

Reading Nationalism in Hindi Cinema: A Study of *Lagaan* and *Gadar: Ek Prem Katha*

*A Dissertation Submitted
In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree
of*

MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY



Submitted by:

Jasvir Kumar
M.Phil. English
Roll. No. 190906

Supervisor:

Dr. Manoj Kumar
Assistant Professor
Dept. of English &
Foreign Languages

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH & FOREIGN LANGUAGES

CENTRAL UNIVERSITY OF HARYANA

MAHENDERGARH – 123029

September - 2021

DECLARATION

I, Jasvir Kumar, hereby declare that the material embodied in the present work, entitled “**Reading Nationalism in Hindi Cinema: A Study of *Lagaan* and *Gadar: Ek Prem Katha***”, is based on my original research. It has not been submitted, in part or full, for any other diploma or degree of any University/Institution Deemed to be University and College/Institution of national importance. References from other works have been duly cited at the relevant places.

(Signature of Candidate)

Jasvir Kumar

Roll No 190906

Department of English and Foreign Languages

Central University of Haryana

Date:

Place: Mahendragarh



Central University of Haryana

Mahendergarh

(Established vide Act No. 25 (2009) of Parliament)

Villages – Jant-Pali, Post – Pali, Distt. – Mahendergarh – 123031 (Haryana)

Website: www.cuh.ac.in

CERTIFICATE

It is hereby certified that Mr. Jasvir Kumar (Roll No 190906) has worked under my supervision for his M.Phil. Thesis entitled “**Reading Nationalism in Hindi Cinema: A Study of *Lagaan* and *Gadar: Ek Prem Katha***” for the Degree of Master of Philosophy. To the best of my knowledge, it is the result of bona fide research work carried out by the researcher. This thesis has not been submitted so far in part or in full for the award of any Degree/ Diploma of this university or any other institution. I deem the present research work fit for being evaluated for the award of degree of Master of Philosophy in English.

Place: Mahendragarh

Date:

(Dr. Manoj Kumar)

Assistant Professor

Department of English and Foreign Languages

Central University of Haryana

Mahendergarh

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to take this opportunity to thank to my supervisor **Dr Manoj Kumar** for his exemplary guidance, valuable feedback, and constant encouragement throughout the duration of the dissertation. His valuable suggestions were of immense help throughout my research. His perceptive criticism kept me working to make this dissertation in a much better way. Working under him was an extremely knowledgeable experience for me.

I am highly grateful to the Head of the Department Dr. Sanjiv Kumar and other faculty members Dr. Rinu, Dr. Sudeep Kumar, and Dr. Snehsata, who had provided me invaluable suggestions during my study.

I would like to thanks to my seniors Siddharth Pratap, Vivek, Niharika Sharma and Radhika for their cooperation, encouragement, and multifaceted discussions. I would also like to offer my special thanks to my dear classmates Tariq Mehmood, Mohd Rafi, Rajat Kumar Maurya, Anuradha Panday, Anaswara Divakaran, Shuchi, Seema and especially Puneet Kaur.

I would also like to thank Librarian and other staff members of the library of the Central University of Haryana for their sincere co-operation in providing the books and other kind of material required for this research.

I would also like to offer my special thanks to Dr. Dinesh Kumar Dadhichi for his valuable advice. I wish to acknowledge the help provided by Deepak Bidhan and Devashish Paul. I would also like to send my gratitude to Priyanka Bharti and Suraj Singh who supported and encouraged me throughout this time. Finally, I would like to thanks my family.

(Jasvir Kumar)

CONTENTS

Declaration		ii
Certificate		iii
Acknowledgement		iv
Contents		v
Plagiarism Report		
	Page No.	
	Introduction	1-21
Chapter – I	Hindi Cinema and Nationalism	22-31
Chapter - II	A Study of <i>Gadar: Ek Prem Katha</i>	32-59
Chapter - III	A Study of <i>Lagaan: Once upon Time in India</i>	60-75
	Conclusion	75-76
	Selected Bibliography	77-82

Reading Nationalism in Hindi
Cinema-A Study of Lagaan and
Gadar Ek Prem Katha (Jasvir
Kumar, M.Phil English, Roll No.
190906, CUH)

by Jasvir Kumar

Submission date: 28-Sep-2021 02:45PM (UTC+0530)

Submission ID: 1659629467

File name: m_Katha_Jasvir_Kumar,_M.Phil_English,_Roll_No._190906,_CUH.docx (642.17K)

Word count: 21089

Character count: 110439

Reading Nationalism in Hindi Cinema-A Study of Lagaan and Gadar Ek Prem Katha (Jasvir Kumar, M.Phil English, Roll No. 190906, CUH)

ORIGINALITY REPORT

5%

SIMILARITY INDEX

5%

INTERNET SOURCES

2%

PUBLICATIONS

2%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	Submitted to SUNY, Binghamton Student Paper	1%
2	journals.sagepub.com Internet Source	1%
3	shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in Internet Source	1%
4	uknowledge.uky.edu Internet Source	1%
5	www.tandfonline.com Internet Source	<1%
6	jan.ucc.nau.edu Internet Source	<1%
7	www.dnaindia.com Internet Source	<1%
8	www.thamizhagam.net Internet Source	<1%

Submitted to O. P. Jindal Global University

9	Student Paper	<1 %
10	www.rediff.com Internet Source	<1 %
11	Submitted to CSU, San Francisco State University Student Paper	<1 %
12	www.lrgs.org.uk Internet Source	<1 %
13	Submitted to Istanbul Medipol Üniversitesi Student Paper	<1 %
14	Submitted to Coastline Community College Student Paper	<1 %
15	docplayer.net Internet Source	<1 %
16	Submitted to Esher College Student Paper	<1 %
17	en.wikipedia.org Internet Source	<1 %
18	Submitted to London School of Economics and Political Science Student Paper	<1 %
19	ir.amu.ac.in Internet Source	<1 %

20

dictionary.infoplease.com

Internet Source

<1 %

21

Submitted to Queen Mary and Westfield
College

Student Paper

<1 %

22

www.sarai.net

Internet Source

<1 %

Exclude quotes On

Exclude matches < 14 words

Exclude bibliography On

INTRODUCTION

The word 'Nation' has been derived from the Latin word 'nasci', nat, and natio [old French]. In the middle English 'nation' means "place of birth: town, tribe" ("Nation | Online Etymology Dictionary") Johann Gotterified Hereder in his book *Treatise on the Origin of Language* (1772) described nation as a group of people having common language and culture, not a common enemy. He also discussed the idea of inclusivity. He was both nationalist and pluralist. He did not see any contradiction between one's own culture and other cultures, he says "just as the creator of all things knows no classes, each only represents itself" (Zocalo). Herder in *Ideas About the Philosophy of the History of Mankind*, underscore the inclusive nature of nationalism (Zocalo).

Nationalism has attained new meanings and definitions since it came into existence. It has been reviewed by political scientists, historians, and sociologists from time to time. However, nationalism remains the strongest and the most flexible political sentiment and can be expressed around cultural, political, linguistic, and religious identities.

According to *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*, the Nationalism is "the desire by a group of people who share the same ethnic group, culture, language, etc. to form an independent country" ("Nationalism") or "a feeling of loving your country very much and being very proud of it; a feeling that your country is better than any other." ("Nationalism") Generally, nationalism refers to the love and passion for the country and love for everything related to the country, which includes national flag, songs, legends, memorial, history etc.

