Indian Cinema and Cultural Identity: Negotiating Tradition, Modernity, and Global Influence

Santanu Sarkar
Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur, India

Anuradha Choudry
Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur, India

Abstract

Indian cinema, particularly Bollywood, has played a pivotal role in shaping cultural identity by blending traditional storytelling with contemporary cinematic techniques. Recent scholarship on Indian cinema has increasingly focused on Indian identity, cultural hybridity, transnational cinema, and Bollywood's role as a vehicle of soft power in global media. Following this, the present study explores how Indian cinema negotiates the intersection of tradition, modernity, and globalization through a multidisciplinary approach that integrates classical Indian aesthetics—particularly *Rasa* Theory's emotional framework, alongside Western cinematic traditions, postcolonial discourse, and transnational cinema as a global context. Seven films—*Pather Panchali* (Ray, 1955), *Mughal-e-Azam* (Asif, 1960), *Lagaan* (Gowariker, 2001), *The Lunchbox* (Batra, 2013), *Rustom* (Desai, 2016), Gully *Boy* (Akhtar, 2019) and *All We Imagine as Light* (Kapadia, 2024)—are analyzed to examine how Indian filmmakers sustain aesthetic continuity while adapting to evolving global conventions. Findings reveal that Indian cinema blends indigenous aesthetics with contemporary cinematic forms, resulting in culturally hybrid and emotionally resonant narratives. *Rasa* aesthetics shape the emotional and visual texture across all seven films, while localized Western conventions address themes of resistance, aspiration, and social justice, alongside postcolonial concerns such as nationalism, caste, and gender. Moreover, its growing global reach reflects a shift toward transnational storytelling rooted in cultural specificity. This study contributes to broader discussions on cultural hybridity, national identity, and global cinema, underscoring Indian cinema's dual role as both a preserver of tradition and a dynamic, evolving force in the international media landscape.

Keywords: Bollywood, cultural identity, globalization, Indian cinema, *Rasa* Theory, transnational cinema

Indian cinema, particularly Bollywood, has emerged as one of India's most influential cultural exports, significantly shaping global perceptions of the country. The global film industry is often categorized into producers and earners, with the United States leading in box office revenue, followed by China and India, while Europe lags slightly behind. In 2024, the U.S. and Canada released 569 films, while China produced around 406 in 2024 (Statista, 2025). India remained a leading producer, releasing 1,823 films in 2024. International distribution also expanded, with 359 Indian films released across 38 countries, including 60 direct-to-digital releases. The OTT sector saw increased consolidation as companies aimed to scale content and strengthen technological capabilities. India's box office revenues surpassed INR 100 billion in 2024, with international theatricals contributing INR 20 billion—a 5% year-over-year growth and underscoring Bollywood's growing influence on the global entertainment landscape (Ernst & Young [EY], 2025; Ganti, 2004). Indian films are now being screened in a wide range of countries, including Japan, New Zealand, and the United States, while also expanding into emerging markets such as Peru, the Middle East, Africa, and Europe. Notably, some Hindi films have found greater profitability in regional Indian markets than in international sales, particularly independent and art-house productions. At the same time, Indian regional film industries such as Tamil, Bengali, and Malayalam cinema continue to play a crucial role in preserving indigenous storytelling traditions while integrating modern cinematic techniques, reinforcing Indian cinema's position as one of the most diverse and prolific film industries in the world (Rajadhyaksha & Willemen, 2014).

To better grasp the artistic and structural uniqueness of Indian cinema, it is essential to understand its deep-rooted connection to the *Natyashastra*, the ancient Indian treatise on performance arts. A central concept of this text is *Rasa* theory, which defines the aesthetic experience evoked in audiences (Bharata Muni, 2016). Derived from the word *rasa*, meaning essence or flavor, it describes how a successful dramatic performance transports the spectator into a transcendental state of enjoyment (Gupt, 2006). According to Bharata, performance is an imitation of life, where emotions must be heightened to allow audiences to fully experience pleasure and pain. The phrase *"Vibhāvanubhav-vyabhichāribhav-samyogādrasanispattih"* explains that *Rasa* emerges from a combination of determinants (*vibhāva*), consequents (*anubhāva—physical or emotional reactions triggered by vibhāva, such as weeping in response to sorrow*), and transitory emotions (*vyabhichāribhāva*) (Ghosh, 2016; Gnoli, 1968). Much like a well-prepared dish combines different ingredients to create a distinct taste, a performance blends emotions to generate a dominant mood (*sthayibhāva*). The eight classical *Rasa(s)*—शृंगाररसः (Śṛṅgāra Rasaḥ) – Romance/Love, हास्यरसः (Hāsya Rasaḥ) – Humor/Laughter, रौद्रसः (Raudra Rasaḥ) – Fury/Anger, करुणरसः (Karuṇa Rasaḥ) – Compassion/Sorrow, बीभत्सरसः (Bībhatsa Rasaḥ) – Disgust, भयानकरसः (Bhayānaka Rasaḥ) – Horror/Fear, वीररसः (Vīra Rasaḥ) – Heroism/Courage, अद्भुतरसः (Adbhuta Rasaḥ) – and Wonder/Amazement—are not just emotions but states of being that arise in the spectator (Buchta et al., 2010). Indian cinema, deeply influenced by the Natyashastra, has long reflected this emotional structuring (Barnouw & Krishnaswamy, 1980; Dudrah & Desai, 2008; Ganti, 2004; Gokulsing & Dissanayake, 1998; Morcom, 2017; Pendakur, 2003; Roy, 2017; Thomas, 1995). Though initially overlooked in film studies (Dwyer & Patel, 2002), *Rasa* theory has gained increasing recognition for its

ability to explain some of Indian cinema's unique storytelling mechanisms (Booth, 2008; Jones, 2010; Massey, 1992; Mullik, 2020).

Aesthetics serve as the defining characteristic of Indian cinema, shaping its storytelling approach and cultural impact. Scholars such as Rajadhyaksha and Willemen (2014) and Vasudevan (2000) argue that Bollywood is not merely a genre or a film industry; rather, it represents a multifaceted entertainment ecosystem, influencing television, music, advertising, fashion, and digital media. While Hollywood also operates as a transmedia industry with global cultural influence, the distinction lies in how each industry is embedded within its respective historical development, cultural positioning, and industrial structure. Hollywood typically emphasizes genre purity, realism, high production values, technological innovation, and formalized global distribution systems; in contrast, Bollywood is deeply embedded in Indian cultural life, blending multiple genres and emotional tones to resonate across diverse regions and communities (Davids, 2023; Dwyer & Pinto, 2011).

However, Raghavendra (2020) and Mehta and Pandharipande (2010) continue to assert that only Hindi cinema qualifies as the dominant form of Indian popular and national cinema. Although this perspective may reflect Bollywood's historical visibility and influence, it may overlook the linguistic and cultural plurality of Indian cinema. As Somashekar and Pinto (2024) emphasize, equating Indian cinema often solely with Bollywood erases the significant contributions of other language industries—such as Telugu, Tamil, Kannada, and Malayalam—which have achieved both critical acclaim and commercial success, as evidenced by the global recognition of *RRR* (Rajamouli, 2022) and *The Elephant Whisperers* (Gonsalves, 2022) at the 95th Academy Awards in 2023. Nevertheless, Indian cinema as a whole maintains its distinctiveness, resisting the conventional narrative structures of Western filmmaking (Thomas, 2015). Unlike mainstream Hollywood films, which are largely driven by linear plots and character arcs, Indian cinema integrates a vibrant fusion of action, humour, melodrama, and music, a format deeply rooted in traditional performance arts (Breckenridge, 1995). As Anjaria (2021) notes, Hindi cinema occupies a distinctive place in Indian cultural life, drawing from Parsi theatre, folk traditions, and epic storytelling. These elements not only reinforce a sense of "Indianness" tied to nationalist discourse but also create space for more inclusive and pluralistic representations of national identity.

However, Bollywood has historically dominated India's domestic film market, recent trends indicate a more competitive global landscape. In 2023, North America led with $9.07 billion in box office revenue, followed by China at $7.71 billion, while Japan trailed at just a fraction of both (China Daily, 2024). India, meanwhile, set a new record with ₹12,226 crore ($1.5 billion) in 2023, a 15% rise over 2022 (*The Economic Times*, Farooqui, 2024), reaffirming Bollywood's continued strong domestic presence amid global shifts. Bollywood's emotionally resonant, music-infused model has shaped various regional film industries, further diversifying Indian cinema while maintaining its core aesthetic sensibilities. Indian films seamlessly integrate music, poetry, and visual spectacle, a tradition that can be traced back to classical Sanskrit theatre and literature. The continued significance of songs as narrative devices in Hindi cinema is a direct legacy of this tradition (Lal & Nandy, 2006; Mishra, 2013). Furthermore,

Indian cinema's narrative structures and artistic philosophies often remain misunderstood by Western scholars unfamiliar with Indian philosophical traditions and aesthetics. While Western film theory is rooted in frameworks such as phenomenology, structuralism, modernism, and psychoanalysis, Indian film narratives often align with indigenous philosophical concepts that predate these theories (Murthy, 2020). Scholars such as Basham (1954) have observed the structural continuity between Sanskrit theatre and contemporary Indian cinema, drawing parallels between Kalidasa's *अभिज्ञानशाकुन्तलम् (Abhijñānaśākuntalam)* and Raj Kapoor's *Satyam, Shivam, Sundaram* (Kapoor, 1978).

Similarly, Indian filmmakers often engage in a hybrid cinematic approach, negotiating between Western cinematic realism and Indian aesthetic traditions (Vasudevan, 2000). For example, *Pather Panchali* (Ray, 1955) aligns with Italian neorealism, depicting everyday struggles while retaining *करुणरसः* (Karuṇa-Compassion/Sorrow) to ensure emotional resonance (Cooper, 2000; Dwyer, 2014). Likewise, Ghatak's *Meghe Dhaka Tara* (Ghatak, 1960) employs exaggerated soundscapes and fragmented storytelling to evoke *Raudra* (Fury/Anger) and *करुणरसः* (Karuṇa-Compassion/Sorrow), deviating from Western psychological realism (Vasudevan, 2000). However, contemporary Indian filmmakers, particularly those engaging with globalized cinematic formats, increasingly merge these traditions, creating a hybrid storytelling approach that warrants further scholarly investigation (Gopalan, 2019). On the other hand, Indian cinema has historically served as a medium of anti-colonial resistance, nationalist discourse, and cultural assertion. During the colonial era, early silent films such as *Raja Harishchandra* (Phalke, 1913) and *Bhakta Vidur* (Rathod, 1921) acted as allegorical critiques of British rule, embedding Hindu mythological themes within nationalist frameworks (Gokulsing & Dissanayake, 1998).

The post-independence era witnessed a shift toward nation-building narratives, with films like *Mother India* (Mehboob, 1957) and *Do Bigha Zamin* (Ray, 1953) reinforcing socialist ideals and national unity (Chakravarty, 2011; Ingawanij, 2012). Scholars such as Prasad (1998) and Dwyer (2014) argue that Indian cinema continues to engage with nationalist and postcolonial themes, particularly in films addressing globalization, diaspora identity, and political resistance. However, there is a research gap in examining how post-2010 Indian films engage with digital colonialism, AI-driven narratives, and globalized film markets, necessitating further study (Majumdar, 2021).

The globalization of Indian cinema, particularly Bollywood, has positioned it as a significant tool of soft power, drawing audiences from Africa, the Middle East, and Southeast Asia (Ganti, 2004). However, in catering to international markets, Bollywood has incorporated Westernized aesthetics, sometimes altering traditional Indian storytelling methods (Dudrah, 2012). Films such as *Gully Boy* (Akhtar, 2019) exemplify this shift, adopting Hollywood-style underdog narratives while retaining Indian cultural elements through music, language, and setting. In contrast, regional cinemas such as Tamil, Malayalam, and Bengali industries continue to thrive, preserving indigenous storytelling while integrating experimental filmmaking (Gooptu, 2001). Directors like Mani Ratnam, Rituparno Ghosh, and Pa Ranjith have challenged Bollywood's

hegemony by addressing local socio-political issues, caste struggles, and feminist narratives (Sengupta, 2024; Vijayan & Akshayaa, 2025). Despite extensive scholarship on Bollywood, regional cinema's evolving relationship with global media platforms remains underexplored, making it a crucial area for further study.

