world views’. And these world views are largely imaginary which do not ‘correspond to reality’. But they do make allusions to reality. It means one needs to be ‘interpreted’ to discover the reality behind the imaginary representation or certain world view. The interpretation can be different but the essential point is ‘men represent their real conditions of existence to themselves in an imaginary form’ (Althusser: 1971, p37). To be precise what is represented in ideology is not the real relation that govern individuals “but the imaginary relation of those individuals to the real relations in which they live.”(Althusser: 1971, p39)

Althusser further argues that ideology has a material existence. We already know that all the world views are imaginary. But this imaginary relation to the condition of existence is based on the existing relation of production. And this relation of production is the material foundation of all ideology. Thus he proposes two theses first, there is no practice except by and in the ideology. Second, there is no ideology except by the subject and for the subjects. Althusser’s next proposition is that Ideology interpellates individuals as subjects. Which means ideology is meant for the subject and also made possible by the subject. Thus subject is the constitutive category of all ideology and this is why all ideology constitutes concrete individual as subjects.

distinguishes between coercive State Apparatus and Ideological State Apparatus. According to him the coercive State Apparatus functions predominantly through violence. Whereas, Ideological State Apparatus functions predominantly through ideology. He then gives a list of Ideological State Apparatus: the religious, the educational, the family, the legal, the political, the trade-union etc. Althusser is concerned with how the reproduction of the relation of production is secured. According to him it is secured by both Repressive State Apparatus and Ideological State Apparatus. To be precise it is the ideological State Apparatus that mostly secures the relation of production with the backup of Repressive State Apparatus.

In the orthodox reading of Marx, the cultural superstructure depends on economic base and superstructure does not have any autonomy. It is base, which determines the superstructure. Althusser going back to Marx argues that culture or superstructure has a relative autonomy. He argues the relation between base-superstructure is also a relation of matter-idea and in Marxian reading the matter itself can be a philosophical category. Lenin argues that the idea of political revolution itself is based on the relative autonomy of superstructure. If ideas do not have any autonomy then one cannot think of revolution. But the question remains how far we can stretch the issue of autonomy. Althusser proposes the notion of over-determination which argues that so called base and superstructure or to be specific economy and culture helps to constitute each other. Thus they are interdependent. Extending the argument further, this dependency makes difficult to define economy or culture itself. The extreme form of interdependence can lead to a situation which cannot formulate the external boundaries of economy itself. To solve this problem Althusser argues that to think in a structure one must give primacy to something, or else it would be a total fluid field. Althusser then argues that from a Marxian position the primacy should be economy.
Althusser’s next move is that all ideology hails or interpellates concrete individuals as concrete subjects. In this proposition we distinguish between ‘concrete individuals’ and ‘concrete subjects’. Thus ideology transforms individuals into subjects through interpellation or hailing. According to Althusser the hailing or the interpellation of individuals as subjects is same as the function of ideology. He further argues the hailing or interpellation seems to take place outside ideology but it actually takes place in ideology. Answering to the hailing is happening within the ideology but ideology does not acknowledge that.

Next I argue, how base and superstructure can be redrawn by the Raymond Williams (Williams: 1980). Williams in “Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory” argues for the importance of base as the concept had not received adequate attention. The understanding of base is crucial if one tries to explore the realities of the cultural process. The base is the mode of production in a particular stage of development of the material productive forces. Thus following Marx we can argue that base is a process and not a state. Williams wants to revalue ‘the base’ and distance it from fixed economic and technological abstraction. It is clear that we are looking for primary productive forces within the base. Williams complicates our understanding of base by addressing two ways of primary production. These two ways are: the primary production within the terms of capitalist economic relationships and the primary production of society itself, the production and the reproduction of real life. If we consider the production of the society itself as a vital issue then the question of the base will be addressed differently. And within this framework the notion of superstructure will not be reduced to an insignificant secondary component.

According to Williams any society has specific structure and organization that is related to specific social intention or to be precise, the class character of the particular society. Thus he argues that the notion of base and superstructure are important to understand the class bias in any society. Various social constitutions which often appear as natural and universal may actually indicate the domination of a particular class. To understand the domination of particular class one must engage with the notion of hegemony.

Further Williams proposes, “This notion of hegemony as deeply saturating the consciousness of a society seems to me to be fundamental. And hegemony has the advantage over general notions of totality, that it at the same time emphasizes the facts of domination” (Willliams:
Thus hegemony is not singular, open to renewal and recreation. In any society there is a central system of value, meaning and practice which is dominant and effective. These are not abstract notions but a lived reality which is not static. To understand a dominant culture one must understand the social process on which it depends. The dominant culture of any era is a mix with the economy. The process of education, the role of family, organization of work, certain intellectual persuasions contribute to form an effective dominant culture. The effective dominant culture seems to be an imposed ideology which is the values and practices of the ruling class. Williams emphasizes upon the recognition of the alternative meanings and practices which are accommodated within particular dominant culture. These alternative meanings and practices may produce internal conflict but these conflicts will not go beyond the limits of central effective and dominant definitions. Williams made a distinction within the practices, meanings and values which are not part of the effective dominant culture. One is alternative to the effective dominant culture and the other is oppositional to the effective dominant culture.

He further distinguishes between residual and emergent forms. The residual culture is those meanings and practices which cannot be expressed in terms of dominant culture. The residual culture is mostly residue of the culture of past. The new meanings and values and new practices are considered as ‘emergent’ culture. The residual meanings and practices are part of earlier social formations which still have some signification. They represent the human experience which dominant culture cannot address.