A nation can be defined as a group of people with a common language, history, culture, and causally geographical territory but this is an inadequate definition of nation because there are lots of exception to this definition. For example, in India we do not share a common language rather we have many languages. India is a multicultural and multilingual society like Canada. So, broadly nation can be defined as a group of people who have something in common populace and have some commonality. On the other hand, a state is an association of people formed by a formal institution of government including laws, permanent territorial boundaries, and sovereignty (politically independent). To understand the difference between these two different concepts of nation one need to understand the difference between these two terms: nation and nation-state.

Nationalism is a political belief, which attributes that nation should be self-governing. Nationalism advocates the rights of people, who are considered to be a nationalist to establish their own independent state. The goal of nationalism is to build Nation-State and Independence. To produce nationalism, one need to have a nation and nationalism produces a nation-state. Therefore, a nation is basically a group of people united on the basis of something common between them. For instances, Kurds are living in Turkey, Iran, and Israel; they make a nation what they want their own nation-state. Basque in Spain is a separatist group, who want their own country or nation-state. Nation-states are backed up by military and political control. However, kings do not make nation, but it is the people, who make nation or nation-state. A nation is not a natural phenomenon, it comes into existence because of the perpetual cultural practices.

The state has permanent elements, but a nation has not permanent elements as it may change over a period. For example, the definite territory is essential for a state but

not for a nation. Sovereignty is essential for state but not for a nation. The idea of oneness (unity) is essential for a nation, but not for a state. Smith says in this regard that “a Nation is a stable community of people formed on the basis of a common language, territory, history, ethnicity, or psychological make-up, manifested in a common culture.” (17). A nation is more overtly political than an ethnic group. A nation has also been defined as a cultural-political community that has become conscious of its autonomy, unity, and particular interests.

The concept of nationalism is not easy to define. Many scholars tried their hands to define the term ‘nationalism’ and these definitions overlap with each other. There is no single definition of nationalism which can be generalized, and these definitions are constantly evolving. To understand the term ‘nationalism’ in a better way, we should focus on the definitions given by Smith (1986, 2010), Anderson (2006), Gellner (1965), and (Kohn 2020). Anthony D. Smith states, “by the term nationalism, I understand an ideological movement for the attainment and maintenances of autonomy, unity, and identity on behalf of a population deemed by some of its members to constitute an actual or potential ‘Nation’ like others” (*Culture, Community and Territory* 447). He believes that “the three main goals of nationalism are: autonomy, national unity, and national identity” (*Nationalism* 7). A. D. Smith further states, “by the term nation, I understand a named human population occupying a historical territory or memories; a mass, public culture; a single economy; and common rights and duties for all members” (3). He says that nationalism is essential “fuses three ideals: collective self-determination of the people, the expression of national character, and individuality and finally vertical division of the world into unique nations” (171). Anderson defines nations as merely “imagined communities”, and the members of

these communities do not know each other personally. The concept of nationalism is driven upon them by their own imagined population to which they belong to (211).

Hans Kohn claims nationalism as “first and foremost a state of mind” (10). He further clarifies that “this sentiment grows out from some of the oldest and most primitive feelings of man, namely love for his birthplace, a preference for his own language, customs and food and a deep attachment to his own religion and race” (*Nationalism* 16). Kohn states that none of these factors is essential to the existence or definition of nationalism. “Nationalism is a state of mind in which the supreme loyalty of the individual is felt to be due to the nation-state” (*Nationalism* 29). Karl Marx described nationalism, which is no more than a fervour of bourgeois, and depicted the government or executives of the nation-state. He states, “the executive of the modern state is nothing but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie” (15). He also opposed that the slogans like liberty, equality, and fraternity which were voiced during the French revolution, were no more than masks intended to mislead the masses.

Gellner says that nationalism is nothing more than the process of imagining nations. A similar definition was also given by Kohn. Smith and Kohn describe nationalism in connection with nation-state while Anderson and Gellner with imagining communities. Therefore, it can be said that the concept of nationalism is defined by these theoreticians differently.

According to Roy Armes, western-educated elites were the driving force behind nationalist movements in most colonial nations. He delineates group as “humiliated and frustrated in its everyday contact with the colonial power came to form an opposition

that was a kind of shadow image of the colonial state” (16). Armes argues that these groups, including the *Ilustrados* of the Philippines, the *Bhadralog* of Calcutta, India, or the *Assimiles* of West Africa, who inherited the power when the colonizers departed, were also the inheritors of colonial/western political ideologies of democracy and freedom of the individual. He says:

The style of nationalism adopted by the elite was conceived before independence as opposition to colonialism, and it took Western political forms. It was in fact a search for political independence within a framework of foreign economic and ideological dominance...The nationalists did not seek to revive a traditional form of society or to mobilize mass support for the independence movement in terms of ethnic identity—denigrated as —tribalism by the colonizers. Instead, their ambition was to create a modern state, using concepts of democracy, elections, and political parties borrowed from the West (16).

On the other side, some scholars supported the traditional form of nationalism. These definitions support the European model of nationalism, which led to disaster in the 20th century. This concept of nationalism caused two world wars, which took lives of millions of people, and millions were wounded. One of the American scholars, Jhon H. Koutsky describes nationalism as “an ideology and a movement striving to unite all people who speak a single language. And who shares the various cultural characteristics transmitted by that language, in a single independent state and loyalty to a single government conducted in people’s language” (32). This definition of nationalism is narrow. Various definitions of ‘nation’ lead to different types of nationalism, for instance, **Ethnic nationalism**, **Religious nationalism**, **Civic nationalism**, **Cultural nationalism**, **Revolutionary nationalism**, **Expansionist**

nationalism, Language nationalism, Left-wing nationalism, Liberal nationalism, National conservatism, Schools of anarchism which acknowledge nationalism, Pan-nationalism, Diaspora nationalism. Anti-nationalism, and internationalism.

From this description of nationalism, we can draw two models of nationalism and one of them is the European model of nationalism. On the contrary, we have the Indian model of nationalism, or we can call it third world nationalism or modern nationalism. The nationalism of India and South Africa lie in this category. Basically, we have two types of nationalism one is exclusive, and the other is inclusive. The European model of nationalism is very exclusive in nature, it supports nation on the basis of one single identity that involves one language, one religion, one race. It means that it excludes people or group of people based on identity. They exclude those groups which are not similar to them like who speak a different language, and who have a different religion or race etc. This type of nationalism supports the idea of imperialism. Conclusively, they have violence in the centre. However, some nations are totally against the traditional form of nationalism or the European model of nationalism. These types of nationalism flourish in anti-colonial movement. These models of nationalism are very inclusive in nature. Peoples in Africa and Asia were fighting against the colonial power of Europe.

The idea of nationalism was invented in Europe in the 18th century. In Europe, nationalism was based on uniting the citizen of a particular territory, and making them to speak the same language, as well as subscribing them to the same religion along with defining the common enemy. In Britain standard English was imposed, and thus, Gaelic and Wells language were extinguished. When Protestants were privileged in Britain, Catholics were made second class, and Jews and Muslims were made 3rd class citizens

of the country. British compelled people to consider France as a common enemy. In this type of nationalism, one is only truly British if he/she can speak English, and he/she is protestant if they hate the French. In France, similar model of nationalism was followed with subtle difference. Like English, French was imposed in France. Catholics executed protestant. French compelled people to consider England as a common enemy. one is only truly French if he/she can speak French, and he/she is Catholics if they hate the England (Guha).