In a mediatized society, film analysis is crucial for understanding how cinema reflects and shapes socio-cultural structures and collective experiences. As communicative media, films are embedded within discursive practices that demand analysis beyond aesthetics, encompassing production, reception, and broader cultural contexts (Benshoff, 2015; Mikos, 2014). Over the past two decades, scholarly interest in Indian film has grown much, focusing on identity, hybridity, transnationalism, and Bollywood's role in global media. Building on this scholarship, the present study explores how Indian cinema negotiates the intersection of tradition and modernity by integrating indigenous aesthetic principles, particularly *Rasa* Theory, with global cinematic conventions. While prior research has addressed hybridity and Western influences, limited attention has been given to how cultural, social, and regional identities are preserved within transnational contexts—an area this study seeks to address. Moreover, by analyzing seven influential films through postcolonial and transnational lenses, the study offers a nuanced understanding of Indian cinema's aesthetic evolution, creative adaptability, and expanding global presence. To achieve this, the study adopts a descriptive qualitative methodology, using seven films—*Pather Panchali* (Ray, 1955), *Mughal-e-Azam* (Asif, 1960), *Lagaan* (Gowariker, 2001), *The Lunchbox* (Batra, 2013), *Rustom* (Desai, 2016) *Gully Boy* (Akhtar, 2019) and *All We Imagine as Light* (Kapadia, 2024)—were selected as case studies to represent diverse historical periods, thematic richness, varied storytelling approaches, critical acclaim and socio-political concerns, offering a cross-section of Indian cinema's engagement with cultural identity, aesthetic tradition, modernity, and transnational influence.

The analytical framework integrates four interrelated critical theoretical perspectives: 1) *Rasa* Theory, rooted in Bharata's *Natyashastra,* which explains how Indian cinema evokes emotional engagement through music, movement, and visual aesthetics, distinguishing it from Western realism. 2) Western cinematic traditions, particularly Hollywood's narrative structures, Italian neorealism, and European minimalism, highlighting how Indian filmmakers have adapted global storytelling conventions while maintaining indigenous aesthetics. Beyond narrative and aesthetics, 3) Postcolonial discourse explores how Indian cinema engages with nationalism, resistance, caste, gender, and socio-political critique, positioning films as a medium of cultural negotiation and identity formation. Lastly, 4) Transnational cinema examines Indian cinema's global reach, analysing its engagement with diaspora audiences, streaming platforms, and international markets while balancing cultural authenticity with global cinematic trends. Each film is examined through close textual analysis, focusing on narrative construction, aesthetic techniques, emotional resonances, and embedded socio-political themes. This multi-theoretical approach enables a layered interpretation of Indian cinema's evolution, highlighting how filmmakers negotiate traditional aesthetics and contemporary cinematic forms. The central research question guiding this inquiry is: *How does Indian cinema negotiate the tension between traditional aesthetic frameworks and global*

cinematic conventions in the construction of cultural identity? The corresponding hypothesis is that Indian cinema, while influenced by global influences, continues to be rooted in indigenous aesthetic traditions and cultural values.

Theoretical Frameworks

The *Natyashastra* posits that an ideal drama should evoke multiple *rasas* (emotional essences), a principle that perhaps can explain the "*masala*" (Melodrama) nature of Indian cinema, where diverse emotions, genres, and tonal shifts coexist. Reginald Massey (1992) notes that while Bharata's dramaturgy reflected the high culture of his time, modern Indian films, driven by commercial success, mirror contemporary tastes while retaining the *Natyashastra's* core ideals. Despite *rasa* theory's foundational role, it remains underutilized in mainstream film criticism, though post-2000 scholars like Hogan (2008) and Cooper (2000) have revived interest in its relevance, arguing that Hindi cinema prioritizes affective realism—emphasizing emotions over narrative logic—unlike Hollywood's cognitive realism. Studies applying *rasa* aesthetics have examined auteurship (Cooper on Satyajit Ray), genre classification (Hogan on *Mother India* and *Bandit Queen*), and narrative impact; Gerow's *rasa dhvani* analysis of European films (Roy, 2017). Scholars such as Roy (2017) and Kudva (2019) emphasize Bollywood's continuity with the *Natyashastra*, challenging Western critiques that dismiss heightened emotions, song, and dance as excessive. Instead, they advocate for a *rasa*-centered framework to evaluate Indian cinema on its own terms. Roy examines the historical continuity of expressive acting, melodrama, and genre-blending, demonstrating their alignment with *Natyashastra* principles rather than Western cinematic realism. Similarly, Kudva analyses films like *Sholay* (Sippy, 1975) and *Dilwale Dulhania Le Jayenge* (Chopra, 1995), illustrating how Bollywood's storytelling reflects *rasa*-based emotional engagement. This tradition persists in *Mughal-e-Azam* (Asif, 1960) (*Śṛṅgāra Rasaḥ & Vīra Rasaḥ*), *Pather Panchali* (Ray, 1955) (Karuṇa-Compassion/Sorrow), and *The Lunchbox* (Batra, 2013), which, despite Western influences, employs *rasa* for emotional depth. Ultimately, *rasa* theory remains integral to Indian cinema's narrative style, emotional resonance, and cultural identity.

Indian cinema has also drawn structural inspiration from Western cinematic traditions, particularly Hollywood, European arthouse cinema, and Italian neorealism. While Bollywood follows a unique, episodic storytelling format with song-and-dance sequences, the rise of parallel cinema in the mid-20th century marked a shift toward realism, influenced by filmmakers like Vittorio De Sica and the French New Wave (Anjaria, 2021; Dasgupta & Clini, 2023; Mishra, 2013; Virdi, 2003). These traditions introduced linear narratives, structured character arcs, and socio-political realism to Indian cinema. The significance of this framework lies in narrative hybridization, where Indian filmmakers absorb Western storytelling techniques while retaining indigenous aesthetics. For instance, *Pather Panchali* (Ray, 1955) follows neorealist conventions such as non-professional actors and location-based cinematography but retains Indian emotional depth through करुणरसः (Karuṇa-Compassion/Sorrow). Similarly, *Lagaan* (Batra, 2001) incorporates Hollywood's sports-drama structure while weaving in postcolonial and folk storytelling traditions (Chakravarty, 2011). In contemporary cinema,

Gully Boy (Akhtar, 2019) merges the Hollywood underdog narrative *8 Mile* (Curtis, 2002) with Indian socio-political realities, demonstrating Bollywood's evolving global appeal. Rather than a process of Westernization, this framework highlights aesthetic negotiation, where Indian cinema selectively incorporates global influences without erasing cultural specificity.

Postcolonial discourse provides a socio-political lens to examine Indian cinema's role in shaping national identity, resisting cultural imperialism, and reflecting post-independence struggles. As a former British colony, India's cinematic history has been deeply influenced by colonial censorship, nationalist movements, and post-independence nation-building (Gokulsing & Dissanayake, 1998; Langah & Sengupta, 2021). This framework is crucial for tracing the evolution of Indian cinema from colonial subjugation to postcolonial assertion. Early films such as *Raja Harishchandra* (Phalke, 1913) used Hindu mythology as an allegory of resistance against British rule, while *Mother India* (Mehboob, 1957) reinforced nationalist resilience and sacrifice (Prasad, 1998). Parallel cinema, in contrast, critiqued socio-political realities, as seen in *Jana Aranya* (Ray, 1976), which exposed post-independence corruption, and *Kaala* (2018), which reclaimed Dalit identity through subaltern resistance (Abraham & Misrahi-Barak, 2022**;** Raghavendra, 2020; Sengupta, 2024). Postcolonial themes continue to shape contemporary Indian cinema, particularly in response to globalization, cultural hybridity, and neo-colonial economic structures. Films like *Lagaan* (Gowariker, 2001) reinterpret colonial oppression through cricket, transforming an imperial sport into a symbol of indigenous empowerment (Dwyer, 2014), while *Gully Boy* (Akhtar, 2019) reframes urban marginalization through globalized hip-hop culture. This framework reinforces Indian cinema's role as a medium of historical reflection, social critique, and identity politics.

Transnational cinema explores how films operate beyond national borders through globalization, diasporic networks, international festivals, and digital platforms. Traditionally catering to domestic and diaspora audiences, Indian cinema has undergone a major shift with the rise of streaming platforms such as Netflix, Amazon Prime, and Hotstar, enabling filmmakers to reach wider global audiences (Chatterji & Washbrook, 2013; Ganti, 2004; Gehlawat, 2015; Menon, 2024). This shift marks the transition from a national to a transnational cinematic identity. While transnational cinema is often associated with cultural exchange and hybridity, Higbee and Lim (2010) argue for a "critical transnationalism" that views it as a space where power, identity, and cultural negotiation converge—an approach especially relevant to Indian cinema, which maintains strong cultural specificity while engaging global audiences.

The growing presence of Indian films at international festivals signals their increasing integration into global cinema discourse. *The Lunchbox* (Batra, 2013), which was screened at Cannes Critics' Week, exemplifies how Indian independent cinema engages with global arthouse aesthetics (Dwyer, 2014), while *RRR* (Rajamouli, 2022) demonstrated that Indian films can integrate Hollywood action tropes while maintaining mythological storytelling traditions (Menon, 2024). However, globalization has raised concerns about the dilution of Indian storytelling traditions. Some scholars argue that Bollywood's growing reliance on Westernized narratives and big-budget spectacles threatens its indigenous aesthetics (Dudrah,

2012). Conversely, regional cinema has leveraged global platforms to assert linguistic and cultural diversity, evident in the global success of Tamil, Malayalam, and Marathi films on streaming services (Shohat & Stam, 2014; Vijayan & Akshayaa, 2025). This framework highlights the dual nature of globalization—as both an opportunity for cultural exchange and a challenge to cinematic authenticity. Rather than merely adapting to Western frameworks, Indian cinema has emerged as an active force in global storytelling, demonstrating its ability to adapt, hybridize, and innovate within a transnational media economy.

Integrating these four theoretical frameworks, this study provides a comprehensive approach to understanding Indian cinema's artistic continuity, structural hybridity, political significance, and expanding global impact. Examining Indian cinema through these perspectives allows for a deeper appreciation of its complexities, ensuring it is recognized not just as an entertainment industry but as a cultural force shaping national and international narratives. The following discussion will explore these aspects in detail through case studies of seven selected films. Each case study highlights a distinct phase in Indian cinema's evolution, demonstrating how filmmakers integrate Natyashastra principles, Western cinematic influences, postcolonial narratives, and transnational storytelling to craft a cinematic language that is both culturally rooted and globally resonant.