Now the question is what is the relationship between art/ literature and society? Art and literature is a practice within society and their relationship should not be considered in any abstract way. The practice of art and literature should be included to understand the society in its full sense. The art and literature may have specific features but they should not be separated from general social processes. Literature, art, performing arts, films are part of the cultural process in different ways. They are part of the central articulation of the effective dominant culture but also embody residual and emergent practices and meanings. Some of the residual and emergent practices and meanings may be incorporated within dominant culture but some may be non-incorporated. But the dominant culture also changes through such incorporation. Such changes are crucial for the dominant culture to remain dominant.
According to Williams the contemporary controversy in cultural theory is between work of the art as an object and the work of art as a practice. He further argues that the relationship between the production of a work of art and its reception is always active, a form of changing social organization and relationship which is different from the production and consumption of an object. When we see the cultural products as a series of objects and try to discover its component we are actually producing them as the base of Marxist cultural analysis. But Williams clearly states that we must not look for the component of object but the condition of practice. When we look at a single work or group of works we find ourselves looking at the reality of practice and the conditions of the practice. According to Williams we should actively seek the true practice which is reduced to object and true conditions of practice which have been reduced to mere background.

In contemporary society, the nature of cultural politics is changed particularly because of the disappearance of ‘critical distance’. In fact Jameson argues that any form of distance has disappeared from the postmodern force field. This disappearance of distance in a way brings the notion of ‘co-optation’ in the field of cultural resistance. Not only local countercultural movements but also in overtly political interventions “are all somehow secretly disarmed and reabsorbed by a system of which they themselves might well be considered a part, since they can achieve no distance from it” (Jameson: 1984, p87). The main proposition of this section is that the postmodern space is not a simple matter of cultural ideology but have strong socio-economic grounding, an effect of the third phase of capital. The question is how that socio-economic trope works within the field of postmodern culture of globalization.

We can explore the difference between Jameson and Adorno within the field of the representation of masculinity. If we follow Adorno, the representation of masculinity seems to be a continuation from earlier epoch. Following Jameson we can consider the multiplicity of masculinity which seems to be not a continuation of earlier forms of representation. But such diverse representation of masculinity does not consider politics of feminism as a crucial trope. In my thesis I try to link feminist politics with the representation of masculinity. Such connection between the representation of masculinity and feminist politics open up new possibilities for masculinity itself. It also explores the issue of continuity within the representation of masculinity. This particular section explores the interaction between the representations of masculinity in Hindi cinema with the socio-cultural dynamic of
contemporary era. Moreover it engages with ‘Culture’ as addressed within the contemporary intellectual field.

In this thesis I have tried to explore contemporary masculinity of Hindi cinema and this particular section opens up the socio-cultural dynamics of such enquiry. To be precise, how ‘Culture’ engages with these dynamics is considered here. ‘Culture’ itself is a complex field which negotiates with economic and social trope of contemporary era. In fact the dominant culture of any era comprises both the economic and cultural activities. But we have already discussed that the culture appears to be the central linchpin of contemporary era. Thus it requires a distinct discursive engagement.

Films as a Cultural Product of Contemporary globalization

I would now like to explore how two films (as an example of cultural product of contemporary era) interact with the tropes of globalization. I chose two particular films where the representation of contemporary masculinity takes interesting dimension in the context of globalization. Both *Dil Chahta Hai* (Akhtar: 2001) and *Zindagi Na Milegi Dobara* (Akhtar: 2011) have some similarity in plots. Both of them are buddy movies and explore male bonding. Moreover they represent the world of upper class youth and their global aspirations. My question is how new form of masculinities are evolving through the socio-economic pull of contemporary globalization. Here I would once again state that the politics of feminism is co-constitutive of such masculinity. I would explore that feminist demand has been appropriated within the high profile lifestyle to which globalization caters. I must say that there are other forms of negotiation with globalization available within our cultural field in general and Hindi cinema in particular. But I restrict myself to these two films which explore a ‘new type of urban masculinity’ and do not address the class, caste dynamics of our society. Like in the earlier chapter, I would also problematize the newness of such masculinity. Such new masculinity may be possible due to globalization but they do not propose any break at the level of ideology. This section would focus on how this apparent newness within the representation of masculinity is a product of globalization’s appropriation of feminist tropes. Thus I would go through a close reading of these two films and explore the interaction of such images with the trope of globalization.
*Dil Chahta Hai* is a story of three friends Akash, Sameer and Siddharth who represent contemporary urban masculinity of upper strata of our society. Their masculinity reveals some *newness* which is distinct from the earlier generation. But we would see such *newness* may not be entirely new but works within the masculine ideology of earlier generation. Further these new masculinities incorporate some idiom of masculinity which is actually possible due to feminist intervention. The notion of masculinity gets a significant makeover due to globalization and through the packaging of feminism such changes are accommodated. As the story line goes, they were friends from college but were parted due to some unpleasant exchange of words. Moreover the life took each of them through different paths after they complete their graduation. Most of the film is in flashback. It is Sameer who is remembering and narrating the story to Siddharth while they were at a hospital where Tara Jaspal was admitted.