After partition, two nations are formed on the basis of two-nation theory. Pakistan gave importance to religion while India chose to remain a secular country, which means India as a state would not have single state religion, thus India gave equal importance to all religions and languages. Pakistan followed the European model of nationalism. In east Pakistan, Urdu was imposed, therefore, Bangladesh emerged as a new nation. British historian Elie Kedourie stated, "Nationalism is also sometimes described as a new tribalism" (Habib). This refers to the inherent xenophobia of nationalism where a nation excludes outsiders and prejudiced against them. They hate the stranger or the outsider and unwilling to admit him/her into the group. Such versions of nationalism have often been associated with fascist ideologies and regimes that empower themselves by inciting hatred in one religious, racial, or linguistic group against others. Thus, the European model of nationalism is the combination of religious, language, expansionist, ethnic cultural nationalism.

In Europe, everyone was sick of xenophobic and blind to aggressive nationalism and the consequence of this nationalism is seen in the first world war. The same sentiment was spreading in India in the anti-colonist movement against Britishers. In third world countries, mainly Asia and Africa, nationalism was the product of different

situations. Kunjo Singh said that “nationalism was adopted as a weapon for winning freedom from European imperialism and the colonial regime in India and other Asian and African countries” (32).

In India, we have different religions, languages, races, and castes. Indian nationalism is quite opposite to European nationalism. It did not impose any language on citizens. Though, a few national leaders favoured Hindi as a national language. For Indian nationalism, there is no need to speak Hindi, no need to adhere Hinduism or to have a common enemy as Pakistan. Indian nationalism appropriates to the same Indian value encoded in the Indian constitution, democracy, and equality. We support the pluralism of language and religion. Indian nationalism is inclusive, which includes all religions, languages, genders, castes, states, and geography. Diversity is celebrated in India and one can love multiple identities at the same time. One can love his/her family, home, street, village, city, state, nationality at all levels equally. So, we can say America has more patriotism because every state has its own flag (Guha). Indian nationalism is the combination of anti-colonial, revolutionary, and liberal nationalism. It is also known as third world’s nationalism. K.R. Minogue points out that “the concept of nationalism was alien to India before the nineteenth century. Just as it was alien to all other Asian and African countries” (Ch 4).

Many writers had written on the theme of Indian nationalism. They were writing since the first Indian freedom movement of 1857. There are two streams of nationalism in India. On the one side we have Tagore, Gandhi, Nehru, Ambedkar, and Bhagat Singh and on the other side, we have Savarkar, Golwalkar, Shama Parsad Mukhrji, Madan Mohan Malviya and Muhammad Ali Jinnah. Rabindranath Tagore was a pioneer and prominent among them. Tagore defined nationalism before world

war first. He criticized it for its narrowness and violence. Tagore did not like the idea of nationalism rather he believed in internationalism. He says that humanity cannot be divided based on nations or borders. Furthermore, he advocated equal rights and dignity which need to be provided to everyone regardless of the fact whether he/she is an Indian, American, or Arabian. He not only gave importance to political freedom but also to spiritual freedom. His work “Where the mind is without fear” ignited the passion and united people to dedicate them to the national freedom struggle. He also opposed the partition of Bengal and the idea of division of his beloved state. He advocated Savadesi, composed songs, addressed meetings, and led protest marches. He also composed the national anthem of India and Bangladesh. These two national anthems are very inclusive in nature, where one can see Tagore’s idea of internationalism based on humanity.

Tagore travelled across the world and visited many European countries and analysed European nationalism warily. He gave many lectures while travelling Japan and America. Subsequently, he gave the idea of humanism and internationalism or cosmopolitanism rather than nationalism. In his writing, he was against the policy of imperialism, but he did not hate Britishers. He wanted that native should rule their land instead of a foreigner. But he did not support the narrow sectarian nationalism. The concept of nationalism is narrowed down as it has a history of violence, plunder, and domination of powerful group on weaker. Tagore says about Nation:

A nation, in the sense of the political and economic union of a people, is that aspect which a whole population assumes when organized for a mechanical purpose. It is an end in itself. It is a spontaneous self-expression of men as

social being. It is a natural regulation of human relationship. So that men can develop ideas of life in co-operation with one another (55).

Tagore favours the natural regulation of human relationship that is cooperative, helpful in sustaining humanity, and wellness of common being. He dislikes the idea of nation made by the people to gain more power and wealth to dominate others. He does not support the nation for political purpose. He favours the nation only on humanitarian basis. Thus, it can be said that a nation is an 'imagined community' joined together by the shared beliefs, aspirations, and imaginations of its members. It is based on people's assumptions, which are used to identify them. These common assumptions are shared beliefs, territory history, and shared political ideas. We have seen how religions have turned into nationalist ideologies, forming majoritarian hegemonies, discriminating against those acknowledging minority religions, and restricting their legitimate rights as inhabitants of the state. The conversion of religion into nationalist ideology is even more suitable in the nationals which can utilize the powerful and stubborn loyalties that held in faith for centuries.

Supposedly, in a country as diverse as India, the leaders of the anti-colonial choose to avoid cultural and religious attitudes, rather they attribute culture as part of humanity in their several writings. As Jawaharlal Nehru, the first prime minister of independent India, focused on developmentalism and economic nationalism that affected the lives of the people across diverse identities. Nehru frequently said that nationalism, as it expressed in our culture and religion, is quite narrow to solve the big problems that our country was facing. Nehru was also aware of religious nationalism. That is why he made a distance with religious symbols and customs. In the 1952 election, he used to ask people which type of India do you want? Like religion-based

Pakistan or secular India, where people from all background and all religion can live peacefully together with dignity. Nehru clearly said that there is problem with India; India is by default a Hindu nation. We must do relentless efforts to make it secular. This idea of Nehru was inclusive in nature. Such idea exerts provision of reservation to ensure equality and proper representation in government. Fundamental rights are also included in the constitution to ascertain equality in diversity. Nehru said about nationalism:

Nationalism, of course, is a curious phenomenon which at a certain stage in a country's history gives life, growth, strength, and unity but, at the same time, it has a tendency to limit one, because one thinks of one's country as something different from the rest of the world. The perspective change and one is continuously thinking of one's own struggle and virtues and failing to the exclusion of other thoughts. The result is that the same nationalism, which is the symbol of growth for a people, becomes a symbol of the cessation of that growth in the mind. Nationalism, when it becomes successful, sometimes goes on spreading aggressively and becomes a danger internationally (Habib 180).

Nehru says that there must be balance otherwise good can turn into evil. Thus, the people, who are united on some commonality, make a nation. Their nationalism demands the nation-state, and the creation of nation-state strengthens nationalism. Nationalism has lots of threats which we have seen in the two world wars. In India, Tagore, Nehru, Ambedkar, and Gandhi were churning over the hazardous nature of nationalism. Religion is the biggest threat to nationalism in India. During Indian freedom movement, Hindu and Muslim nationalisms emerged. Therefore, Tagore was criticizing the nationalism in the world, and Gandhi, Nehru, and Ambedkar were

questioning religious nationalism. Ambedkar in *Annihilation of Caste* (1936) rejected nationalism saying that Indian society was divided into castes systems. Such division brings inequality, injustice, discrimination, and untouchability.