Mughal-e-Azam (1960): Classical Indian Aesthetics and *Rasa* Theory

K. Asif's *Mughal-e-Azam* (Asif, 1960) remains a quintessential example of Indian cinematic grandeur, showcasing the enduring influence of Natyashastra aesthetics and *Rasa* Theory in mainstream Indian cinema. As a historical romance set in the Mughal era, the film revolves around Prince Salim's love for the courtesan Anarkali and the ensuing power struggle between love and imperial duty. Its visual opulence, poetic dialogues, and meticulously composed frames recall Indian classical theatre and miniature painting traditions, reinforcing Bharata's emphasis on the performative nature of storytelling (Rangacharya, 2005). Unlike Western historical dramas, which often prioritize psychological realism and character-driven arcs, *Mughal-e-Azam* (Asif, 1960) embraces a distinctly Indian aesthetic vocabulary, where performance, spectacle, and heightened emotion become primary modes of cinematic engagement (Dwyer, 2014). The grandeur of the film is not merely an aesthetic choice but a narrative device that enhances its emotional and philosophical dimensions, aligning with Indian traditions of *rasa*-based storytelling. One of the most defining aspects of *Mughal-e-Azam* (Asif, 1960) is its masterful use of *Rasa* theory to evoke deep emotional engagement from the audience. *शृङ्गाररसः (Śṛṅgāra* (Romance/Love) is at the heart of the narrative, embodied in the passionate yet forbidden love between Salim and Anarkali. Their love is accentuated through soulful gazes, poetic dialogues, and expressive Kathak dance performances, all of which align with Bharata's notion of *Śṛṅgārarasa* (Romane/Love) as an aesthetic experience that transcends mere romance to evoke a profound emotional response in the viewer (Bharata Muni, trans. Ghosh, 2016). The song "*Pyar Kiya Toh Darna Kya",* translated as "We have loved so why fear" is a striking example of how the film integrates visual spectacle, music, and movement to amplify *rasa*. In this sequence, Anarkali's defiant stance against royal authority

is not just conveyed through lyrics but also through her body language, eye movements, and spatial positioning within the grand Sheesh Mahal (Palace of Glass) set, where reflections multiply her presence, symbolizing the defiance of an individual against an empire (Vasudevan, 2000). This moment exemplifies *Rasa* Theory's emphasis on theatrical immersion and sensory engagement, where emotions are not merely felt but viscerally experienced by the audience. On the other hand, *वीररसः* (*Vīra*-Heroism/Courage) manifests in the ideological conflict between Emperor Akbar and his son Salim, where imperial duty clashes with personal desire. Akbar embodies the stoic, authoritative ruler, his measured speech and unwavering expressions reinforcing his unyielding commitment to statecraft, whereas Salim, driven by love and rebellion, counters his father's rigidity with fiery dialogues and emotional intensity (Chakravarty, 2011). The confrontations between father and son serve not only as moments of heightened drama but also as philosophical debates on individual agency, love as defiance, and the moral authority of the ruler, themes that resonated deeply with post-independence India's struggles with tradition and modernity (Prasad, 1998). Unlike Hollywood historical epics of the time, which relied on realist acting and psychological depth, *Mughal-e-Azam* (Asif, 1960) amplifies emotional intensity through exaggerated facial expressions, stylized dialogues, and symbolic gestures, reinforcing its theatrical origins and rootedness in Indian classical aesthetics (Dwyer, 2014).

Beyond its performance and narrative structure, *Mughal-e-Azam* (Asif, 1960) also demonstrates a sophisticated use of cinematic technology to enhance *rasa*-based storytelling. While much of the film remains in black and white, key moments—particularly the *Śṛṅgārarasa*-infused love sequences—are rendered in Technicolor, a strategic aesthetic choice that heightens emotional impact (Virdi, 2003). The transition between monochrome and colour cinematography mirrors the shifting emotional tones, symbolizing moments of dreamlike romance in contrast to the stark realities of imperial power. This visual innovation can be seen as a continuation of Indian miniature painting traditions, where colour played a crucial role in depicting emotional intensity and thematic contrasts (Gopal & Moorti, 2008). Walia (2014) further suggests that the film's digital colorization enhanced its visual grandeur while reconfiguring its historical aura, positioning *Mughal-e-Azam* (Asif, 1960) as a hybrid cultural artefact that bridges analogue cinematic tradition with contemporary digital aesthetics.

Moreover, the film's aural landscape reinforces its engagement with classical Indian aesthetics. The dialogues, written in highly stylized Urdu, imbue the film with poetic gravitas, making conversations feel like lyrical recitations rather than conventional exchanges (Ganti, 2004). The use of Hindustani classical music, particularly the compositions of Naushad, reflects the mood-based structuring of traditional Indian ragas, where melodies are carefully selected to align with the dominant *rasa* of a given scene (Menon, 2024). The film's use of silence, particularly in moments of deep emotional turmoil, further emphasizes the impact of *अभिनयः (Abhinayaḥ*-Dramatic representation, allowing gestures, facial expressions, and musical cues to convey unspoken emotions (Lutgendorf, 2006). This may contrast with Western method acting, which, following Stanislavski, emphasizes the actor's empathetic immersion and identification, whereas *Abhinayaḥ* (Dramatic representation) relies on aesthetic distance and

controlled expression to evoke *rasa* without personally experiencing the emotion (Cuneo & Ganser, 2022).

Another critical aspect of *Mughal-e-Azam* (Asif, 1960) is its political and cultural significance in postcolonial India. Released in 1960, a period marked by Nehruvian socialism and efforts to forge a unified national identity, the film's celebration of Mughal history was both an act of historical reclamation and a subtle assertion of India's composite cultural heritage. At a time when Hindu nationalist discourse sought to marginalize India's Indo-Islamic past, *Mughal-e-Azam* (Asif, 1960) presented the Mughal court as a site of grandeur, discipline, and philosophical depth, countering reductionist narratives of Muslim rulers as tyrants (Chatterjee, 2012). The film's nuanced portrayal of Emperor Akbar as a just but rigid ruler, alongside its emphasis on Persianate aesthetics, Urdu poetry, and Islamic architectural grandeur, reinforced a vision of India as an inclusive civilization that had historically integrated diverse cultural influences (Vasudevan, 2000). Despite its historical and cultural specificity, *Mughal-e-Azam* (Asif, 1960) continues to resonate with contemporary audiences, not merely as a relic of classical Bollywood but as a template for cinematic storytelling that balances tradition with innovation. Its influence can be seen in films such as *Jodhaa Akbar* (Gowariker, 2008), which adopts similar visual and thematic tropes while infusing a more contemporary sensibility to historical storytelling. Even in contemporary Bollywood's globalized cinematic landscape, where Westernized storytelling structures dominate, *Mughal-e-Azam* (Asif, 1960) remains an example of how Indian filmmakers can integrate traditional performance aesthetics with modern cinematic techniques without losing their cultural specificity (Ganti, 2004). Ultimately, *Mughal-e-Azam* (Asif, 1960) exemplifies how Indian cinema preserves classical aesthetic traditions while embracing technological advancements and changing audience expectations. Through its elaborate mise-en-scène, masterful use of *Rasa* Theory, and integration of music, performance, and spectacle, the film represents the pinnacle of Indian cinematic artistry, reinforcing the idea that cinema, much like classical Indian drama, is not merely a vehicle for storytelling but an immersive, emotionally charged experience that transcends time and cultural shifts.

Pather Panchali (1955): Realism and the Hybridization of Indian Aesthetics

Satyajit Ray's *Pather Panchali* (Ray, 1955) represents a radical departure from the melodramatic and spectacle-driven aesthetics of Bollywood, opting instead for a neorealist storytelling approach influenced by Italian filmmakers such as Vittorio De Sica and Roberto Rossellini (Vasudevan, 2000). Unlike mainstream Indian cinema, which integrates song-and-dance sequences, exaggerated dramatic arcs, and larger-than-life characters, *Pather Panchali* (Ray, 1955) focuses on the small, intimate moments of everyday life, portraying the struggles, joys, and tragedies of a poor Bengali family with stark realism. The film's minimalist aesthetic and observational style redefine Indian cinematic language by placing emotional authenticity over theatricality, an approach that significantly contrasts with Bollywood's reliance on heightened sentimentality and spectacle. However, while the film is deeply influenced by Western cinematic realism, it does not entirely abandon Indian aesthetic sensibilities. Instead, *Pather Panchali* (Ray, 1955) embodies a hybrid cinematic form, incorporating elements of

Natyashastra and *Rasa* Theory, which structure the film's emotional engagement (Dwyer, 2014).

The dominant emotional tone of the film is करुणरसः (*Karuṇa*-Compassion/Sorrow), a core element of Indian dramatic theory, which evokes compassion, sorrow, and the beauty of suffering. This *rasa* is carefully woven into the childhood innocence of Apu and Durga, the quiet endurance of their mother Sarbajaya, and the omnipresent realities of poverty and displacement. Ray masterfully creates a poetic contrast between moments of joy and inevitable tragedy, reinforcing the Natyashastra's emphasis on emotional contrast and heightened dramatic impact (Chakravarty, 2011; Cooper, 2000; Mason, 2006). One of the most poignant scenes in the film—where Apu and Durga dance gleefully in the monsoon rain—initially conveys a sense of freedom, playfulness, and wonder, yet simultaneously foreshadows the fragility of their existence and the impending sorrow of Durga's untimely death (Vasudevan, 2000). The juxtaposition of nature's abundance with human fragility reflects a deeply Indian aesthetic sensibility, which, while framed through Western cinematic realism, remains rooted in traditional modes of storytelling. This ability to seamlessly blend realism with poetic emotional depth is what distinguishes *Pather Panchali* (Ray, 1955) as a landmark in Indian cinema. Furthermore, Landy (2010) highlights the film's lyrical, humanist approach and its ability to capture transience, cultural memory, and social change through minimalist aesthetics and emotional subtlety, positioning it as a cinematic response to post-Independence India's evolving national identity.

Ray's rejection of Bollywood's studio-controlled aesthetics in favor of spontaneous, location-based compositions further enhances the film's naturalistic authenticity. Inspired by Italian neorealism's emphasis on non-professional actors, handheld camerawork, and real locations, *Pather Panchali* (Ray, 1955) captures the textures of rural Bengal with an unfiltered, documentary-like immediacy (Ganti, 2004). By choosing real village settings over artificially constructed sets, Ray eliminates the artifice of commercial cinema, creating a world that breathes with organic detail. The film's cinematographer, Subrata Mitra, pioneered the use of natural light and soft-focus cinematography, lending the visuals a lyrical, painterly quality while maintaining a raw sense of realism (Rajadhyaksha & Willemen, 2014). This aesthetic choice not only reinforces the film's commitment to authenticity but also marks a pivotal shift in Indian cinematic technique, influencing future directors who sought to break away from formulaic, studio-driven filmmaking. In its narrative structure, *Pather Panchali* (Ray, 1955) departs from the cause-and-effect logic of Western storytelling, instead embracing an episodic, fluid form that mirrors the rhythms of life itself. There is no clear protagonist or singular dramatic arc; rather, the film is a series of loosely connected moments that accumulate emotional weight over time. This narrative form aligns with Indian oral storytelling traditions, where events unfold gradually, emotions take precedence over action, and stories flow organically rather than adhering to strict structural conventions (Gopal & Moorti, 2008). In this way, Ray's film resists both Hollywood's three-act structure and Bollywood's spectacle-driven melodrama, forging a distinctly Indian yet universally resonant mode of storytelling.

While *Pather Panchali* (Ray, 1955) is often celebrated for its departure from commercial Bollywood norms, it also serves as a challenge to the notion that Indian cinema is defined solely by Bollywood's extravagant style. Ray's work opened up space for parallel cinema, a movement that prioritized subtlety, realism, and socio-political consciousness over escapist entertainment (Virdi, 2003). The success of the film—both critically and internationally—demonstrated that Indian cinema could operate on multiple aesthetic registers, engaging with both local traditions and global cinematic movements without losing its cultural distinctiveness. Moreover, *Pather Panchali* (Ray, 1955) paved the way for future filmmakers such as Mrinal Sen, Ritwik Ghatak, and Shyam Benegal, who expanded on Ray's socio-realist approach, using cinema as a means of political critique and cultural reflection (Vasudevan, 2000). Despite its alignment with Western neorealist techniques, *Pather Panchali* (Ray, 1955) remains profoundly Indian in its spiritual and philosophical undertones. The film's quiet meditation on life, impermanence, and human suffering echoes themes found in Indian classical literature and aesthetics, particularly in the works of Rabindranath Tagore and in Bibhutibhushan Bandyopadhyay's 1929 Bengali novel *Pather Panchali* (Ray, 1955), from which the film is adapted (Majumdar, 2021). The depiction of human resilience amid suffering, the reverence for nature as both nurturing and indifferent, and the emphasis on cyclical time rather than linear progress are deeply embedded in Indian philosophical traditions, particularly within Hindu and Buddhist worldviews (Kītā & Rājaturai, 1998). In this way, Ray's film, while borrowing Western cinematic language, ultimately tells an Indian story in an Indian way, proving that realism need not be synonymous with Westernization. In the broader discourse on Indian cinema, *Pather Panchali* (Ray, 1955) stands as a landmark of aesthetic hybridization, demonstrating that Indian filmmakers could simultaneously engage with international film movements while retaining indigenous storytelling traditions. This balance between local and global influences continues to shape contemporary Indian cinema, where filmmakers such as Ritesh Batra (*The Lunchbox,* 2013), Nagraj Manjule (*Fandry,* 2013), and Chaitanya Tamhane (*Court,* 2014) draw inspiration from both Ray's realism and indigenous narrative forms to create cinema that is at once intimate, political, and culturally rooted. *Pather Panchali* (Ray, 1955) thus remains a timeless example of how Indian cinema can bridge artistic traditions, resist mainstream conventions, and offer a deeply humanistic vision that resonates across cultures and generations.