The first important scene of this film is the graduation day party. Not only did Akash meet Shalini for the first time but this scene exposes his preference in the case of girlfriend and his notion of romance and marriage. When Akash saw Shalini he gets excited but Siddharth or Sid says she does not seem to be his type. Akash replies that he does not need his type as he is not going to marry her. Priya, Sameer’s girlfriend of that time asks Akash what is his type would have been. Akash replies that his type of girl must live her own life and let him live his. She should not be very emotional. Interestingly Kabir in *Zindagi Na Milegi Dobara* has same expectation from his partner. I would say that such expectations on the part of contemporary men is nothing new. Men have always demanded such gendered segregation of space. What is new is that men use feminist rhetoric for such demands. They appropriate feminism to retain the male hegemony. Thus there is no real change. Feminism demands independence and self-sufficiency of women in general. To be a perfect partner of contemporary women men also want self-sufficiency and expect less possessiveness from women. What is interesting is that such expectation on contemporary male’s part may be influenced by feminism which may not fulfil women’s need. Both the films I discuss here explore this paradoxical situation and I would explore this side of contemporary masculinity in details. We see a song and dance sequence. The lyrics of the song express that they are part of new generation thus their world view should not be old. Thus the song sequence creates the expectation for its viewer that the men from the new generation must explore new concepts. After the song and dance sequence we see Akash going down on his knees and proposing to Shalini. The way he proposes appears both ridiculous and comical. It does not
explore male chivalry but the easy going and fun loving character of Akash. At that moment we are introduced to Rohit who is Shalini’s fiancé. He punches Akash on his eyes. In this sequence we see two types of masculinities. Akash represents a casual fun loving personality whereas Rohit seems to be aggressive and possessive lover who represents the conventional masculinity. But eventually we would see that such differences are apparent. Akash would appear as an equally possessive and aggressive lover in the end.

In the next episode we would see Sameer jogging with Priya in the sea shore. Priya insists that Sameer must choose between her and Akash. Sameer seems to be thoughtful. Priya gives him time to think and asks him to ring her within one in the afternoon. Next we see Akash, Sameer and Sid in Akash’s place. Suddenly Sameer realizes it is four in the afternoon and he had forgotten to ring Priya. He visualizes Priya slapping him. Sid asks why he fears Priya so much. Sameer says he does not fear her but loves her. He does not want to hurt her and does not want to lose her. Thus we see a softer side of Sameer. But Akash seems to be apprehensive towards this relationship. According to him she is more of a boss than a girlfriend. Akash suggests Sameer to be a man. He suggests that Sameer should go to Priya and tell her that this kind of drama will not do. If she wants to stay with him, she has to live according to his terms. Thus we see the easy going personality of Akash is not divorced from machismo.

Next few scenes are important for the narrative to develop. We meet Tara Jaspal who is an interior designer and lives in Sid’s neighbourhood. Sid had met her while she was shifting to her new apartment and he had invited her to see his paintings. While Tara watched his paintings she senses the hidden part of Sid’s personality which he does not express to others. Sid appears as an introvert and sensitive person.

Next we see three friends going to Goa. The scene at an old and broken wall is important to understand their male bonding. They are looking at the sea from there. Akash suggests they should come to Goa once in a year. Sid says it may be hard to meet in ten years. But Akash seems optimistic and proposes that they will be friends for rest of their lives. In Goa they met Deepa. We see Sid talking to Deepa who has already been introduced to the viewer as Akash’s admirer. We see the soft side of Sid who tries to consol Deepa. Like the other two he does not make fun of her. This scene is important because at the end we would see Sid falling in love with Deepa. We would learn that it is Deepa who is the perfect match for Sid.
and not Tara Jaspal who is ten to fifteen years older, divorcée, has a daughter and is an alcoholic. Tara cannot be Sid’s partner in spite of the fact that he loves her and in the end Tara dies.

Next I engage with the scene where Akash is having a meal with his parents. His father asks him if he had thought about his life. Akash seems less serious. But his father is determined to send him to Sydney to look at his export import business there. He further states that it is his love that has spoiled Akash. He had always thought that Akash needed more time. What is interesting here is that in most of the cases in Hindi cinema we see it is the mother who ‘spoils’ her son with her love and care. But here it is the father who confesses his affection to his son in front of the mother. Later when Akash would be emotionally disturbed due to his affair with Shalini, it will be his father who would console him and advice him. Here we see a fathering in terms of mothering and this form of fathering is not explored by the men of new generation but of the earlier generation. Thus the so called newness of contemporary urban youth may be apparent and the men from older generation can also explore soft and caring masculinity.

To understand the newness of these contemporary youths their notion of love and marriage is crucial. To be precise, their relationship with women can be an interesting trope to understand their masculinity. Sameer’s parents insist him to meet Puja for an arranged marriage. Sameer is against such kind of match making. So when they meet Sameer says that he does not consider an arranged marriage to be the right thing. Puja says she is relieved. She considers one must love someone to get married. But Sameer is already in love with her and does not know what to do next. Later we would see Sameer will marry Puja. We would realize Sameer may be apprehensive towards arranged marriage but does not turn down his parent’s choice. He may represent contemporary youth but does not propose any newness regarding his marriage or career. He marries Puja whose parents are his parents’ friends and inherits his father’s computer business. Thus he keeps his social position intact by not breaking the family tradition in any way.