Nowadays democracy, tolerance, understanding, self-criticism is being replaced in India with a new model of nationalism associated with Hindutva. This nationalism follows the European model of Nationalism which describes Hindu superior to all religion and Pakistan a common enemy. This Hindutva nationalism model has anti-democratic problems branding all anti-national. Hence, the nationalism of Tagore, Gandhi, Nehru, and Ambedkar spreads love and understanding. India has ample resources; it needs not to attack other countries. Indian nationalism does not support the idea of Imperialism. If the unity based on language, race, and community is adequate to create a nation, then the logic of Hindu nation might be right. Hindu and Muslim may form one nation because of language, community, race, and territory but this is not true with this case. No language, race, and community are adequate to mould people into one nation. Similar argument is put forward by Renan. In his essay on 'Nationality', he says that there is nothing as a pure race. Earlier, racial facts played significant role but now it is obsolete. Speaking about language, Renan argues, "Language invites people to unite, but it does not force them to do so. The United States and England, Latin America and Spain speak the same languages and yet do not form single nations" (Bhabha 16). He demonstrates that race, language, and country do not suffice to create a nation. Renan raises a very significant question, e.g., what is necessary to constitute a nation? He gives answers to this question as:

A nation is a living soul, a spiritual principle... One is in the past, the other in the present. One is the common possession of a rich heritage of memories; the

other is the actual consent, the desire to live together, ... The nation, like the individual, is the outcome of a long past of efforts, and sacrifices, and devotion. ... To have a common glory in the past, a common will in the present; to have done great things together. such are the essential conditions for the making of people. ... all these can be understood despite diversities of race and language. suffering in common is the greatest bond of union than joy (Bhabha 10).

There are multiple groups in India which comprises Hindu, Muslim, SC, ST, OBC, and women. How would they see nationalism from their point of view? This is the vital question of nationalism in India. For example, ST people have a very different approach to nationalism. They consider the nation where they live. Delhi and Mumbai are even a different nation or country for them. Indians think that Hindus make the majority in India. They developed such thinking in their mind after the colonial had ruled. They also adhered to follow the same path and anticipated to make Indian a Hindu nation. Similarly, Pakistan where Muslims were in majority, thought to make it a Muslim nation. These majoritarian people imitated the European model of nationalism to make Hindu and Muslim nation. Hindu gave a slogan like Hindu, Hindi, and Hindustan. The definition of Indian nationalism according to Golwalkar revolves around the Hindu nation. He mentioned it in his book *Bunch of Thought*. According to Golwalkar, there are three common enemies in India: Muslims, Christian, and Communists (112). V.D Savarkar in his book *Hinutava* (2003) emphasizes a national identity and strengthen it. We need a common enemy which can help us to make the nation united and feed the spirit of patriotism. Only true patriot would born here which is called *Dharmabhoomi*. The concept *Pitribhoomi* and *Punyabhoomi* discourage other

from taking citizenship in India, especially Muslims and Christians because they may have loyalty to their religions and countries.

There are some limitations to the European Model of nationalism. First, they will exclude a group of people if they do not show love to the country, and they would be called anti-national such as Nagaland is the part of India, but the people of Nagaland are not Indians. Similarly, Kashmir is ours but the people of Kashmir are not ours.

Then, the first question that arises here is, what type of nationalism. Is it based on constitution values, referendum, democratic activity, or on diversity? India has a rich diversity in every area like in languages, race, religion, culture, and geography. If European model of nationalism is applied in India, then, India would have been divided into 30 nation-states because India has more variety than Europe. Yugoslavia has to be divided into 7 nation-states. Hence, the European model of nationalism cannot be applied in India.

Satyarth Parkash is the first book of Dayanand Saraswati in which he advocates the idea of one nation underpinning one religion and one language. However, Dayanand Saraswati never uses the term 'Hindu' throughout the book. He was totally against this word. Instead, he uses the terms such as Aryan religion and Aryan language as well as *Aryavarta* instead of *Hindurastra*. Furthermore, these terms are used alternatively and the core idea of *Aryavart* would lie the same with the Hindu nation. This is the basis of Hindu nationalism. By using the idea of Dayanand Saraswati, Savarkar and Golwalkar propounded their own idea of Hindu nationalism. The root of new ideology is not of Indian origin. It is totally inspired by non-Indian thinking or western philosophy. It comes into existence with the ideology of a strong master like

Mughal and British, in which Muslim and Christian are felt stronger by Hindu reformists or by revivalists. Therefore, Indian people also want to be stronger like them having a nation based on one religion and one language.

Religious reformists of the 19th century thought that England have one religion and one language that is why they are one nation, and they are stronger. Similarly, Pakistan is becoming a nation having one language and one religion and would be stronger country than that of India. But England is certainly not a country of single language and single religion. Dayanand Sarasvati considered Veda as a sacred book for Hindu, as Quran is considered for Muslims, and the Bible for Christians. When Delhi Darbar took place in 1977, Dayanand Sarasvati called all religious reformists. He said if we would consider the Veda as our religious book, we may then become a united nation. This idea was refuted by all the religious reformists, even by his close friend Sayyed Ahamad (Habib 84).

Nationality based on religion is a European idea. During the period of Pope, the whole Europe followed Christianity and considered Europe a Christian nation. This concept of nationality was proved wrong at the end of 16th century when Europe was divided in many countries on the basis of different ethnicities, cultures, geographies, and languages. They developed the idea of secularism which was based on their own geography, culture, and their own national history. Europe entered a new modern era with secularism.

The nationalism of Golwalkar stood against all the provision on which Indian nationalism is formed. He says nationality cannot rest only on religion. No nationality builds ever on religion. Pakistan tried to form a nationality based on religion and Urdu

was imposed on the citizen of East Pakistan. Consequently, East Pakistan broke out as a separate nation called Bangladesh. Likewise, India cannot be formed as a nation mere for Hindus as it is a country of diverse religion. According to an Anthropological Survey of India, India has 4635 communities which includes Hindu, Muslim, Christianity, Sikh, Jain, Buddhist, and other groups which have their own religion. Nationalism whether Hindu or Indian has its own disadvantages.

Europe had directly or indirectly some advantages and disadvantage. Because they had one religion and race. They always opposed pluralism. That was one of the main reasons which caused demolition of land of Rousseau social agreement. Now, they are having agitations against Black people and Muslim and Migrant workers from Asia. This happened after the second world war. Now, India is in the race of adopting this model of nationalism. No one has the right to ask other groups and communities to prove their loyalty and patriotism to the nation. What Dalits thinks about nationalism in India? What imagination of nationalism they have in their minds? Which type of nationalism they have desired? And what type of nationalism is given to them? What did they think of it? After independence in 1947, when the constitution was implemented, they had desires and dreams that they would be free from untouchability. But the goal could not be attained completely. Whereas we need to include Dalits to make mainstream nationalism more progressive, inclusive, and modern.

India is the only country in the world that shows the path of cultural tolerance parallel to Europe which means that with diversity we have only one nation-state with multiple cultures that can co-exist with tolerance. This is a big lesson for the contemporary world. Earlier, nations were formed on the basis of one language, one religion, and one race. But at the time of mobility or globalization, one nation and one

language concept would not be possible. As the population migrates from one nation to another, or one state to another. To solve the problem of a nation-state that is based on one race, one language, one religion etc., the idea of the nation should be broadened. We will have to be united on some common modern values, which are more democratic and secular, and must develop the culture of pluralism. We must focus on the idea of multiculturalism and diversity in language. We must protect the rights of minorities in terms of religion, language, race, etc. These common modern values are humanitarian in nature. This type of nationalism should be appropriated to live united in the time of globalization.