Lagaan (2001): Postcolonial Resistance and Transnational Appeal

Ashutosh Gowariker's *Lagaan* (Gowariker, 2001) was another a landmark in Indian cinema, blending historical narratives with global storytelling structures to create a film that resonates both domestically and internationally. Set during British colonial rule, the film follows a group of villagers in Champa (Central India) who challenge their British oppressors in a high-stakes cricket match, transforming the sport—an imperial import—into a symbol of anti-colonial resistance (Prasad, 1998). The film's narrative structure simultaneously reflects postcolonial resistance, Indian folk traditions, and Hollywood-style sports drama, making it a unique fusion of indigenous storytelling and global cinematic techniques. While the film primarily speaks to Indian nationalist sentiment, it also engages with transnational audiences, carefully negotiating between local authenticity and global accessibility (Dwyer, 2014). This balance contributed to

its global success, making it one of the few Indian films to receive an Academy Award nomination for Best Foreign Language Film, reinforcing the idea that Indian cinema can engage with global audiences without losing its cultural specificity (Ganti, 2004).

The postcolonial resistance in *Lagaan* is evident in its portrayal of वीररसः (*Vīra* (Heroism/Courage) and करुणरसः *(Karuṇa*-Compassion/Sorrow, both of which structure the emotional engagement of the film. The villagers, despite their socio-economic hardships, caste divides, and subjugation under colonial rule, unite against the British exploiters, transforming the game of cricket from a symbol of imperial hegemony into a tool of liberation (Chakravarty, 2011). The use of वीररसः *(Vīra* Heroism/Courage) is particularly striking in the character of Bhuvan (played by Aamir Khan), who embodies the ideal of the fearless, resilient leader, echoing the archetypal Indian warrior figures from epics such as the Mahabharata and Ramayana (Rangacharya, 2005). Bhuvan's strategic thinking, moral conviction, and ability to inspire unity among disparate social groups reinforce the film's nationalist undertones, positioning him as a postcolonial hero who challenges British superiority through intelligence, teamwork, and an assertion of indigenous agency. The करुणरसः *(Karuṇa*-Compassion/Sorrow), on the other hand, is evident in the villagers' suffering, highlighting the exploitative nature of British taxation policies, the brutality of colonial governance, and the deep inequalities of rural Indian life (Virdi, 2003). These emotional elements make *Lagaan* more than just a sports drama—it becomes a historical parable of resistance, echoing both Gandhian ideals of non-violent defiance and postcolonial struggles for cultural and political sovereignty.

While *Lagaan* (Gowariker, 2001) is deeply rooted in Indian history and nationalist discourse, it also strategically employs Hollywood-style sports drama conventions, which contribute to its global appeal. The film follows a classical three-act structure, incorporating training montages, character-driven subplots, and a climactic underdog victory, aligning with the narrative structures commonly seen in Hollywood sports films such as *Rocky* (Avildsen, 1976) and *Remember the Titans* (Yakin, 2000) (Bordwell & Thompson, 2010). This hybridization of Indian and Western storytelling ensures that *Lagaan* is accessible to international audiences, who can recognize familiar genre tropes while being introduced to Indian historical and cultural contexts. The film's use of English-speaking British characters, particularly Captain Russell (played by Paul Blackthorne), allows for a more fluid narrative transition between colonial and indigenous perspectives, further bridging local and global cinematic traditions. Additionally, the panoramic cinematography of rural India, executed by Anil Mehta, provides an epic visual scope, reminiscent of classic Hollywood period dramas, reinforcing its grand, transnational cinematic appeal (Rajadhyaksha & Willemen, 2014).

A crucial factor in *Lagaan*'s (Gowariker, 2001) global success was its deliberate positioning as an "Indian film for the world", which aligns with transnational cinema theory. Unlike many Bollywood productions, which cater primarily to domestic and diasporic Indian audiences, *Lagaan* was designed to reach a wider global market, reflected in its multilingual elements, hybrid storytelling approach, and meticulous attention to historical authenticity (Dudrah, 2012). This positioning was not incidental but a conscious strategy to ensure the film's success

on the international festival circuit, particularly at Cannes and the Academy Awards, where it was shortlisted for Best Foreign Language Film (Ganti, 2004). By aligning with both Indian and Western cinematic traditions, the film created a new blueprint for how Indian cinema could engage with global audiences while maintaining cultural authenticity.

Despite its broad accessibility, *Lagaan* has also been critiqued for its idealized representation of Indian unity, which some scholars argue sanitizes the complexities of caste, gender, and internal social hierarchies within Indian society (Chakravarty, 2011). The film presents a utopian vision of rural India, where caste divisions are temporarily set aside for the greater good, reinforcing a simplified nationalist narrative rather than a nuanced critique of India's own internal struggles (Vasudevan, 2000). The presence of Elizabeth Russell (played by Rachel Shelley), a British woman who sympathizes with the Indian cause, further complicates the film's postcolonial stance, as some scholars argue that her role serves to soften British culpability, presenting colonial figures in a more humanized light rather than as outright oppressors (Shohat & Stam, 2014). However, these critiques do not diminish the film's impact; rather, they highlight the ongoing debates within postcolonial cinematic discourse about how nationalist narratives should be framed within global film industries. *Lagaan* (Gowariker, 2001) also raises important questions about the globalization of Indian cinema and its role in transnational storytelling. The film's success demonstrated that Indian historical narratives could be repackaged for international consumption, a trend that has continued with films such as *Slumdog Millionaire* (Boyle, 2008) and *RRR* (Rajamouli, 2022), both of which use Western cinematic techniques while foregrounding distinctly Indian themes. In doing so, *Lagaan* (Gowariker, 2001) paved the way for a new genre of Indian cinema that balances local storytelling with global accessibility, influencing subsequent historical epics and sports dramas that adopt a similar transnational aesthetic. Karmakar and Catterall (2025) similarly position *Lagaan* (Gowariker, 2001) within a broader shift in Hindi cinema—from inclusive, anti-colonial storytelling to more assertive nationalist themes—arguing that Bollywood has long served as a space for both constructing and contesting national identity in response to shifting socio-political dynamics. Ultimately, *Lagaan* (Gowariker, 2001) serves as a powerful example of how Indian cinema can negotiate between tradition and modernity, history and entertainment, nationalism and transnational appeal. By combining postcolonial resistance with Western cinematic conventions, it offers a compelling case study in aesthetic and ideological hybridization, proving that Indian filmmakers can reclaim historical narratives while engaging with global cinematic frameworks. Its enduring legacy lies in its ability to speak simultaneously to Indian nationalist sentiments and international cinematic sensibilities, making it a film that continues to resonate across multiple cultural and historical contexts.

The Lunchbox (2013): Minimalism, Globalization, and Indian Emotionality

Ritesh Batra's *The Lunchbox* (Batra, 2013) also represents a significant departure from mainstream Bollywood, embracing a minimalist, contemplative narrative style that aligns more closely with European arthouse sensibilities than with the melodramatic and spectacle-driven traditions of commercial Indian cinema. The film's restrained storytelling, its reliance on unspoken emotions, and its meticulous attention to everyday details demonstrate a shift in

Indian cinema's engagement with globalized, intimate narratives. Unlike conventional Bollywood romances, which often rely on elaborate song sequences, exaggerated expressions, and grand romantic gestures, *The Lunchbox* (Batra, 2013) builds its emotional depth through subtle glances, handwritten letters, and daily rituals, crafting an intensely personal yet universally resonant cinematic experience (Dwyer, 2014). By prioritizing understated performances and naturalistic dialogue, the film moves beyond Bollywood's theatrical traditions, signaling the rise of independent Indian cinema on the global stage. At the heart of *The Lunchbox* (Batra, 2013) is its use of food as a metaphor for longing, nostalgia, and human connection, an element deeply embedded in Indian cultural and cinematic traditions. The premise of the film—where an accidental mix-up in Mumbai's famously efficient *dabbawala* lunchbox delivery system sparks an unlikely epistolary romance—serves as both a narrative device and a symbolic reflection on urban loneliness and longing (Majumdar, 2021). The preparation, delivery, and consumption of food in the film operate as a means of emotional expression, reflecting unspoken desires, disappointments, and small joys (Ganti, 2004). Ila (played by Nimrat Kaur), a neglected housewife, infuses her cooking with care and affection, attempting to revive her failing marriage, but when her food mistakenly reaches Saajan Fernandes (Irrfan Khan), a lonely widower on the brink of retirement, a silent yet profound bond begins to develop between them. This interplay between domestic rituals and emotional intimacy echoes Indian cultural traditions, where food is not merely sustenance but an expression of love, memory, and relationships. The film's reliance on visual storytelling and sensory engagement resonates with Indian aesthetic philosophy, particularly *Rasa* Theory, wherein *Śṛṅgārarasaḥ* (romantic longing) and करुणरसः (*Karuṇa*-Compassion/Sorrow) dominate the emotional landscape. Despite its deep roots in Indian traditions of emotional storytelling, *The Lunchbox* (Batra, 2013) is also emblematic of Indian cinema's growing engagement with transnational narratives, marking a shift away from the commercially driven, spectacle-heavy model of Bollywood filmmaking (Dudrah, 2012). The film's narrative structure, characterized by slow pacing, lingering silences, and minimal dialogue, bears similarities to European cinematic traditions, particularly the works of French and Italian neorealist directors, as well as the Japanese aesthetics of Yasujiro Ozu, who similarly explored quiet moments of human connection amidst the chaos of everyday life. Batra's direction places emphasis on subtle, interior performances, using muted color palettes, natural lighting, and unobtrusive camerawork to enhance the film's introspective quality. This cinematic approach distances *The Lunchbox* (Batra, 2013) from Bollywood's hyper-expressive style, reinforcing its alignment with global arthouse sensibilities (Gopal & Moorti, 2008).

The film's global reception and success at international film festivals, including its screening at Cannes Critics' Week, further underscore Indian cinema's evolving participation in transnational film discourse. Unlike many Bollywood films that cater to diasporic nostalgia or domestic mass appeal, *The Lunchbox* (Batra, 2013) found an audience among international cinephiles, critics, and festival-goers who appreciated its nuanced storytelling and cross-cultural accessibility (Dwyer, 2014). Its recognition also reflects the growing space for independent Indian filmmakers in global cinema, challenging the notion that Bollywood is the sole representation of Indian filmmaking. By moving away from musical interludes, high

melodrama, and formulaic storytelling, *The Lunchbox* (Batra, 2013) aligns itself with a new wave of Indian cinema that prioritizes subtlety, realism, and universal themes, engaging with the emotional complexities of modern urban existence. Through the quiet exchange of lunchbox notes between Ila and Saajan, the film explores urban loneliness, emotional disconnection, and personal transformation. Its minimal dialogue, ambient sound, and subtle performances reflect a shift toward global arthouse aesthetics and universal storytelling.