Their friendship takes a significant turn when they are returning home after celebrating Tara’s birthday. Sid declares that he is in love with Tara. At first his friends think he is making fun. When they saw he is serious Sameer says it is not love but madness. Sid says one does not fall in love by calculating. Further he says that he does not expect that she would
love him or he would marry her. Akash seems relieved. According to him she is perfect for Sid, she is experienced, stays alone, Sid goes to her house frequently. Listening to this Sid slapped him and said how dirty Akash’s mind is. He further says Akash made fun of his love. There is a limit in friendship and Akash has crossed the limit. This sequence is important to explore the complexity of their friendship. Their friendship is soiled due to their difference of opinion regarding love particularly a love between an older women and younger man. Moreover we would see this text does not consider such relationship feasible. Thus the representation of new masculinity does not challenge the conventional pattern of heterosexual relation. One may desire older women but finally when the question of heterosexual partnership arises one must select much younger woman.

The narrative progresses further. Sid leaves for Kausani next day and Akash leaves for Sydney after a week. In the flight Akash meets Shalini who is going to visit her maternal uncle at Sydney. At Sydney airport Shalini introduces Akash to her maternal uncle, Mahesh. Next sequence important for us is at the poolside restaurant where Akash and Shalini go for lunch. Akash asks how Rohit is. Shalini says he is fine and she has told Rohit that she met Akash at the flight. Akash says that he must have warned Shalini not to meet him. Shalini said Rohit does not like her to meet with any guy. She further says Rohit may be possessive but he is a good guy. We get a sense of Rohit’s aggressive and possessive masculinity which rests on ideas of male chivalry. We see the typical forms of male domination within Rohit’s personality from which Akash seems to be distant. Though later I will propose that Akash is not much different from Rohit. Shalini asks if Akash has any girlfriend to which Akash says, yes but not more than two weeks. Shalini asks the reason behind such pattern of romantic life. Akash says that he had seen his friends with their girlfriends. They share everything except love. Thus he thinks it is good that he does not have to answer to anyone. Shalini says Rohit does not need to answer to her. Thus we come to realize Shalini, like truly independent women, are not a demanding lovers. Akash points out that Rohit demands answers from Shalini. We already know Rohit as possessive and aggressive and Akash appears to be different from him. Akash further states that he does not think that it is always women’s fault. He thinks all the relationships ends in same way. It brings happiness first but ends in sadness. Thus he has decided that he would not fall in love. Shalini says one does not fall in love by prior decision, it just happens. This sequence is interesting to understand Akash’s masculinity. Akash’s machismo is build through a negation of romantic liaison which is crucial to maintain hetero-normative social matrix. Thus the question arises does Akash in a
way negate the hetero-normative reproductive domain altogether? Does his preference to remain single signal some fundamental change in patriarchal organization? The text does not sustain such possibilities. We would eventually see he will fall in love and marry Shalini. Thus threat to hetero-normative social matrix is appropriated within the body of this text.

Next little sequence shows Shalini and Akash roaming around in Sydney. For my project to explore contemporary masculinity two scenes are important. We see Akash and Shalini sitting in an amusement park. Akash asks Shalini why she fears these rides. Shalini says she thinks those who like these rides are mentally sick. Akash considers this a a good excuse. One needs courage to seat on such rides and laughs at Shalini as she lacks courage. Thus Shalini gets into the ride to prove that she is not a coward. We see that she enjoys that ride. The point I wish to put forward is that the notion of such bravery was traditionally considered as a masculine trope. Men were asked to prove that they are not cowards. It is after feminist intervention such demands are placed on women. Feminist demand for sexual equality comes with a package where women had to explore so called male characteristics. Thus courage is no more a male characteristic and Shalini as the contemporary liberated women has to prove her bravery by sitting on a ride.

The scene at the metro station is interesting to understand the new masculinity that Akash and his generation explore. In the station we see Akash get into a train but Shalini cannot get into it. She waits alone in the station. We see a vagabond approaching her and she seems to be afraid. At the moment Akash come from behind and the viewers accustomed to Hindi cinema expects that Akash would hit or at least say something to the vagabond and save Shalini. But we do not see anything like that. Rather Akash hugs the vagabond and says that Shalini must have frightened him. The vagabond considers Akash mad and leaves. This scene is not only amusing but also appears as a statement of neo masculinity. It critiques aggressive and violent masculinities of earlier epochs and explores a soft and sensitive masculinity. But this form of masculinity is one among many masculinities and it does not ensure that the earlier forms of masculinities are erased from contemporary cultural field. We would later see traces of aggressive masculinity in Aakash’s persona itself.

Next we see an interesting sequence between Sameer and Puja. We come to know that they are on much friendly terms now and Sameer is in love with her. But he is unable to express his feelings to her. We see that Sameer is embarrassed that they had met as prospective
bride and groom for a marriage arranged by their parents. He suggests that had they not met in that way and met in some other way would they be the same as they are now. What I sense from Sameer’s approach is that he had a problem with the process of marriage and not with the person. Thus his choice is not different from his parents but it is the process through which such a choice takes place. Thus Sameer as representative of new generation may think arranged marriage as ridiculous but the newness of his generation is not fundamentally different from earlier generation. Moreover such choice does not disturb the class, caste nexus of his social strata. In Zindagi Na Milegi Dobara we will also see how arranged marriage is considered ridiculous among contemporary youth.

Next we see Sameer and Puja in a cinema hall and watching a musical sequence ‘Woh ladki hai kahaan’. This sequence gives tribute to Hindi cinema in general. This sequence may not be very important for the narrative but it has a stylistic feature. We see Sameer and Puja dancing in three different locations and costumes. First, one in black and white attire; next in an open hooded car and the last one in a natural spot. This sequence reflects different eras of Hindi cinema and through this musical sequence Sameer gets to know that Puja is the girl whom he is looking for. This sequence reflects the continuity of heterosexual couple formation in Hindi cinema from earlier epochs.