Patriotism is the feeling of love, devotion, and a sense of attachment to the homeland. The English word 'Patriot' comes from 'Patris' means fatherland, and in French it is Patriato which means "fellow countryman". To show excess of patriotism in the defense of a nation can be possibly done by provoking the mood of public enthusiasm and celebration and enforcing military expansion of imperial conquest. Chauvinism attributes crave for power, and is an attitude of superiority. 'Chauvinism' is named after the name of Nicolas Chauvin from France (*aggression and militarism*). Oxford dictionary defines Jingoism as "a strong belief that your own country is best, especially when this is expressed in support of war with another" ("Jingoism") Jingo one who supports policy favouring war. A conservative supporter of Disraeli's policy in the Near East during the period 1877-78. (wiki) A jingo who thought other countries should automatically follow his country's policies. The term was first coined in a British folk song from 1878 used to inspire patriotism.

In this chapter, the researcher has defined the terms nation, nationalism, nation-state, and other associated terms. The researcher has discussed two different models of

nationalism; one is the Indian model of nationalism, and another is a European model of nationalism. Some scholars were favouring secular nationalism which is pluralistic and inclusive in nature in terms of language, religion, geography, region, and caste while some were opposing.

Work Cited:

Banerjea, Surendranath. *A Nation in Making*. Rupa Publications, 2016.

Bhabha, Homi K. *Nation & Narration*. Routledge, 2013.

Garner, Bryan A., ed. "nation". *Black's Law Dictionary (10th ed.)*, 2014. p. 1183

Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Cambridge: Blackwell, 1983.

Golwalkar. *Bunches of Thoughts*. First, Sahitya Sindhu Prakashana, 2021.

Guha, Ramchandra. "Four reasons why Hindutva is rising in India: Ramachandra Guha's speech at KLF." YouTube, uploaded by TNIE videos, 18 Jan 2020, www.youtube.com/watch?v=_hn97186_Zw.

Ians. "Bollywood, a Derogatory Term, Say Indian Actors." *DNA India*, 2 July 2007, www.dnaindia.com/entertainment/report-bollywood-a-derogatory-term-say-indian-actors-1107587.

Kautsky, J. *Communism and the Politics of Development: Persistent Myths and Changing Behavior*. 99th ed., Wiley, 1968.

Kohn, Hans. "Nationalism." *www.Britannica.com*, <https://www.britannica.com/topic/nationalism> accessed by 03 July 2020

---. *Nationalism: Its Meaning and History*. USA: Van Nostrand, 1965.

---. *The Idea of Nationalism: A Study in Its Origin and Backgrounds*. Routledge Publication, 2017.

Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. *Karl Marx and Frederick Engels: Selected Works*. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1969.

“Nation” *Online Etymology Dictionary*. www.etymonline.com. www.etymonline.com/word/nation. Accessed 22 Sept. 2021.

“Nationalism” *Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary*, www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com.
<https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/nationalism?q=nationalisms>. Accessed 22 Sept. 2021.

Paul, James. *Nation Formation: Towards a Theory of Abstract Community*. London, Sage Publication, 1996.

Roy Armes, *Third World Film Making and the West*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.

Sarswati, Swami Dayanand. *Satyarth Prakash*. Abhishek Publications, 2017.

Savarkar, V. *Hindutva*. Hindi Sahitya Sadan, 2003.

Singh, K., and Anthropological Survey of India. *People of India*. Anthropological Survey of India, 1992.

Smith, Anthony D. “Culture, Community and Territory: The Politics of Ethnicity and Nationalism.” *International Affairs*, vol. 72, no. 3, 1996, pp. 445–58. *Crossref*, doi:10.2307/2625550.

---. *Nationalism: Theory, Ideology, History*. Polity Press, 2010.

---. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1986.

---. *The Nation Made Real: Art and National Identity in Western Europe, 1600-1850*.

Illustrated, Oxford University Press, 2013.

Smith, Anthony D. "Culture, Community and Territory: The Politics of Ethnicity and Nationalism." *International Affairs*, vol. 72, no. 3, 1996, pp. 445–58. *Crossref*, doi:10.2307/2625550.

Tagore, Rabindranath. *Nationalism*. Fingerprint Publishing, 2018.

Zocalo. "The Philosopher Who Coined the Term 'Nationalism' Also Preached Inclusivity."

Zócalo Public Square, 9 Jan. 2019, www.zocalopublicsquare.org/2019/01/09/philosopher-coined-term-nationalism-also-preached-inclusivity/ideas/essay.

CHAPTER – I

HINDI CINEMA AND NATIONALISM

Cinema refers to the motion picture, a motion-picture theatre, movies and the art or technique of making motion pictures. Cinema can be divided into two types: commercial cinema which makes money from the audience and art cinema or parallel cinema. Cinema is also considered a popular art in the 20th century.

Renowned actor Om Puri says, “the cinema should be the reflection of time and society as you yourself see in the mirror-like that we can see the society through the films” (63). The credit of invention of cinema goes to Paris; however, Germany, England, Italy, and America have been also given credit for experimenting in this field. The Europeans sensed the commercial opportunity of cinema since its inception.

Hindi cinema has been developed as a Hindustani cinema. This is the cinema of various communities and languages. ‘Bollywood’ term is also used as substitution of Hindi Cinema. Bollywood is the portmanteau which is derived from, ‘Bombay’ (now Mumbai), the centre of the Indian film industry. The term ‘B’ is taken from Bombay and ‘wood’ is taken from Hollywood. Amit Khanna said that “he had mentioned the term 'Bollywood' in a magazine column he used to write in the 1970s”. (Dey) However, Bengal film industry was the first to use the word ‘wood’ in Tollywood. In Bengal, most of the films are produced in Tollygunge, Kolkata. Kollywood is the nickname of Tamil Cinema. In Tamilnadu, most films are produced mainly in Kodambakkam, Chennai. Bollywood is formally termed as Hindi Cinema. Many actors, directors and film critics have shown their dissent on this term ‘Bollywood’. The term ‘Bollywood’ is often used by the non-Indian as a synecdoche to refer Indian film industry.

Some of the actors, who dissented on using the term 'Bollywood', are Nasiruddin Shah and Om Puri. They slam western media for calling them, Bollywood actors. They say that the Indian film industry dislikes the term 'Bollywood' and feels disgusted by its use in the media. "The term Bollywood was used by the Western press to mock on us. "It is just an indication of our own idiocy that we still use it," (Ians) said Shah. Veteran actor Om Puri said in very emotional tone: "Bollywood - whenever Western people refer to it, they mean Hindi films, they say, 'Oh those song and dance films!'" (Ians) So, it is a derogatory term. These terms are created by the media." (dnaindia.com) They cautioned Indian media for using this word. Shah said: "Now the Mumbai film industry refers to itself as Bollywood. It's like being called an idiot all your life and then making it your name," (dnaindia.com) Pervaiz Alam, who interviewed the two actors on stage and said: "This is the reason we've started distancing away from the term 'Bollywood' as more and more film-makers and actors from India are telling us not to use the word 'Bollywood', a term, that they often find patronizing." (Ians) The term 'Bollywood' is now being used to refer to the entire Indian film industry not just the Hindi cinema over a period of time.