The themes of isolation, missed connections, and existential yearning explored in *The Lunchbox* (Batra, 2013) also speak to larger socio-cultural anxieties in contemporary India, particularly regarding urban alienation, shifting gender roles, and the erosion of traditional social structures (Vasudevan, 2000). The film critiques modern life's mechanical routines, showing how Saajan's bureaucratic job, Ila's monotonous domesticity, and even the hyper-efficient *dabbawala* system become metaphors for the disconnect experienced by individuals in a rapidly changing society (Chakravarty, 2011). Unlike conventional Bollywood films, which often romanticize urbanization and modernity, *The Lunchbox* (Batra, 2013) subtly critiques the emotional emptiness that accompanies economic progress, portraying a city where millions live in close proximity yet remain emotionally distant. This thematic engagement with urban loneliness, nostalgia, and unfulfilled longing positions the film within a broader global trend of minimalist, character-driven storytelling that transcends national boundaries. Moreover, *The Lunchbox* (Batra, 2013) challenges traditional gender roles in Indian cinema, particularly through the character of Ila, who, unlike many Bollywood heroines, is not defined by her relationship to a male protagonist but by her own quiet journey of self-discovery. While she initially seeks validation through her husband's affection, the film gradually portrays her growing sense of agency, culminating in her decision to leave Mumbai in search of a new life (Ganti, 2004). This portrayal aligns with a broader shift in Bollywood, where women are increasingly depicted as active agents of change. As Yadav and Jha (2023) argue, recent Bollywood films have begun to reposition women as agents of transformation rather than passive figures, highlighting a significant cultural shift in gender representation. Similar representations of female subjectivity appear in independent films like Alankrita Shrivastava's *Lipstick Under My Burkha* (Shrivastava, 2016) and Chaitanya Tamhane's *Court* (Tamhane, 2014), which explore the subtle ways in which women navigate societal constraints and personal aspirations (Menon, 2024). By integrating elements of *Rasa* Theory, neorealism, and transnational cinematic aesthetics, *The Lunchbox* (Batra, 2013) successfully bridges local storytelling traditions with global cinematic trends, proving that Indian cinema can thrive beyond the Bollywood paradigm. The film's success demonstrates that Indian filmmakers need not rely on spectacle or formulaic narratives to engage international audiences, but can instead find new modes of storytelling that emphasize quiet emotions, everyday interactions, and deeply personal experiences. As Indian cinema continues to evolve, films like *The Lunchbox* (Batra, 2013) pave the way for a more diverse and globally relevant cinematic landscape, proving that the essence of Indian storytelling can flourish in intimate, minimalist narratives just as powerfully as in epic, grand spectacles.

Rustom (2016): Navigating Betrayal, Law, and Nationhood

Rustom (Desai, 2016), directed by Tinu Suresh Desai, tells the story of a naval officer whose life becomes a legal and moral battle after he discovers his wife's disloyalty, betrayal and commits murder. Set in post-independence India, the film delves into themes of loyalty, justice, emotional conflict, and national integrity. The film weaves together multiple *rasas—vīra* (Heroism/Courage), *karuṇa* (compassion/Sorrow), *Raudra* (Anger), *Śṛṅgāra* (Romantic/Love) and *Hāsya rasa* (Humor/Laughter)—creating a layered emotional narrative that aligns with classical Indian aesthetic principles. The dominant *vīra rasa* (Heroism/Courage) is embodied in the protagonist Commander Rustom's dignified resolve, moral courage, and refusal to compromise his integrity, even as he faces a murder trial. His commitment to personal and national duty reflects the archetype of the righteous hero. *Karuṇa rasa* (Romantic/Love) unfolds through Cynthia's remorse and emotional vulnerability, reflecting compassion as the couple navigates betrayal and reconciliation. *Raudra rasa* (Anger) delves into Rustom's measured yet intense anger, particularly in his reaction to Vikram's betrayal and corruption, framed as a righteous and disciplined response rather than uncontrolled rage. On the other hand, *śṛṅgāra rasa* (Romantic/Love) is subtly expressed in the affectionate bond between Rustom and Cynthia, which, though strained, is ultimately reaffirmed through forgiveness and emotional reconnection. Furthermore, the *Bhayānaka rasa* (Fear) is evoked through the film's pervasive atmosphere of tension and unease, reflected in the uncertainty of Rustom's trial, the threat of institutional scandal, and Cynthia's psychological distress. It reaches its peak during the murder scene, where Rustom's quiet intrusion, the abrupt gunshots, and the servant's horrified discovery of Vikram's body create a profound sense of fear, not merely of the violence itself, but of its ethical, emotional, and legal implications. Although the film is primarily a courtroom drama, it integrates *hāsya rasa* (Humor/Laughter) through satirical media portrayals, witty courtroom exchanges, and humorous side characters, using comic relief to critique the performative nature of justice, heroism, and public spectacle.

The protagonist, Commander Rustom Pavri, embodies the postcolonial subject who negotiates loyalty to the nation-state while confronting corruption embedded in institutions shaped by the colonial legacy. His moral stand against bribery and systemic decay aligns with what Partha Chatterjee (1993) describes as the postcolonial tension between national sovereignty and inherited colonial frameworks of governance. The film critiques the comprador elite—figures like Vikram Makhija and Rear Admiral Kamath (film's characters)—who exemplify Homi Bhabha's (1994) concept of mimicry, imitating colonial authority for personal gain while destabilizing national integrity. This mirrors similar dynamics in *Madras Café* (Shoojit, 2013), where internal betrayal and political manipulation reflect neocolonial entanglements. Rustom's resistance, framed as a patriotic and ethical stance, serves as a counter-narrative to such disillusionment, akin to the moral complexity explored in *Raazi* (Gulzar, 2018), where personal sacrifice intersects with national duty. Moreover, the courtroom drama, structured around a jury system modeled on British legal tradition, highlights India's ongoing entanglement with colonial legal structures. This resonates with Upendra Baxi's (1982) critique of legal colonialism and is echoed in *Court* (Tamhane, 2014), which exposes the alienating and archaic nature of Indian judicial systems derived from colonial rule.

Rustom (Desai, 2016) strategically employs Western cinematic conventions, particularly those of courtroom drama, the anti-hero archetype, and noir aesthetics, to frame its narrative of personal betrayal and institutional corruption within a globally recognizable form. The film follows a classical three-act structure—exposition, confrontation, and resolution—rooted in Aristotelian narrative theory (Chatman, 1978), which is a staple in Western cinematic storytelling. Its courtroom scenes, centred around moral debates rather than procedural accuracy, resemble Anglo-American legal dramas such as *12 Angry Men* (Lumet, 1957) and *A Few Good Men* (Reiner, 1992), where truth is revealed through rhetorical confrontation and character-driven revelations. The film also adopts noir stylistics—emotional restraint, flashbacks, suspenseful pacing, and a shadowy visual palette—that evoke classic Western thriller techniques (Bordwell & Thompson, 2010). In doing so, the film demonstrates how Bollywood can appropriate and indigenize Western narrative models to tell distinctly Indian stories.

Within a transnational lens, *Rustom* (Desai, 2016) operates not merely as a crime thriller but as a vehicle for reaffirming idealized notions of nationalism and institutional integrity at a time when India's global identity is increasingly mediated through its cultural exports. The protagonist, Commander Rustom Pavri, is emblematic of the disciplined, incorruptible national subject—his naval uniform, integrity, and self-sacrifice reinforcing the symbolic power of the Indian armed forces within a postcolonial nation-building narrative. The film's historical setting (1959 Bombay) and the inclusion of English dialogues, military protocols, and geopolitical concerns (such as naval procurement) further delves it within a global imaginary that transcends national borders. However, *Rustom* (Desai, 2016) also indulges in nationalist myth-making, ultimately justifying extra-legal action under the guise of patriotism and emotional righteousness. In doing so, it aligns with a broader trend in Indian popular cinema that blends indigenous narrative forms (like melodrama and *Rasa* aesthetics) with global cinematic styles to produce a hybrid narrative form. Regarding accolades, *Rustom* earned significant recognition; at the 64th National Film Awards, Akshay Kumar received the Best Actor award for his portrayal of Commander Rustom Pavri. The film also achieved commercial success, grossing over ₹218 crore worldwide. Additionally, it won a Silver Lotus Award for Best Actor (Akshay Kumar) and a Bollywood Business Award for the 100 Crore Club. It also won a Lions Gold Award for Best Film. These accolades underscore the film's impact both critically and commercially.

Gully Boy (2019): Bollywood's Engagement with Global Youth Cultures

Zoya Akhtar's *Gully Boy* (Akhtar, 2019) exemplifies Bollywood's increasing engagement with globalized youth subcultures, particularly through its integration of hip-hop music, urban narratives, and Hollywood-inspired underdog storytelling. Loosely inspired by the lives of Mumbai-based rappers Divine and Naezy, the film functions as both a coming-of-age story and a social critique, blending Indian cinematic traditions with Hollywood's *rags-to-riches* formula, akin to films such as *8 Mile* (Curtis, 2002). While the film's structure and character arcs align with global cinematic conventions, its dialogue, socio-political commentary, and use of Hindi-Urdu rap firmly root it within Indian cultural realities (Ganti, 2004). This interplay

between local authenticity and transnational aesthetics allows *Gully Boy* (Akhtar, 2019) to transcend the boundaries of conventional Bollywood storytelling, making it a case study in how Indian cinema is evolving to engage with global youth cultures. At its core, *Gully Boy* (Akhtar, 2019) employs *वीरसः* (*Vīra*-Heroism/Courage) and *Raudra* (Fury/Anger) to construct a gritty, socially conscious portrayal of class struggle, youth aspirations, and artistic rebellion. The protagonist, Murad (played by Ranveer Singh), embodies the quintessential underdog, navigating economic hardship, family oppression, and societal constraints, yet finding an outlet for self-expression and defiance through rap music. The film's use of *Raudra* (Fury/Anger), particularly in Murad's confrontations with his abusive father, systemic inequalities, and his own internalized fears, serves as a catalyst for his artistic and personal transformation (Chakravarty, 2011). His ability to channel anger and frustration into creative expression mirrors the origins of hip-hop as a form of resistance, linking Mumbai's underground rap movement with global traditions of musical activism (Dudrah, 2012). At the same time, *वीरसः* (*Vīra*-Heroism/Courage) *manifests* in Murad's journey from a disempowered slum resident to an empowered artist, reinforcing Bollywood's enduring fascination with aspirational narratives of self-actualization and triumph over adversity (Dwyer, 2014). Unlike traditional Bollywood musicals, where song-and-dance sequences serve as diversions from the narrative, *Gully Boy* (Akhtar, 2019) integrates music as a primary storytelling device, using rap as a form of social commentary and self-expression. Tracks like *Apna Time Aayega* and *Mere Gully Mein* ('Our time has come' and 'in my gully/lane) are not merely entertainment interludes but are deeply embedded in the film's thematic concerns of class conflict, ambition, and the search for identity (Menon, 2024). This shift toward diegetic musical storytelling, where songs emerge organically from the characters' realities, signals Bollywood's increasing alignment with global filmmaking trends, particularly in the way it merges narrative and musical elements without disrupting cinematic realism. By placing rap music at the center of Murad's journey, *Gully Boy* (Akhtar, 2019) departs from Bollywood's traditional, often escapist use of music, instead positioning it as an act of defiance, empowerment, and cultural assertion (Gopal & Moorti, 2008). The film also stands out for its social critique and commentary on urban India, providing a more nuanced portrayal of contemporary youth struggles than mainstream Bollywood narratives typically allow. Set in Mumbai's Dharavi slums, *Gully Boy* (Akhtar, 2019) confronts issues of economic disparity, religious discrimination, domestic violence, and patriarchal oppression, all of which shape Murad's experiences and motivations (Vasudevan, 2000). The film critiques the structural inequalities that limit social mobility, portraying a city where opportunity exists but remains stratified along class and caste lines. Unlike earlier Bollywood films that romanticized poverty or framed success through idealistic, meritocratic narratives, *Gully Boy* (Akhtar, 2019) acknowledges that talent alone is insufficient without access, privilege, and systemic change (Ganti, 2004). Murad's journey is not merely about personal ambition but about collective empowerment, reflecting the broader ethos of hip-hop culture as a voice for marginalized communities. Kulkarni (2020) argues that *Gully Boy* (Akhtar, 2019) appropriates Mumbai's rap culture, softening its political edge to suit Bollywood's commercial framework; drawing on Stuart Hall's articulation theory, she shows how elements like the song *Azaadi* (Freedom) are reconfigured into marketable narratives that underscore the tension between cultural resistance and mainstream assimilation.