The sequence where Sid’s mother and Tara both come to know Sid’s liking for Tara is important for us. Sid is hesitant to say that he is in love with Tara. He thinks his mother would not understand it. Due to his mother’s repeated insistence he confesses that he is in love with Tara. His mother is furious and says that she will not let her ruin her son’s life. Tara overhears the conversation between mother and son and gets upset. She leaves Sid’s house and Sid follows her. In her house Tara asks Sid that how he imagined that they could have a relationship. She further states that the problem with Sid’s generation is that they think everything is possible. Thus not only did we come to know of Tara’s assessment of new generation and also her apprehensiveness towards the newness of this generation. We would see in this film that such newness of contemporary youth is not completely new.

In Sydney we see Akash and Shalini going around. The scene at the opera is important for Akash and Shalini’s relationship to flourish. Shalini brings Akash to opera and wants to prove that there is something called love. Shalini narrates the plot and at a point she insists Akash to close his eyes and think of a person with whom he would like to spend a moment
despite thousand deaths. We see Akash visualize Shalini. While they are returning, Shalini asks Akash whom he had seen. Akash says he had seen her, whose eyes were innocent as hers, whose voice had the magical quality like hers, whose breath had the same fragrance as hers. Then he laughed loudly and said he had seen the fat opera singer. At that point Rohit calls Shalini from the entrance of Mahesh’s house.

Next Shalini calls Akash for a dinner as they are going back to India. They are going to get married very soon. Akash comes for the dinner. As they dine quietly, Rohit lets Mahesh know of the incident at their graduation party. Then he says sorry to Akash. Akash responds that he considers himself lucky. If he was with Shalini and someone misbehaved with her, he would kill the person. If we take these words literally then we would conclude Akash is no less aggressive or possessive. The casualness and fun loving characteristic of Akash is an apparent feature of his personality which can be confused with his masculine characteristics. Here we come to know that at the core he is equally chauvinistic.

Next musical sequence shows Shalini, Rohit and Mahesh going to India and Akash becomes lonely. He seems to be crying when his father calls him. Listening to his voice, his father calls him back to India. We once again see the softer side of his father who consoles and advises him. His father insists that he should know why Shalini is marrying Rohit. Akash and Sameer meet Mahesh who lets them know the reason behind it. Rohit and Shalini’s fathers had been business partners. Shalini’s parents died in a car accident when she was six years old. Rohit’s parents brought her up and gave her the life which she was living. Thus she could not refuse them when they wanted her to get married to Rohit. Mahesh lets them know that the very next day was Shalini’s marriage.

Next we see Shalini’s sangeet where everybody is dancing and we see Shalini seating. Suddenly Akash appears. He proposes to Shalini to marry him. He states that he only loves her. All the music and dance stops and Rohit advance towards him. At this point Rohit’s father appears and declares that he would speak to Shalini. Shalini goes inside with Rohit’s parents. When they come back Rohit’s father says that if Shalini wants to pay back her debts she should marry Akash. He takes her to Akash and said that Shalini is his daughter and Akash should take care of her. Akash and Shalini hug each other. Rohit finds the situation embarrassing and tries to get hold of Shalini but this time Aakash hits him. He is now the legitimate protector of Shalini. Thus he does not seem to be very different from the
aggressive and possessive Rohit. The flashback ends here. So far both Akash and Sameer had found their respective partners.

The plot progresses further. Akash came to the hospital where Tara is admitted. Akash apologizes to Sid and they hug each other. In the next scene Tara dies and any possibility for Sid to have an affair with Tara is negated. Six months later we see three friends standing at the same old wall at Goa. They are accompanied by Shalini and Priya. There we see Sid remembering Deepa and we realize that Deepa is the perfect partner for Sid. In the last scene when the names scroll down we see six of them seating and dining together. Contemporary urban youths have found their perfect match and the hetero-normative social relation is not negated.

*Zindagi Na Milegi Dobara* is another buddy film that explores contemporary urban masculinities. It is a story of three friends Kabir, Arjun and Imran. We may see one of the names is Muslim but the film does not address the religious complexity of our society. Moreover it is their class background that unites them and the religious difference seems to be unimportant. Further we would see how their masculinities are informed by feminism. This neo-masculinity is a result of globalization which comes with a feminist package. Further Kabir and Natasha’s relationship explores the complexity of contemporary gender relations. Kabir, Arjun and Imran have planned their bachelor trip where each would choose a particular daring sport and surprise the other two. The other two has to follow him. This was a pact among them in their college days. Kabir was getting married first and his bachelor trip was scheduled for three weeks in Spain.

We see three of them meet in Spain. We come to see Arjun who is a money man and likes to show off his wealth. Thus when he was asked how he was, he replied that he was good and bought a three bedroom flat. Later that day we see Arjun buying three drinks and saying that he was happy that he was getting a two thousand pound commission. Kabir then applies his tricks to Arjun. He said that he has learned something about Arjun and pretends that he really knows some secret. Arjun thinks his mother might have said something about him. Thus he himself reveals the secret. He went to meet Nilu uncle’s daughter Kuki for an arranged marriage and before he could say ‘no’, Kuki herself refused him. Imran and Arjun laugh at him and we come to realize that rejection in arranged marriage is a shame for this group. We would see the concept of arranged marriage is not cool for these urban contemporary youths.
Thus they appear distinctly different from the earlier generation regarding their approach towards marriage but their choice of respective partner falls squarely within their class caste background. Moreover, like Sameer (in *Dil Chahta Hai*), Kabir also gets engaged to a family friend’s daughter.