Cinema came in India in 1896 and it stretched to the multi-starrer films of 2020 from the silent era films of the late 1800s. It was the Lumiere Brothers who took the credit for pioneering cinema. They toured India after their 2nd film *The Arrival of a Train*. India witnessed the birth of cinema in July 1896, when the Lumiere Brothers arranged a screening of six films at the Watson Hotel in Bombay. The six films screened that day were: *The Sea Bath*, *Arrival of a Train*, *Ladies and Soldiers on Wheels*, *Entry of Cinematograph*, *A Demolition*, and *Leaving the Factory*. Dadasaheb Phalke was the first Indian who produced a full-length motion picture. The Indian film industry was founded by Phalke. He produced *Raja Harishchandra* (1913) film from Sanskrit epics. It was a silent film in Marathi and the role of female characters were played by male actors in the films. Ardeshir Irani made the first Indian talkie film *Alam Ara* on 14 March 1931. The Indian film industry produces approximately a

thousand films in twenty-eight languages annually. These films are primarily classified into three categories: commercial, art, and all other cinema. The commercial or masala films are the most popular and lucrative among the three. Cinema primarily developed in three cities of India such as Bombay (Mumbai), Calcutta (Kolkata), and Madras (Chennai). Regional cinemas and studios have been developed around these cities. Bombay became the hub of commercial(popular) cinema for the north, and Madras for the south, Calcutta due to its cultural and intellectual heritage became the base for the development of art cinema in the eastern part of India.

Feature films are made in about twenty languages in India. The term 'Indian cinema' hence refers to films made in any of these twenty languages. Hindi cinema or Bollywood produces approximately 150-200 films of a total of 800-1000 films a year. It makes twenty per cent of the total number of films made in India. Sixty per cent of films made in four south Indian films industries, (Tamil, Telugu, Kannada, and Malayalam) since 1971 (Chatterjee 2). The Ganti States that:

. . . though Hindi films forms form only 20 per cent of the film product of the nation, they are the only language films that circulate nationally and internationally, dominating discourse on the Indian film. Hindi films represent Indian cinema internationally and are regarded as the standard archetype to follow or oppose. Outside India, the category "popular Indian cinema" tends to denote Hindi films produced in Bombay (3).

This is because Hindi is the official language of Indian Union followed by English. Hindi is widely accepted and spoken language at national level in India. Therefore, Bollywood films made in India's national language are referred to as Indian cinema. Butalia states: "Indian cinema is the single largest medium of communication

with the masses, and close to twelve million people are watching films every week in cinema houses and theatres” (Chatterjee 3). Indian cinema witnessed golden period during 1940s to 1960s. The Parallel Cinema movement emerged at this time mainly led by Bengalis. Parallel Cinema was followed by Classic Bollywood in 1971s–the 1980s. Hindi cinema of 1980s came to stagnation with decline in the box office due to increasing violence and declining in music. Rise of video piracy led middle-class audiences abandoned theatres.

Cinema arrived in India in the first decade of the twentieth century when the national freedom movement in India was at full swing. National freedom movement was growing rapidly across the country against the British colonialism. Therefore, the analysis of nationalism in Indian cinema requires a detailed analysis of colonial-era films. Cinema, as an art form and an entertainment medium, reflects an area where the issues of nationalism, identity, and culture raised.

Nationalism has been used as an anti-colonial discourse in cinema. Bollywood has strived to represent a native Indian model of nationalism on-screen almost since its inception which has been shaped and influenced by the atmosphere of national freedom struggle. During the colonial era, many films were restricted in portraying nationalist sentiments. Censorship was so strong that even the slightest reference to nationalist or anti-colonial ideas was not allowed in the films by the authority. Nevertheless, nationalistic discourse was presented in the early films in subtle form by dodging colonial censorship authority. Gandhi ji was completely hostile to the idea of the film, and Nehru would accept it only if it is used as a medium of education and instruction. “Cinema not only appropriated the discourse of nationalism but became an extension of it” (Ganti 46-47). Sengupta states: “Some filmmakers, like Phalke, openly

advertise their sympathy to the nationalistic cause, especially to the Gandhian Swadeshi movement” (22).

The following films portrays the theme of national movement, nation, and nationality: *Sardar* (1993), *The Legend of Bhagat Singh* (2002), *Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose: The Forgotten Hero* (2004), *Mangal Pandey: The Rising* (2005), *Rang De Basanti* (2006), *Junoon* (1978), *1942: A Love Story* (1994) *Nastik* (1954), *Gandhi* (1982), *Border* (1997), *Karanti* (1981), *Khelein Hum Jee Jaan Sey* (2010), *Haqeeqat* (1964), *Sarfarosh*, (1971), *Chek De India* (2007), *Chittagong* (2012), *Lakshya* (2004), *Purab or Paschim* (1970). *A Wednesday* (2008), *Saat Hindustani* (1969), *Hindustani* (1996), *Roja* (1992), *The Ghazi Attack* (2017), etc. These films represent the idea what Rai calls “renewed cine-patriotism” (2003) of Bollywood. He defines it as:

a set of films that seek to represent, visualise, and narrate the sovereignty of the supposedly secular, in practice upper-caste, Hindu Indian nation. As such, they have both criticised and fuelled the ongoing tensions between Hindus and Muslims that has marked India’s postcoloniality. These tensions have seen a growing regularity of deadly clashes between Hindu nationalist forces and Muslim communities, which have accompanied the sometimes low-intensity, sometimes guerrilla war between India and Pakistan over the northern state of Kashmir (5).

Shiladitya Sen, a film critic, pointed out three important features of terrorist films. The politics of representation portrayed Pakistan as the biggest enemy in the post-Babri era. Najma Khatun states this with example:

In the movie *Sarfarosh*, under a Pakistan flag, the terrorists are discussing how they would attack India. It is applicable for the movies like *Border* and *Gadar* as well. When the film represents Pakistan as indulging in terrorism, at the same time, it is implying that the citizen of Pakistan is a single entity. Secondly, in India whoever is doing terrorist acts, all are anti-religious groups and they do not belong to Hindus. Thirdly, the films support state terrorism to kill those terrorists. These are the central messages of those films (52).

Mainstream Bollywood has traditionally reserved normalcy for the Hindu hero while minor characters are depicted with stereotypes, Muslims as God-fearing, Sikhs as drivers and Parsee with lispings. These characters are essential in the film to represent national integration of India. (Sethi) This is also argued by Dadhe who says that Muslims are depicted as villains and terrorists in the 1990s. They are depicted as enemy of India and against Hinduism. He states:

Generally, this villain is coupled with another good Muslim who is nationalist and wages a war against the former for saving his country; Salim in *Sarfarosh* (1999) being a good example. If the movie is a classic Hindu-Muslim love story, the hero has to be invariably from the majority community (e.g., *Veer Zaara*, *Gadar*, *Bumbai*). As the well-known actor Farooque Shaikh puts it, “[t]he hero is invariably Hindu because they want to release the film to a larger audience (11).

Many successful war films (war among India and Pakistan) were released between 2000-2005 which portrayed Pakistan’s role in terrorist activities and perceived Pakistan as an enemy of the nation, especially in the last two decades. Although India

and Pakistan had countless cross-border conflicts in 1948, 1965, and 1971. The Kargil War in 1999 has been one of the most devastating of wars. From 1997 to 2006, several war films were produced by Bollywood including *Border*, *Sarfarosh*, *Maa Tujhhe Salaam*, *Pukar*, *Gadar: Ek Prem Katha* and *LOC-Kargil*. Rauf Ahmed, a film critic, says about these films: “There was a phase in the late eighties and early nineties, particularly around the time when Babri Masjid demolition took place, there were some films which were anti-Pakistan at that time, the words ‘Pakistan’ and ‘Muslims’ were used as interchangeable words.” (Khatun 55) The 1970s war films include classics like *Haqeeqat* (1964) and *Hum Dono* (1961), and deliver a message of harmony. But movies, which are produced in the recent decades, reflect jingoistic ideology of Hindutva. Similarly, the films which are made after communal tension and riots depict Muslim characters as villain, traitors, and enemy of nation. Pratibha Advani the daughter of Lal Krishan Advani admires patriotic films and writes: “Patriotic films, as a special and much-admired genre of Indian cinema, have had a tremendous impact on our people, cutting across religious, regional, linguistic and economic identities. Moreover, they have also proved their unsurpassed power of communicating both to educated and illiterate masses” (Budha 6).