Another aspect that distinguishes *Gully Boy* (Akhtar, 2019) is its treatment of masculinity and gender dynamics, challenging Bollywood's traditional depictions of male protagonists. While Murad's journey adheres to the hero's arc, he is neither hypermasculine nor aggressive, unlike the archetypal Bollywood hero. His quiet resilience, emotional vulnerability, and non-violent assertion of identity contrast with the dominant representations of male heroism in mainstream Hindi cinema (Dudrah, 2012). His relationship with Safeena (Alia Bhatt) further subverts expectations, as she is bold, outspoken, and fiercely independent, actively shaping her own aspirations rather than merely existing as a romantic subplot. By redefining masculinity in Indian cinema, *Gully Boy* (Akhtar, 2019) contributes to an emerging trend in Bollywood that foregrounds introspective, emotionally complex male protagonists, moving away from hypermasculine, action-driven narratives. Beyond its thematic and narrative elements, *Gully Boy* (Akhtar, 2019) also exemplifies Bollywood's increasing participation in globalized content production. The film's distribution on international streaming platforms such as Amazon Prime, its screening at the Berlin International Film Festival, and its selection as India's official entry for the Academy Awards highlight Bollywood's growing engagement with transnational film networks. Unlike traditional Bollywood exports that primarily catered to diasporic Indian audiences, *Gully Boy* (Akhtar, 2019) resonated with non-Indian viewers, particularly those familiar with global hip-hop culture and youth activism. This cross-cultural appeal demonstrates the evolving nature of Bollywood, which is no longer confined to national or diasporic audiences but is actively shaping and responding to global film discourse. Moreover, *Gully Boy* (Akhtar, 2019) challenges previous assumptions about Bollywood's role in global cinema, proving that Indian films can engage with youth culture, urban struggles, and contemporary socio-political realities while maintaining commercial viability. It aligns with a broader trend in contemporary Bollywood, where filmmakers like Anurag Kashyap, Dibakar Banerjee, and Zoya Akhtar herself are experimenting with grittier, more socially engaged storytelling, moving away from formulaic masala films (Gopal & Moorti, 2008). The film's success further validates the rise of indie-spirited Bollywood productions, proving that commercial success and artistic integrity are not mutually exclusive. Ultimately, *Gully Boy* (Akhtar, 2019) represents a critical moment in Bollywood's engagement with globalized youth cultures, demonstrating how Indian cinema can negotiate between hyper-local authenticity and transnational aesthetics. By incorporating Hollywood's underdog narrative, the stylistic elements of hip-hop culture, and the emotional depth of Indian storytelling, the film carves a unique space in contemporary global cinema. More than just a Bollywood adaptation of hip-hop culture, *Gully Boy* (Akhtar, 2019) is a testament to how Indian cinema can absorb global influences while maintaining its distinct socio-political and emotional depth. It reinforces the idea that Indian films are no longer simply "exotic exports" for Western audiences or nostalgic artifacts for the diaspora but are active participants in global storytelling movements, contributing to international discourses on class, youth identity, and creative rebellion.

All We Imagine as Light (2024): *Rasa*, Resistance, and the Poetics of Feminist Realism

All We Imagine as Light (Kapadia, 2024), directed by Payal Kapadia, is a contemplative and lyrical drama that interweaves the lives of three women—Prabha, Anu, and Parvaty (Characters of the film)—as they navigate urban solitude, displacement, belonging, and emotional

resilience in contemporary Mumbai. Their collective search for "light" operates as a metaphor for hope, intimacy, and the pursuit of emotional survival amid the alienation of modern city life. Echoing the emotional intimacy of *The Lunchbox* (Kapadia, 2013) and drawing from European arthouse sensibilities, Kapadia employs a minimalist narrative style to foreground the subtle emotional rhythms of her characters. The film can be seen as reinforcing a culturally rooted Indian aesthetic through its evocation of emotions, while simultaneously drawing on Western arthouse conventions to craft a globally resonant cinematic form. The film's affective sense can be compellingly understood through the lens of classical *Rasa* theory, as it evokes multiple *rasas*, notably *karuṇa* (Compassion/Sorrow), *śṛṅgāra* (Romance/love), *śānta* (Calmness/tranquility), and *vīra* (Heroism/Courage), *Śānta rasa* (Calmness/tranquility), as inner peace; a contemplative detachment from worldly pursuits, which is emphasized in post-*Bharata* (Author of Natyashastra) aesthetics, particularly by Abhinavagupta, and resonates with the film's minimalism and quiet interiority (Gnoli, 1968; Pollock, 2016), creating a nuanced emotional experience that transcends conventional melodrama. *Karuṇa rasa* (Romance/Love) dominates the film, particularly through Prabha, whose life is marked by emotional abandonment and suspended intimacy and mental attachment with an absent husband. Her experience of sorrow is encapsulated in the rice cooker sent from Germany and the silence of unreturned calls and absences that function as *vibhāvas* (emotive triggers). Her quiet rejection of a doctor's proposal advances further deepens the viewer's empathetic engagement. Similarly, Parvaty's looming eviction and her status as a widowed domestic worker without legal documentation highlight systemic precarity, reinforcing *karuṇa rasa* (Sorrow) through her dignified endurance. Anu's character further deepens this emotional tone, embodying *karuṇa* (sorrow) through her silent struggle for love and belonging within a socially fractured world. *Śṛṅgāra rasa* (Romance/Love) is delicately rendered in Anu's secret affair with Shiaz, marked by the burden of communal tension. In parallel, Prabha's hallucinatory encounter with a drowning man, whom she imagines to be her estranged husband, becomes a moment of emotional sublimation, wherein longing transforms into psychological closure. This inner transformation ushers the film into *śānta rasa* (Calmness/tranquillity), particularly in the coastal sequences where the women, distanced from the chaos of Mumbai, find moments of introspective clarity and peace. Prabha's epiphanic release of the past, combined with Kapadia's evocative use of elemental imagery—wind, sea, and shifting light—and the final scene of the three women quietly sharing a meal by the sea, encapsulates a profound sense of solidarity, reflecting emotional maturity, mutual recognition, and the tranquil detachment that defines the essence of *śānta rasa* (Calmness/tranquility). Although understated, *vīra rasa* (Heroic/ Courage) also permeates the narrative, not through spectacle but through everyday acts of moral courage: Prabha's integrity, Anu's defiance of social taboos, and Parvaty's autonomous decision to return to her village; Kapadia redefines heroism as a domestic ethic rooted in emotional endurance and ethical conviction. Her documentary-informed aesthetic further reinforces this layered emotional architecture; the film's opening montage features anonymous voices reflecting on the struggle for survival in Mumbai.

The film subtly critiques the everyday realities of working-class women in postcolonial urban India. Central to this discourse is its focus on internal migration, with the three protagonists embodying a transregional movement of female labor from rural or semi-urban spaces to the

sprawling metropolis of Mumbai. Their lives unfold not in centers of power but in rented flats, overcrowded chawls, and sterile hospital corridors—spaces that render them visible only through their labour and invisible in every other sense (Desai, 2005). Rejecting the romanticized notion of the "spirit of Mumbai," Kapadia instead centres female interiority, aligning with postcolonial feminist thought that challenges the historical silencing of *Subaltern* women (Spivak, 2023). The film foregrounds suppressed desires, quiet acts of resistance, and emotional vulnerability as central to these women's experiences. Anu's hidden relationship, curtailed aspirations, pressure to marry, and fear of social judgment, alongside Prabha's emotionally void arranged marriage and the symbolic rice cooker sent from abroad, reflect how patriarchal norms and global capitalism co-produce emotional alienation. Parvaty's displacement due to the demolition of her chawl, despite decades of residence, exemplifies the ongoing processes of postcolonial dispossession, where the urban poor are consistently erased to make way for speculative capitalist development, echoing colonial patterns of spatial control and displacement (Roy, 2009). The final image—three women sharing a meal by the sea—critiques the envisioning of alternative kinships grounded in emotional solidarity, care, and shared womanhood.

The film aligns closely with Western arthouse cinematic conventions through its minimalist structure, meditative pacing, and emphasis on mood over plot. Echoing the aesthetics of filmmakers like Chantal Akerman and Michelangelo Antonioni, it favours long takes, ambient sound, and intimate gestures over dialogue-driven exposition, drawing viewers into moments of solitude and fleeting connection (Mulvey, 2006). Kapadia foregrounds the interior lives of her female protagonists through observational realism and resists melodrama in favour of a slow, reflective emotional rhythm. Her visual style—marked by natural light, sparse mise-en-scène, and understated performances—evokes the sensorial realism of slow cinema. The film also features moments of nudity, presented with quiet honesty and without eroticization, underscoring vulnerability as part of emotional authenticity (Williams, 2008). A hallucinatory episode in which Prabha imagines reconciling with her estranged husband serves as both personal epiphany and symbolic release, recalling the metaphysical ruptures of Tarkovsky or Malick (Bird, 2008). Rather than offering overt social critique, Kapadia humanizes marginal lives by centring their desires, doubts, and quiet resistances. In doing so, she reframes resilience as a deeply personal and often unacknowledged form of survival, offering a luminous example of global art cinema articulated through a distinctly South Asian lens.

Furthermore, as a transnational film, *All We Imagine as Light* (Kapadia, 2024) bridges the local and the global, rendering its narrative both culturally specific and universally resonant. Its emotional depth and aesthetic have made it accessible to audiences beyond Indian contexts. As an international co-production involving France, India, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, and Italy, with dialogue in Malayalam, Hindi, and Marathi, the film exemplifies a new model of global Indian cinema. Kapadia's feminist perspective, emotional restraint, and resistance to exoticism mark a significant departure from conventional representations of Indian womanhood. The film has received 47 wins and 92 nominations worldwide, including the prestigious Grand Prix at Cannes, Best International Film from the New York and Los Angeles Film Critics, and nominations at the Golden Globes, BAFTAs, and Asian Film Awards.

Kapadia has been widely celebrated for Best Director and Screenplay, while lead actress Kani Kusruti received multiple accolades for Best Actress and Best Ensemble. Recognition from the National Society of Film Critics, Gotham Awards, and the Directors Guild of America further underscores the film's impact, weaving a moment for Indian arthouse cinema on the global stage.