We see them hiring a car as they go for a long drive. Arjun seems to be busy with his phone and laptop. At one point he stops the car wears his vest and tie and chats with some Japanese business tycoons. Next we see Arjun speaking on the phone and Kabir suggests that someone should throw his phone away. Imran instantly takes the phone from Arjun and throws it away. Arjun stops the car and asks Imran to bring it back which is not possible for Imran. Imran suggests that he would buy him a phone. Arjun shouts and says that the call was important for him. Then he says that throwing away the phone was not funny. Being involved with his girlfriend was not funny. We sense certain stiffness in their friendship, particularly between Arjun and Imran. Imran says that it was an incident that happened four years ago and he had apologized to Arjun for that. Arjun and Imran start fighting and Kabir tries to stop them. Kabir states that Sonali (the girl concerned) was a bitch who first exploited Arjun and then Imran. We see that by derogating the girl concerned they establish their male bonding.

Next we are introduced to Layla who is a trainer for deep sea diving. She is an independent fun loving character. She travels around the world and we do not see any kinship ties attached to her. I would say this type of an independent female character is possible due to feminist intervention into contemporary media space. But we will also see a character like Natasha. She is apparently an independent interior designer but she is actually bound by her family ties. Thus when she learned that Kabir was not ready to marry her, the first thing she said was, what would she tell her father. Thus we see that different types of female characters are possible within the field of contemporary Hindi cinema. In this chapter I would explore the masculinity which appears as a perfect partner for the new women. Thus in the end we will see Kabir and Natasha may not be a perfect couple but Layla becomes Arjun’s perfect match.

Imran had chosen deep sea diving as his preferred sport. After the training we see Layla drinking with Kabir, Arjun and Imran. She comes to know that Kabir is getting married with Natasha who is an interior designer. Arjun adds that Natasha’s father has a hotel business worth one thousand crore. Kabir said that he was not marring for money. but Arjun insists
that this was a plus point. Layla asks Arjun if he could marry for money. Arjun said that it depended on the amount of the money. If it was one thousand crore then the answer would be yes. But Layla asked, what would he do if his wife was boring. Arjun answers that if one had one thousand crore one would not need his wife for entertainment. We came to know Arjun’s notion of marriage which is not only divorced from actual love and care but his masculinity rests on the older notion of a separate male world where husbands do not get entertained by their wives. Here marriage is part of reproductive domain solely.

Next we go through the scenes where they actually go through under water diving. To celebrate their first underwater dive Imran calls Layla for dinner. We see Kabir chatting with Natasha and Layla comes to his room to use the washroom. Kabir asks Layla to meet Natasha. Natasha and Layla exchange greetings. When Layla left, Natasha asks what she was doing in his room. We get to see Natasha being suspicious. At the dinner table Layla proposes that they join her for the Tomantina festival at Bunol. She explains that it is almost like holi but they play it with tomatoes.

Next Arjun is thinking of his earlier relationship with Rohini. We see them are shouting at each other as Arjun gives priority to work over his relationship. Rohini asks him not to confuse his work with his life. Work is a part of his life just as this relationship is a part of his life. Arjun says that he is working for their future. But Rohini insists him to think about the present, she wants his time now. Thus we come to know that Arjun is a workaholic who does not have time for his relationship. His masculinity rests on his ability to earn money which is a conventional pattern of male chivalry.

Next we see Natasha talking to Kabir as they were going to Bunol. Natasha takes the name of hotel where they are staying. At Bunol they meet Nuria who is Layla’s friend. Five of them join the festival and we see a song and dance sequence. When they come back to the hotel, Natasha is waiting in the lobby of the hotel. Kabir is embarrassed as he is carrying Layla in his arms. Next we see an interaction between Natasha and Kabir. Natasha says that she thought Kabir would be happy to see her. Kabir says that it was his bachelor trip and he wanted to spend time with his friends. Natasha asks if Layla and Nuria were his friends. He says that Layla was their diving instructor and they had met Nuria that very day and may not see her in future. Natasha suggests that it was even better. No one would know what had
happened. Kabir gets irritated and says that the sorry in the phone was just an excuse for Natasha. She wanted to know where they were staying.

After dinner Layla and Arjun go for a walk. The conversation between Arjun and Layla is important to understand their views regarding love, life and relationship. Such views also explore Arjun’s masculinity. Arjun asks if Layla had any boyfriend. She replies no. She explains that whom she wanted, that person wanted something else in life. Arjun asks what was her type. She replies that there was no such type. Arjun says that someone who had three weeks of holiday in a year cannot be her type. For whom career is the most important thing of life cannot be her type. He then adds that the person who thinks of money as most important thing also cannot be her type. At this point Layla says that Arjun falls in this type. Arjun asks her not to judge him. He further elaborates that when he was eight years his father died leaving a lot of debt. He quickly realised the importance of money. Layla says that in spite of earning a lot he feels that there is something he still wanted. She suggests making time for those things which make him really happy, like cooking. Arjun says that is the plan. He would work hard till forty and then he would retire. Layla asks him how he was so sure that he would live till forty. He must live for today. This sequence brings out two different world views. Arjun belongs to the era where production is the key feature. We may consider this era passé. Layla represents the feminist aspirations which are part of the consumerist aspect of contemporary capitalism. Her preference to live the present moment reflects her aspirations in life. Later we will see that Arjun learns to live according to Layla. He plans to join Layla at Morocco despite his busy schedules. His preference changes from money making to consumption or to be precise, live the life of the present. Thus it is not Layla who becomes perfect match for Arjun but it is Arjun who learns to be new man following Layla.