Border is regarded as one of the most important films depicting war of two neighbour countries. The film depicts only one Indian Muslim character fighting against the neighbour Muslim country. The message of Hindu tolerance is endorsed by this statement. Mahesh Bhatt corroborates that “the lack of representation of Muslim Army officers in war films, these films promote Indian culture and rituals identified as markers of Hindu tradition, thereby making any other religion or culture appear Un-

Indian” (Rajgopal 242) Mahmood Mamdani, a cultural theorist, has theorized that there are two types of Muslims: one is good Muslim and another one is bad. He says further:

“the ‘good Muslim’ is co-opted by the state and the ‘bad Muslim’ challenges the status quo, who try to harm the nation, while the majority community is often represented as ‘victims. Hence, Hindus are projected as the norm of the society and Muslims are the ‘disrupter of this norm, hence perceived as the Other” (241).

Romila Thapar, a historian, writes, “In 1999, a collective of Hindu right-wing nationalist organisations labelled the Sangh Parivar propagated their version of Indian history encapsulated in the ideology of Hindutva” (96). There are other sorts of film which promote Indian culture, family values, patriarchy, and minorities. Muslim characters may be identified by their Islamic culture. Moreover, nationalism, patriotism, and jingoism are transmitted to the country’s identity politics through the cinematic space. Characters of terrorists are essentialized as Muslims. Cinema has become a strong vehicle for culture, education, leisure, and propaganda. The influence of the media for movies is greater than newspapers and books. Since commencement of the cinema, the film has a significant influence on the mind of audience. No other mass media has such a greater influence. The most important role of cinema to provide entertainment, is the main reason for its popularity among mass media. Cinema functions as an agent of change. It is capable of changing the attitude, belief, and value system of the people. Therefore, the study of cinema is significant in the 21st century.

Work Cited:

Arjun Appadurai, —Patriotism and Its Futures. *Public Culture* 5: 3 (1993): 411-429.

Budha, K. 'Genre development in the age of markets and nationalism: The war film', in Meenakshi Bharat and Nirmal Kumar (eds), *Filming the Line of Control: The Indo-Pak Relationship through the Cinematic Lens*, New Delhi: Routledge, 2008.

Dadhe, Kasturi. *Religious and Nationalist Trends in Modern Bollywood Cinema*. ZAA 57.1 (2009): 9-20

Dey, Simantini. "'When Sr Bachchan Angrily Asked...': The Man Who Gave 'Bollywood' Its Name Shares How Indian Media Became a." *News18*, 21 Dec. 2019, www.news18.com/news/india/when-sr-bachchan-angrily-asked-man-who-gave-bollywood-its-name-shares-how-indian-media-became-brand-2431941.html.

Ians. "Bollywood, a Derogatory Term, Say Indian Actors." *DNA India*, 2 July 2007, www.dnaindia.com/entertainment/report-bollywood-a-derogatory-term-say-indian-actors-1107587.

Khatun, N. (2016), 'Imagining Muslims as the "Other" in Muslim political films', *Journal of Arab & Muslim Media Research*, 9: 1, pp. 41–60, DOI: 10.1386/jammer.9.1.41_1

Rai, Amit (2003). "Patriotism and the Muslim Citizen in Hindi Films." *Harvard Asia Quarterly* 7.3. <<http://www.asiaquarterly.com>> (April 25, 2006).

- Rajgopal, S. S. (2011), 'Bollywood and neo-nationalism: The emergence of nativism as the norm in Indian conventional cinema', *South Asian Popular culture*, 9: 3, October, pp. 237–246.
- Sen, Shiladitya (2013), personal interview, Kolkata, 13 March, 23 August. Khatun, N. (2016), 'Imagining Muslims as the "Other" in Muslim political films', *Journal of Arab & Muslim Media Research*, 9: 1, pp. 41–60, doi:10.1386/jammr.9.1.41_1
- Sethi, Manisha, "Cine-Patriotism." *Samar*, Issue 15, 2002. <http://www.samarmagazine.org/archive/article.php?id=115> accessed by March 25, 2021.
- Tejaswini, Ganti. *Bollywood: A Guidebook to Popular Hindi Cinema*. New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Thapar, Romila. "The History Debate and School Textbooks in India: A Personal Memoir." *History Workshop Journal*, no. 67, 2009, pp. 87–98. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/40646211.

CHAPTER – II

A STUDY OF *GADAR: EK PREM KATHA*

Two movies, *Gadar: Ek Prem Katha* and *Lagaan: Once Upon a Time in India*, were released on 15th June 2001. These two movies made records at the box office and influenced the audience widely. *Gadar: Ek Prem Katha* was directed by Anil Sharma and produced by Nittin Keni, while *Lagaan: Once Upon a Time in India* was directed by Ashutosh Gowrikar.

Gadar: Ek Prem Katha and *Lagaan: Once Upon a Time in India* were released soon after the Kargil war. *Gadar: Ek Prem Katha* conveyed subtle communal messages promoting the public hate spirit that came into existence immediately just after the Kargil war. Saba Naqvi Bhoumik a movie critic points out that “in the movie, all the Muslim characters – Indian and Pakistani – are fundamentally flawed. It cannot be a coincidence that such a movie broke all the records at a time when NDA’ s popularity was at its height. Hindu right’s ideology was blatantly propagated” (86).

Gadar: Ek Prem Katha is based on an interreligious love story across nations. The tremendous achievement and success of war dramas including *Border* (1997), *LOC-Kargil* (2003) and *Gadar: Ek Prem Katha* highlights the influence of Hindutva ideology on the people. Moviemakers demonize Muslims as the 'Other' in this context, in order to make these movies ultra-nationalistic in nature.

The movie *Gadar: Ek Prem Katha* is categorized as an Indian- Hindi language and historical action-drama movie, which are set in the past. In this movie, Sunny Deol and Ameesha Patel played the lead roles. Amrish Puri and Lillete Dubey played the

supporting roles. The movie is set during the partition of India in 1947. Anil Sharma invested 185 million Rs in this movie and it earned 1.33 billion Rs at Box Office. It was the most successful commercial and the second most-watched movie after the 1990s in India. This movie is partially based on the real love story of Boota Singh. The setting of *Gadar: Ek Prem Katha* is based on the tragedy of partition. The movie portrays the story of millions of people, who migrated from their home and were killed in riots. It included Hindu, Muslims, and Sikhs. The women, who were separated from their family, had to suffer more. Moreover, *Gadar: Ek Prem Katha* is the story of such a woman. Her name is Sakina (Ameesha Patel), who was also separated from her family when she was migrating from Amritsar to Lahore at the railway station. Tara Singh (Sunny Deol) protects her from the Sikh mob. When Sakina comes to know that a mob has killed her parents. Then, she decides to marry Tara Singh and continue her stay in India. In the story, a turning point comes when she comes across the fact that her parents are alive in Pakistan. She goes to Lahore, to meet her parents but they never let her come back to India and the remaining story is about her meeting with her husband and son.