Conclusion

Indian cinema has continuously evolved as a dynamic force that negotiates the complexities of tradition, modernity, and globalization. The selected case studies—*Pather Panchali* (Ray, 1955), *Mughal-e-Azam* (Asif, 1960), *Lagaan* (Gowariker, 2001), *The Lunchbox* (Batra, 2013), *Rustom* (Desai, 2016), *Gully Boy* (Akhtar, 2019) and *All We Imagine as Light* (Kapadia, 2024)—serve as pivotal examples illustrating Indian filmmakers' development and ability to adapt, innovate, and assert a unique cinematic identity within shifting cultural and socio-political landscapes. *Mughal-e-Azam* (Asif, 1960) epitomizes Indian cinema's deep-rooted connection to classical aesthetics, particularly through its reliance on *Śṛṅgāra Rasa* (romantic love) and *Vīra Rasa* (heroism/courage). The film's opulent mise-en-scène, poetic dialogue, and grand historical narrative reflect an enduring link to the performative traditions of Indian classical drama, positioning it as a timeless work that continues to inform historical filmmaking in India. However, its theatricality and overt spectacle contrast with later realist movements in Indian cinema, highlighting the diversity of aesthetic approaches within the industry. Conversely, *Pather Panchali* (Ray, 1955) represents a radical departure from mainstream Bollywood's melodramatic excesses, embracing a restrained, neorealist aesthetic. While the film is often discussed within the framework of Italian neorealism, its emotional core remains deeply Indian, structured around *Karuṇa Rasa* (compassion/sorrow). By prioritizing naturalistic performances, real locations, and an episodic narrative structure, Satyajit Ray challenged conventional storytelling norms, paving the way for parallel cinema in India. The film's quiet yet powerful portrayal of poverty and resilience speaks to a broader commentary on socio-economic realities, illustrating how realism can function as a form of political critique. *Lagaan* (Gowariker, 2001) bridges historical and postcolonial narratives, utilizing the Hollywood sports drama template while reinterpreting it within an Indian nationalist framework. The film's emphasis on *Vīra Rasa* (heroism/courage) recasts the British colonial game of cricket as a metaphor for indigenous resistance and self-determination. While its cinematic style aligns with Western storytelling conventions, it remains deeply Indian in spirit, underscoring how globalization enables hybrid storytelling models. However, *Lagaan* has also been critiqued for presenting an idealized vision of Indian unity that overlooks caste, class, and gender complexities, raising questions about the limitations of nationalist narratives in mainstream cinema. A shift away from spectacle-driven storytelling is evident in *The Lunchbox* (Batra, 2013), which embraces a minimalist, introspective approach reminiscent of European arthouse cinema. By centring its narrative on human relationships and everyday routines, the film's use of *Śṛṅgāra Rasa* (romantic longing) and *Karuṇa Rasa* (sorrow) creates an intimate and contemplative cinematic experience. The use of food as a metaphor for emotional connection reflects deep-rooted Indian cultural values while demonstrating the increasing influence of transnational aesthetics on independent Indian cinema. The film's international

success suggests a growing acceptance of non-traditional Indian narratives in global arthouse circles, positioning Indian cinema beyond the constraints of Bollywood's dominant format. *Gully Boy* (Akhtar, 2019) represents Bollywood's engagement with global youth cultures, integrating hip-hop as a narrative tool to critique class inequality and social marginalization. The film's interplay between *Raudra Rasa* (anger/fury) and *Vīra Rasa* (heroism) underscores its protagonist's struggles within an urban landscape defined by economic disparity and systemic oppression. While it follows a recognizable Hollywood underdog arc, *Gully Boy* (Akhtar, 2019) remains uniquely Indian in its treatment of aspirations, familial tensions, and localized artistic expression. The film's international reception demonstrates how contemporary Bollywood films are increasingly incorporating global cultural influences without entirely abandoning their Indian identity. Furthermore, the film *Rustom* (2016) weaves together emotional depth, aligning with *Rasa* aesthetics with dominant evocations of *vīra* (heroism), *karuṇa* (compassion), *raudra* (anger), *śṛṅgāra* (romantic love), and *Bhayānaka* (fear)—alongside postcolonial critique, Western cinematic form, and transnational aesthetics to explore justice, identity, and moral complexity. Other hand, *All We Imagine as Light* (Kapadia, 2024) stands as a transformative work that blends classical *Rasa* aesthetics, particularly *śānta* (tranquility), *karuṇa* (compassion), and *śṛṅgāra* (love) with postcolonial critique, and minimalist global cinema to portray women's lives with rare emotional precision. Kapadia's observational realism transcends national boundaries while remaining rooted in Indian cultural specificity. The film marks a quiet yet powerful redefinition of Indian arthouse cinema on the world stage.

While the study provides a comprehensive analysis, a key limitation is its reliance on a limited selection of films and the application of four specific theoretical frameworks—*Rasa* Theory, Western cinematic traditions, postcolonial discourse, and transnational cinema—which may not fully capture the breadth and diversity of regional and genre-specific practices in Indian cinema. Future research could broaden the scope by incorporating alternative frameworks such as reception theory, gender theory, psychoanalytic film theory, or media industry studies, particularly those aligned with cultural studies and postmodern perspectives. Additionally, the research adopts a qualitative textual analysis approach and does not incorporate audience reception data, empirical surveys, or box office analytics, which could have further validated the emotional and cultural impact of these films. Moreover, while transnational cinema has been contexualised, the paper does not extensively address emerging developments such as AI-driven storytelling, algorithmic content curation, or the transformative role of OTT streaming platforms in shaping production and viewership trends. Future research could expand the film sample, adopt mixed methods, and explore how emerging technologies—such as AI-driven filmmaking, virtual production, and blockchain distribution, are reshaping narrative structures and audience engagement in Indian cinema. Comparative studies with industries like Nollywood and Korean cinema could also offer insights into how film cultures navigate identity and globalization. As Indian cinema continues to evolve with technological innovation and global trends, sustained research on its increasingly diverse forms and contents is vital to examine its negotiation of cultural authenticity and its position in the global media landscape.

Declaration of Use of AI and AI-assisted Technologies in the Writing Process

The author used ChatGPT (*https://chat.openai.com/*) for proofreading the manuscript, with minimal use in the Literature Review section. ChatGPT, an AI language model, assisted in identifying typos, grammatical errors, passive voice, redundancy, and unnecessary adverbs. The final output was further refined to maintain the author's original intent and writing style.

References

Abraham, J., Kumar, S., Lahiri, R., & Vats, S. (Producers), & Shoojit, S. (Director). (2013). *Madras Café* [Film]. JA Entertainment; Rising Sun Films.

Abraham, J. K., & Misrahi-Barak, J. (Eds.). (2022). *The Routledge companion to caste and cinema in India*. London: Routledge India. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003343578

Akhtar, Z., Akhtar, F., & Sidhwani, R. (Producers), & Akhtar, Z. (Director). (2019). *Gully Boy* [Film]. Excel Entertainment; Tiger Baby Films.

Anjaria, U. (2021). *Understanding Bollywood: The grammar of Hindi cinema*. New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.1080/19472498.2022.2036404

Arora, P., Arora, V., Bhatia, A., Bhatia, S., Chawla, A., Kapoor, A. N., Kapoor, I., Keni, N., & Mishra, D. (Producers), & Desai, T. S. (Director). (2016). *Rustom* [Film]. Zee Studios; KriArj Entertainment; Cape of Good Films; Plan C Studios.

Asif, K. (Producer & Director). (1960). *Mughal-e-Azam* [Film]. Sterling Investment Corporation.

Barnouw, E., & Krishnaswamy, S. (1980). Indian film. India: Oxford University Press.

Basham, A. L. (1954). *The Wonder that was India; A survey of the history and culture of the Indian Sub-Continent before the coming of the Muslims [by] AL Basham*. USA: Grove Press.

Baxi, U. (1982). *The crisis of the Indian legal system*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.

Benshoff, H. M. (2015). *Film and television analysis: An introduction to methods, theories, and approaches*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203129968

Bharata Muni. (2016). *Natyasastram Ascribed to Bharata Muni: A Treatise on Ancient Indian Dramaturgy and Histrionics* (M. Ghosh, Trans.). India: Chaukhamba Surbharati Prakashan.

Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203820551

Bird, R. (2008). *Andrei Tarkovsky: Elements of cinema* (p. 255). London: Reaktion Books.

Bohra, S., Kashyap, A., & Shukla, A. (Producers), & Kashyap, A. (Director). (2012). *Gangs of Wasseypur* [Film]. Viacom18 Motion Pictures; Tipping Point Films; AKFPL; Phantom Films; Elle Driver; Bohra Bros.

Booth, G. D. (2008). *Behind the curtain: Making music in Mumbai's film studios*. New York: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195327632.001.0001

Bordwell, D.& Thompson, K. (2010). *Film Art: An Introduction (9th ed)*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Breckenridge, C. A. (Ed.). (1995). *Consuming modernity: public culture in a South Asian world*. USA: University of Minnesota Press.

Brown, D., Reiner, R., & Scheinman, A. (Producers), & Reiner, R. (Director). (1992). *A Few Good Men* [Film]. Castle Rock Entertainment.

Bruckheimer, J., & Oman, C. (Producers), & Yakin, B. (Director). (2000). *Remember the Titans* [Film]. Walt Disney Pictures; Jerry Bruckheimer Films; Technical Black Films.

Buchta, D., Schweig, G. M., & Jacobsen, K. A. (2010). Rasa theory. *Brill's Encyclopedia of Hinduism*, *2*, 623–29.

China Daily. (2024, June 28). *Domestic films account for 83.8% of China's 2023 box office revenue*. Retrieved from https://global.chinadaily.com.cn/a/202406/28/WS667eacfca31095c51c50b696.html

Chakravarty, S. S. (2011). *National identity in Indian popular cinema, 1947-1987*. USA: University of Texas Press.

Chatterjee, P. (2012). *The black hole of empire: History of a global practice of power*. USA: Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400842605

Chatterjee, P. (1993). *The nation and its fragments: Colonial and postcolonial histories*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvzgb88s

Chatterji, J., & Washbrook, D. A. (Eds.). (2013). *Routledge handbook of the South Asian diaspora*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203796528

Chatman, S. (1980). *Story and discourse: Narrative structure in fiction and film*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Chitrakalpa (Producer), & Ghatak, R. (Director). (1960). *Meghe Dhaka Tara* [Film]. Chitrakalpa.

Chopra, Y. (Producer), & Chopra, A. (Director). (1995). *Dilwale Dulhania Le Jayenge* [Film]. Yash Raj Films.

Colson, C. (Producer), & Boyle, D. (Director). (2008). *Slumdog Millionaire* [Film]. Celador Films; Film4.

Cooper, D. (2000). *The cinema of Satyajit Ray: between tradition and modernity*. UK: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139173148

Cuneo, D., & Ganser, E. (2022). *The emotional and aesthetic experience of the actor: Diderot's Paradoxe sur le comédien in Sanskrit dramaturgy*. In F. Sferra & V. Vergiani (Eds.), *Verità e bellezza: Essays in honour of Raffaele Torella* (pp. 193–272). Università di Napoli "L'Orientale".

Danayya, D. V. V. (Producer), & Rajamouli, S. S. (Director). (2022). *RRR* [Film]. DVV Entertainment.

Dhanush (Producer), & Ranjith, P. (Director). (2018). *Kaala* [Film]. Wunderbar Films.

Dasgupta, R. K., & Clini, C. (2023). The cultural industries of India: an introduction. *Cultural Trends*, *32*(4), 341–347. https://doi.org/10.1080/09548963.2023.2247368

Davids, E. L. (2023). The evolution of film genres: A comparative analysis of Hollywood and Bollywood. *Art and Society*, *2*(4), 15–27. https://doi.org/10.56397/AS.2023.08.04

Desai, V. (2005). NGOs, gender mainstreaming, and urban poor communities in Mumbai. *Gender & Development, 13*(2), 90–98. https://doi.org/10.1080/13552070512331332290

Dudrah, R. (2012). *Bollywood travels: Culture, diaspora and border crossings in popular Hindi cinema*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203125649

Dudrah, R., & Desai, J. (2008). *The Bollywood Reader*. UK: McGraw-Hill Education.

Dwyer, R. (2014). *Bollywood's India: Hindi cinema as a guide to contemporary India*. London: Reaktion Books.

Dwyer, R., & Patel, D. (2002). *Cinema India: The visual culture of Hindi film*. USA: Rutgers University Press.

Dwyer, R., & Pinto, J. (Eds.). (2011). *Beyond the boundaries of Bollywood: The many forms of Hindi cinema*. London: Oxford University Press.

Ernst & Young (EY). (2025, March). *Shape the future: Indian media and entertainment is scripting a new story*. Retrieved from https://www.ey.com/en_in/insights/media-entertainment/shape-the-future-the-revolution-in-indian-media-and-entertainment-sector

Farooqui, J. (2024, January 22). *India's box-office collections reach an all-time high of Rs 12,226 crore in 2023*. The Economic Times. Retrieved from https://m.economictimes.com/industry/media/entertainment/indias-box-office-collections-reach-an-all-time-high-of-rs-12226-crore-in-2023/articleshow/107035317.cms

Fonda, H., & Rose, R. (Producers), & Lumet, S. (Director). (1957). *12 Angry Men* [Film]. Orion-Nova Productions.