When Arjun and Layla were conversing we see Kabir and Natasha in their room. Natasha is packing and Kabir insists her to stay a few more days. Natasha says that Kabir does not mean it. Kabir genuinely says that he does not want Natasha to go back in such an unhappy mood. Natasha asks how would he have felt if she went out with friends. Kabir says that she has her own life and if she and Samira went for a trip why would he object. Natasha says that if she tells him that they met some guys and were planning for dinner how would he feel. Kabir says he would be concerned about their safety but would not be suspicious. Natasha says this was easy to say but not easy to do. Their conversation follows in the car as Kabir, Arjun and Imran go to drop her off at the airport. In the meantime, Layla follows them on a bike and
kisses Arjun and went back. Thus Natasha seems to be relieved. She is discussing her future plans. She suggests that she will leave her job. Kabir insists that she work. Natasha asks how that would be possible. They were getting married in two months and then they would go for their honeymoon. After that she would decorate their home which will take a year. Further she says that if Kabir was going to Singapore for his new project she would accompany him. Kabir reminds her that the hotel project was her dream. Natasha says that dreams change. She had not known then that she would get married. Kabir does not understand the connection between her marriage and this particular project. Natasha says that priorities change. For example Kabir would not go for such boys’ trip after their marriage. This entire conversation is important to understand contemporary masculinity. Kabir’s understanding of work, marriage and independence is informed by feminism. What he is suggesting is a demand feminism posed for gender equality. Being a contemporary man he appropriates those tropes and appears as a perfect partner for contemporary women. What is interesting is that such a point of view is not replicated by Natasha. She seems to be an old fashioned woman who considers marriage as an important turning point in her life. She herself says that priority changes. But such changes in priority are not addressed by feminism. Thus feminism seems to be distant from everyday life of women (at least in this case). Paradoxically feminism becomes productive for contemporary masculinity. The pertinent question becomes therefore-is contemporary masculinity truly egalitarian? I would later explore that contemporary masculinity only appropriates feminism to keep its masculine trope intact. The question of women’s independence is important because it leaves space for their male selves. Here women’s independence is not linked with their empowerment rather it is a lifestyle choice. It is a lifestyle for the contemporary woman which is convenient for contemporary man.

The next important sequence for our project is how Imran meets his father. He learns that Salman Habib is his biological father after the death of his foster father. Salman Habib is a painter and stays in Spain. Imran is indecisive to meet Salman. But the course of events brings them together. While three of them were drinking in a pub they play a trick and make fun of a customer who fights back. Thus they end up fighting and land in a jail. They need someone who could bail them. Imran called Salman and lets the other two know that he is his father. Next we meet Salman Habib who takes the three of them to his house. Salman stays there with his wife who was at Paris at the time. After introducing themselves Arjun and Kabir leave Imran and Salman alone. Salman says he had thought many times of what he would say to him if he ever met Imran. Imran says he expects him to tell the truth. Salman
says that truth is subjective. He was in his early twenties when Rohila expected a baby. He was not ready for such a responsibility. He wanted to paint, wanted to travel. Rohila wanted to be mother and have a family. He made his decision and Rohila made her decision. Imran asks him why he never tried to contact him. Salman answered that he thought it was better not to contact. We see Imran crying and leaving the house. We see the softer side of Imran which is not reflected in Salman’s personality. Salman’s personality represents a bohemian irresponsible masculinity. He is ready to take neither familial responsibility nor does he have any affection for his son. He represents a masculinity which considers reproductive domains less important. He rejects Rohila and their son but he does not reject the reproductive domain altogether. When Imran meets him he is married. What we can conclude here is that his artistic aspirations are more important to him than family and fatherhood. Moreover we witness him being less affectionate than Imran regarding this father-son relationship.

We learn through flashback how Kabir had proposed to Natasha. Kabir bought a ring for his mother on her birthday. He showed it to Natasha who thought it was for her. She showed it to Tania and both of them shouted and told everybody that Kabir had proposed to Natasha. Every one present there congratulate each other and Kabir’s mother Anjali considers it her best birthday gift. Outside the hall Kabir confesses to Natasha that the ring was meant for his mother. Natasha asks why he did not say it then and there. Kabir replies that they were all shouting so much and then the announcement was made. Natasha says so he does not want to marry! What would she tell her father. She finds this too embarrassing. Kabir asks her to tell her father that they needed more time. Natasha then asks Kabir if he was serious about their relationship. At that point Kabir sits on his knees asking her to marry him and pust the ring in her finger. Thus we came to know of how and why Kabir had proposed to Natasha.

Next important scene for our project is at the restaurant where Layla suggests shopping. Kabir refuses to go. Arjun suggests that something is wrong with Kabir and asks Kabir to go through a test. Thus Arjun plays Kabir’s trick on Kabir. The rule of this test is one should name a word and Kabir has to say something related to it immediately. If he hesitates it will be considered that particular word held some problem for him. So the test follows. We see that he hesitates on the word marriage. When Arjun points it out to Kabir, he says he does not have time for such silly things and leaves the restaurant. Arjun and Imran follow him. Kabir says sorry to them. Imran asks what his problem was, he is not going for an arranged marriage. We see arranged marriage as almost a taboo for these contemporary youths. For
example we had seen how Sameer reacted to arranged marriage in *Dil Chahta Hai*. Here it is not an arranged marriage between Kabir and Natasha; they are not only from same class and caste background but their parents are business partners too. Such liaison does not challenge our social hierarchy and does not have any radical potential. More to it we would learn they are not sure of their feelings and were under pressure as their parents were also involved. When Imran says it is not a arranged marriage Kabir answers that the Natasha he used to know was not like this. She has changed. She has become possessive. The Natasha he used to know was a talented, independent interior designer who got pleasure out of her work. Now she has stopped working. She has turned her life into his life. Kabir says he wants to marry but he is not comfortable with the idea of two bodies one soul. We once again see what Kabir is expecting from his partner falls clearly under feminist demand. Right to work, leading one’s own life and independence was feminist prerogative long back. Contemporary masculinity appropriated those prerogatives to fulfil their own needs. For example someone like Natasha may be apprehensive towards these boys’ trips but a *truly independent* women who herself freaks out with her friends would give such space to her partner. Thus the notion of independence is a life style choice and not a life line. It is a matter of convenience among partners and not an empowerment of women.

Kabir’s friends want to know if he had proposed to her too quickly. Kabir lets them know how things happened. Arjun says that now he realizes why this trip was important to Kabir. Kabir wanted to hear from someone else that he should not go for this marriage. It is only they who can insist him not to marry. Kabir says it is impossible to cancel the marriage now. Cards have been printed. Arjun says that Natasha is a great girl but Kabir should be sure that he wants to marry her. If he does not want to marry he should tell her. It would be good for her in long run. Kabir refuses to do so.

Next important scene for the narrative was at the sport where men are running and bulls were chasing them. This was Imran’s choice and it seems to be wild and more dangerous than other two. Arjun tells Imran that if he died in this game his spirit will not leave Imran. Imran asks him why he is talking about death. He suggests to make a pact, what will they do if they were alive. Imran says he would show the poetry he had written. Arjun says he would go to Morocco with Layla. Kabir after lots of hesitation decides to tell Natasha that he cannot marry her. Next we see the scene where ferocious bulls are chasing them along with a crowd of men. Three of them succeed in running and remain alive. The narrative ends here. Both the
films discussed here are not only similar in plot but also in treatment. They explore the complexity of contemporary gender relation. Both contemporary masculinity and femininity go through a significant makeover as they engage with feminisms. Feminism which is reduced to a lifestyle choice is a manifestation of the socio-economic pull of contemporary globalization. Here I have tried to understand the masculinity of Hindi cinema as a cultural product of contemporary globalization.

I would now wind up what I have said earlier. My entry point to the discursive field of globalization is the heterogeneity of cultural forms. Within contemporary intellectual field such notion of cultural heterogeneity is celebrated. Fredric Jameson (Jameson: 1984) is one such scholar who celebrates such heterogeneity. Further he proposes postmodern culture as the logic of late capitalism. According to him postmodern culture is both a rupture from earlier epochs and also repetition of earlier cultural practice. Slavoj Zizek (Zizek: 1997) considers culture as the only trope to understand contemporary globalization. He argues that valorisation of culture may be an apparent feature within the field of globalization. For him, such appearance has real significance. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (Spivak:1999) in A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Towards a History of Vanishing Presence also engages with Jameson. She argues that the change Jameson valorizes at the level of aesthetics is not a conceptual change rather it is a chronological change. Next she engages with the hybridity of multinational capitalism. She proposes that if one considers capitalism as both good and bad, one cannot fight the wrong side of capitalism. To understand postmodern culture both economy and culture are necessary. In fact she is for an economy that imbedded in culture.

To understand the complexity of culture within postmodern force field, I have engaged with both Judith Butler (Butler: 1998) and Raymond Williams (Williams: 1980). Butler challenges two propositions which are prevalent in contemporary intellectual field. First of all orthodox Marxism does not consider culture as a significant field of enquiry. Such an understanding of culture by orthodox Marxism is challenged by Butler. Secondly, she proposes that the new social movements should be part of political economy. I also engage with Raymond Williams who identifies the alternative meanings and practice which are part of dominant ideology. These alternative meanings and practices expose internal conflict within dominant ideology. But these alternative meanings and practices does not challenge the overall dominant ideology. Further he explores residual and emergent practices within dominant culture.
According to him, the dominant culture changes itself by incorporating the residual and emergent practice within its ambit.

The pluralism and diversity within the representation of masculinity is important here. Here we should remember the heterogeneity of cultural form is not beyond norm altogether. We can explore certain pattern within such heterogeneity. Thus when I engage with contemporary representation of masculinity I come across a pattern in it. We may witness soft and sensitive new man along with older type of virile masculinity within contemporary filmic space but at the core both seem to be the same. I had considered the feminist intervention relevant to formation of such masculinities. Contemporary masculinity reshaped itself in the terms of feminist demands. The new masculinity seems to be feminist. But such change is apparent. We see a continuation of earlier form of masculinity. Thus the diversity in the representation of masculinity not only explores the heterogeneity of cultural field but also explores a masculinity which appropriates the feminist rhetoric but remains masculinist at the core. Thus its change according to feminist demand is not real. The two films I analysed in this chapter give us the opportunity to engage with the newness of contemporary urban youth which has become productive to understand the overall culture field of contemporary globalization.