Grazer, B., Hanson, C., & Iovine, J. (Producers), & Hanson, C. (Director). (2002). *8 Mile* [Film]. Universal Pictures; Imagine Entertainment; Mikona Productions GmbH & Co. KG.

Ganti, T. (2004). *Bollywood: A guidebook to popular Hindi cinema*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203643945

Gehlawat, A. (2015). *Twenty-first century Bollywood*. New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315761048

Gnoli, R. (1968). *The aesthetic experience according to Abhinavagupta*. India: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series.

Gokulsing, K. M., & Dissanayake, W. (1998). *Indian popular cinema: A narrative of cultural change.*UK: Trentham Books.

Gomber, V. (Producer), & Tamhane, C. (Director). (2014). *Court* [Film]. zoo entertainment.

Gooptu, N. (2001). *The politics of the urban poor in early twentieth-century India* (Vol. 8). UK: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139252256

Gopal, S., & Moorti, S. (Eds.). (2008). *Global Bollywood: Travels of Hindi song and dance*. USA: University of Minnesota Press.

Gopalan, L. (2019). *Cinema of interruptions: Action genres in contemporary Indian cinema*. India: Bloomsbury Publishing India pvt. Ltd.

Graff, J., & Hakim, T. (Producers), & Kapadia, P. (Director). (2024). *All we imagine as light* [Film]. Petit Chaos; Chalk & Cheese; BALDR Film; Les Films Fauves; Another Birth; Pulpa Films; Arte France Cinéma.

Guha, S. (Producer), & Ray, S. (Director). (1976). *Jana Aranya* [Film]. Indus Films.

Gupt, B. (2006*). Dramatic Concepts Greek & Indian: A Study of the Poetics and the Nāṭyaśāstra*. New Delhi: DK Printworld.

Hansen, K. (1989). The birth of Hindi drama in Banaras, 1868–1885. In S. B. Freitag (Ed.), *Culture and power in Banaras* (pp. 62–92). USA: University of California Press. https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520313392-008

Higbee, W., & Lim, S. H. (2010). Concepts of transnational cinema: towards a critical transnationalism in film studies. *Transnational cinemas*, *1*(1), 7–21 https://doi.org/10.1386/trac.1.1.7/1

Hogan, P. C. (2008). *Understanding Indian movies: Culture, Cognition, and Cinematic Imagination*. USA: University of Texas Press.

Ingawanij, M. A. (2012). Mother India in six voices: Melodrama, voice performance, and Indian films in Siam. *BioScope: South Asian Screen Studies*, *3*(2), 99–121. https://doi.org/10.1177/097492761200300202

Jain, A., & Monga, G. (Producers), & Gonsalves, K. (Director). (2022). *The Elephant Whisperers* [Short documentary film]. Sikhya Entertainment.

Jain, V., Johar, H. Y., Johar, K., & Mehta, A. (Producers), & Gulzar, M. (Director). (2018). *Raazi* [Film]. Junglee Pictures; Dharma Productions.

JB Angels, & Jha, P. (Producers), & Shrivastava, A. (Director). (2016). *Lipstick Under My Burkha* [Film]. Prakash Jha Productions.

Jones, M. (2010). Bollywood, Rasa and Indian cinema: Misconceptions, meanings and millionaire. *Visual Anthropology*, *23*(1), 33–43. https://doi.org/10.1080/08949460903368895

Kapoor, R. (Producer & Director). (1978). *Satyam, Shivam, Sundaram* [Film]. R.K. Studio

Cinema; Medienboard Berlin Brandenburg; Aide Aux Cinemas Du Monde; CNC; Le ministère de l'Europe et des Affaires étrangères, Institut Français.

Karmakar, G., & Catterall, P. (2025). Nation, Nationalism and Indian Hindi cinema. *National Identities*, 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1080/14608944.2024.2440753

Kashyap, A., Monga, G., & Rangachari, A. (Producers), & Batra, R. (Director). (2013). *The Lunchbox* [Film]. DAR Motion Pictures; NFDC; Essel Vision Productions; Sikhya Entertainment; AKFPL; The Match Factory; Rohfilm; ASAP Films; Arte France Kītā, V., & Rājaturai, E. V. (1998). *Towards a non-Brahmin millennium: from Iyothee Thass to Periyar.* USA: The University of Michigan.

Khan, A. (Producer), & Gowariker, A. (Director). (2001). *Lagaan* [Film]. Aamir Khan Productions.

Kudva, S. S. (2019). *It's Not All About Song and Dance: How the Natyashastra Informs Contemporary Bollywood*. USA: Kent State University.

Kulkarni, D. R. (2020). Appropriation and Articulation: Mapping Movements in Gully Boy. *Cinergie–Il Cinema e le altre Arti*, (17), 87–96. https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.2280-9481/10508

Lal, V., & Nandy, A. (Eds.). (2006). *Fingerprinting popular culture: the mythic and the iconic in Indian cinema*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Landy, M. (2010). The Apu Trilogy: Pather Panchali, Aparajito, and Apur Sansar. *Quarterly Review of Film and Video*, *27*(5), 408–410. https://doi.org/10.1080/10509208.2010.494998

Langah, N. T., & Sengupta, R. (Eds.). (2021). *Film, Media and Representation in Postcolonial South Asia: Beyond Partition*. London & New York: Taylor & Francis.

Lutgendorf, P. (2006). Is there an Indian way of filmmaking? *International Journal of Hindu Studies*, *10*(3), 227–256. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11407-007-9031-y

Majumdar, N. (2021). *The world in a grain of sand: Postcolonial literature and radical universalism*. London: Verso Books.

Mason, D. (2006). Rasa, 'Rasaesthetics' and Dramatic Theory as Performance Packaging. *Theatre Research International*, *31*(1), 69–83. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0307883305001860

Massey, R. (1992). From Bharata to the cinema: a study in unity and continuity. *ARIEL: A Review of International English Literature*, *23*(1). 59-71

Mehboob, K. (Producer & Director). (1957). *Mother India* [Film]. Mehboob Productions.

Mehta, R. B., & Pandharipande, R. V. (Eds.). (2010). *Bollywood and globalization: Indian popular cinema, nation, and diaspora*. London: Anthem Press. https://doi.org/10.7135/UPO9781843318897

Menon, D. (2024). Beyond binge-watching: How the OTT video streaming platforms have transformed Indian television culture. *Quarterly Review of Film and Video*, 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/10509208.2024.2442863

Mikos, L. (2014). Analysis of film. In *The SAGE handbook of qualitative data analysis* (pp. 409-423). Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446282243.n28

Mishra, V. (2013). *Bollywood cinema: Temples of desire*. New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203951392

Morcom, A. (2017). *Hindi film songs and the cinema*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315092980

Mullik, G. (2020). Bharata's theory of aesthetic pleasure or Rasa: Classical Indian theories of "aesthetics" and their relation to cinema. In G. Mullik (Ed.), *Explorations in cinema through classical Indian theories* (pp. 197–277). UK: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-45611-5

Mulvey, L. (2006). *Death 24x a second: Stillness and the moving image*. London: Reaktion Books.

Murthy, C. S. H. N. (2020, March). Negotiating Semiotics of Mise en Scene is the Real Challenge of Indian Cinema: A De-Westernizing Approach to Visual Culture. In *De-Westernizing Visual Communication and Cultures* (pp. 99–124). Germany: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft mbH & Co. KG. https://doi.org/10.5771/9783748906933

Navalakha Arts, & Holy Basil Productions (Producers), & Manjule, N. (Director). (2013). *Fandry* [Film]. Zee Entertainment; Reliance Media Works.

Pendakur, M. (2003). *Indian popular cinema: Industry, ideology, and consciousness*. New York: Hampton Press.

Phalke, D. G. (Producer & Director). (1913). *Raja Harishchandra* [Film]. Phalke Films Company.

Prasad, M. M. (1998). *Ideology of the Hindi film: A historical construction*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Raghavendra, M. K. (2020). *Philosophical Issues in Indian Cinema: Approximate Terms and Concepts*. London: Routledge India. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429344411

Rajadhyaksha, A., & Willemen, P. (2014). *Encyclopedia of Indian cinema*. New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315062549

Rangacharya, A. 2005. *Introduction to Natyashastra.* Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd.

Rathod, K. (Director). (1921). *Bhakta Vidur* [Film]. Kohinoor Film Company.

Ray, B. (Producer & Director). (1953). *Do Bigha Zamin* [Film]. Bimal Roy Productions.

Ray, S. (Director). (1955). *Pather Panchali* [Film]. Government of West Bengal.

Roy, A. (2009). Why India cannot plan its cities: Informality, insurgence and the idiom of urbanization. *Planning Theory, 8*(1), 76–87. https://doi.org/10.1177/1473095208099299

Roy, P. (2017). *Aesthetics of emotional acting: an argument for a Rasa-based criticism of Indian cinema and television* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Edinburgh).

Sengupta, R. (2024). Interrogating "marginality" in Bombay cinema: An exhaustive historiography. *Quarterly Review of Film and Video*, *41*(8), 1475-1500. https://doi.org/10.1080/10509208.2023.2218146

Screwvala, R. (Producer), & Gowariker, A. (Director). (2008). *Jodhaa Akbar* [Film]. Ashutosh Gowariker Productions Private Limited.

Shohat, E., & Stam, R. (2014). *Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the media*. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315771441

Sippy, G. P. (Producer), & Sippy, R. (Director). (1975). *Sholay* [Film]. United Producers; Sippy Films.

Somashekar, I., & Pinto, M. S. (2024). Beyond Bollywood and Hindi: Making a case for other language films in India. *Media Asia, 51*(1), 153–159. https://doi.org/10.1080/01296612.2023.2243415

Spivak, G. C. (2023a). Can the subaltern speak? In H. C. Peter & H. Mark (Eds.), *Imperialism* (pp. 171–219). London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003101536-9

Statista. (n.d.). *Film production worldwide - statistics & facts*. Statista. Retrieved from https://www.statista.com/topics/5431/film-production-worldwide/

Statista. (2025, January). *Number of new movies shown in the cinemas in China from 2019 to 2024*. https://www.statista.com/statistics/642414/china-number-movie-shown/

Thomas, R. (1995). Melodrama and the negotiation of morality in mainstream Hindi film. In C. Breckenridge (Ed.), *Consuming modernity: Public culture in a South Asian world* (pp. 157–182). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Thomas, R. (2015). *Bombay before Bollywood: Film city fantasies*. USA: State University of New York Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781438456775

Vasudevan, R. (2000). Making meaning in Indian cinema. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Vijayan, T., & Akshayaa, R. B. (2025). Cinematic Tapestry: The Evolution and Global Influence of Indian Cinema With a Spotlight on South Indian Films. In *Global Development of Asian Cinema in the Film Industry* (pp. 189–212). USA: IGI Global Scientific Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-6940-1.ch010

Virdi, J. (2003). *The Cinematic ImagiNation: Indian Popular Films as Social History*. USA: Rutgers University Press.

Walia, R. (2013). Techno-Nostalgia: Colorization of K. Asif's Mughal-e-Azam. *BioScope: South Asian Screen Studies*, *4*(2), 137-158. https://doi.org/10.1177/0974927613503233

Williams, L. (2008). *Screening sex* (p. 34). USA: Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv11cw2ct

Winkler, I., & Chartoff, R. (Producers), & Avildsen, J. G. (Director). (1976). *Rocky* [Film]. Chartoff-Winkler Productions.

Yadav, S., & Jha, S. (2023). Bollywood as a site of resistance: Women and agency in Indian popular culture. *Journal of International Women's Studies*, *25*(3), 1–13.

Corresponding Author: Santanu Sarkar
Email: santanus383@gmail.com