Initially, this movie seems to represent the humanitarian aspect of the tragedy of partition, which is not related to communalism and jingoism, but this is not the truth. The way in which the story is told in the movie has inherent meaning. In the movie, a partition love story is tried to give new context to some extent. This movie, like a common commercial Masala Movie, has a hero, heroine and villain, who tries to separate them. To create a thrill, a lot of violent and action scenes are planted in the fight scene. Some emotional scenes are also there at the end of the movie. There is a

victory against Pakistan's army, and a change of the heart of the villain, as usual, the father of the heroine.

The partition is used as context to create the story in the movie. The background played an important role to make this movie popular. This movie unfolded the story of partition at such a time when the separatists' movement was at its peak in Kashmir. The pressure on both India and Pakistan was increasing for peace by the masses. The violent action of militants created a war like situation in Kashmir.

There are numerous movies in Indian cinema like *Roja*, (1992) *Bombay* (1995), and *Gadar: Ek Prem Katha* which have nationalism theme. These movies portray two types of Muslims, one is, who see religion above the nation and supports Pakistan. On the other hand, there are Muslims, who are patriot despite being Muslim. They see the nation above their religion, but they are less in numbers.

The plot of *Gadar: Ek Prem Katha* begins with partition. After partition Hindus and Muslims had to leave their home in Pakistan and Hindustan respectively. Hindus were running from Pakistan to Hindustan and Muslim vice-versa. The riots began in both countries on a large scale. Hindus and Sikhs were being killed at the hands of Muslims and vice-versa. These incidents provoked Tara Singh, a Punjabi Jatt, whose parents and sisters were also killed in riots. He lost his anger and took a sword to take revenge from Muslims. He went out with the mob and tried to kill Muslims but at that moment, he confronted Sakina at the railway station. Sakina was the daughter of Muslim industrialist Ashraf Ali Khan. Tara Singh had fallen in love with Sakina during her college time. Tara Singh was working there as a truck driver, who used to supply things at the college canteen. There, he saw Sakina for the first time. He had gifted her

a miniature model of Taj Mahal as a gift of love and a mixture of two cultures. After a long time, he confronted her at the railway station when she was migrating to Pakistan. He was about to kill her but suddenly stopped by seeing his gift, the Taj Mahal. It was his love that calmed his anger and forced him to stop. A mob followed her to rape or kill her then Tara Singh protected her from the mob. She took the shelter at his home. Tara Singh also promised her that he will help her in reaching Lahore. They came to know that all the passengers, who were travelling on that train, were killed. Sakina also found some belongings of her family at the station which confirmed that they were killed in that train. She returned home and realised that Tara Singh still loved her. She also felled in love with Tara Singh. Tara Singh took her to Atari Railway Station, but she refused to go to Pakistan. She asked Tara Singh to marry her and despite Tara's uncle's and aunt's unwillingness he got marry her. Later, they were blessed with one child named Charanjeet Singh. After some years, Sakina came to know that her parents were not only alive, but his father had become the mayor of Lahore. She wanted to meet her family and talked to them by telephone through an embassy. Her parents arranged her journey in such a way that only she can come to Pakistan neither her husband nor her son. Sakina's parents did not want to send her back to India. Ashraf Ali had some political aspirations as his son was killed during the partition and he wanted to set his daughter in the place of his son, but Sakina had a different mindset. She wanted to go back to India to live with her husband and son.

When Pakistan embassy denied visa to Tara Singh, then, he decided to go to Pakistan with his son by crossing the border illegally. He reached Pakistan and found that Sakina's marriage was about to take place with a Muslim man against her will. On the day of marriage, Tara Singh along with his friend and son reached there. After a

dramatic fight, Sakina's father put conditions on Tara Singh that if he ready to convert to Islam and ready to live in Pakistan, then, he will accept him as his son-in-law. For the sake of her wife and son; Tara Singh agreed upon these conditions. Next day, in front of hundreds of people, he was asked to accept Islam as his religion, and he accepted it without hesitation. To check his loyalty, he was asked to chant Pakistan Zindabad and he did so, but they did not stop here. They again asked him to chant Hindustan Murdabad to prove his loyalty to Pakistan, but this time Tara Singh lost his anger and started shouting at Ashraf Ali. The mob attacked on Tara Singh, but he alone fought with a mob and escaped from there with his wife and son. Ashraf Ali's men followed him and the police and army also joined them. When they were about to reach the border, there was a lot of bloodshed. Sakina was also hit by his father's shot. She was taken to the hospital and after seeing his daughter, Ashraf Ali started weeping and it changed his mind. He accepted Tara Singh as his son-in-law and the movie ended on a happy-note.

Dadhe claims that "*Gadar: Ek Prem Katha* (2001) have distinctly projected communal divisions in the name of patriotism, which in turn involved bashing and criticizing Muslims or proclaiming Islam a religion of fanaticism" (10).

One of the characteristics of European model of nationalism is that if one is a true nationalist then he/she must have a common enemy also. Second, he/she must subscribe to the state's religion. He/she must speak the language of that country. He/she must hate the language of a common enemy's country. There is imperialism in the centre of European model of nationalism. For example, in England, if one is a true nationalist then he/she must be Protestant and he/she should speak the English language. He/she have to hate French people and the French language. The similar case

will be in France also. He/she must be Catholic; he/she have to speak the French language; he/she have to hate English and the English language and protestant as well.

Thus, if this model is applied on India and Pakistan both, then one is only a true Indian nationalist if he/she is Hindu, and he/she speaks Hindi and he/she has a common enemy like Pakistan. Also, he/she should hate Pakistan, and Muslim or Islam as well. Only then you would be considered as a true Indian nationalist. Some groups in India are trying to implement this model. Hindutva Model is a copy of the European model of nationalism. Similarly, in Pakistan, one has to subscribe to Islam and consider India as the common enemy of the nation and he/she has to hate Hindu and Hindi. So, these are the characteristics of the European model of nationalism. Indian nationalism stands against European nationalism, because Indian nationalism is anti-colonial in nature and very inclusive nationalism which is pluralistic.

There are lots of instances that confirm that *Gadar: Ek prem Katha* supports the idea of the European model of nationalism and also displays some scenes of Indian nationalism. Therefore, in the movie, we see Pakistan's hatred against Tara Singh because he is Sikh, and Hindustani. He speaks Hindi and Punjabi languages. He loves his nation. European model of nationalism is implemented in the movie. The hate towards India and Hindustani is visible in this scene of the movie:

Asraf: *Hamare vatan me per rakhne ki himat kese hui, itne tukde karuga ki pahchanana nhi jayega. bhut khoon bahaya tha tumhare logon ne hamre bhayiyon ka.*

Tara: *Kya tumne khoon nhi bahaya tha hamre logon ka, mere maa baap bahne sab ko to maar dala tha, tum logon ne, lakin vo ek janoon tha gujar gya. ab me*

apne pyar ko lene aaya hu ek bache ki maa ko lene aaya hu.me nafarat bhula chuka hu aap bhi bhula dijie.

Ashraf: Me nafrat bhula du vo bhi tum hindustani se. mera vash chale to me ek hindustani ko goli se uda du.

Tara: *Kin Hindustanio ko goli se udayenge aap log, ham Hindustani ki vajah se aapka vajud hai. Duniya janti hai ki bantware ke vakt ham longo ne aapko 65 crore Rs diye the tab jaker apke sir per tarpal aayi thi. Barsat se bachne ki hasiyat nhi hai or golibari ki baat kar rhe aap log.*

Saleem: *Pakistan ki foj ko lalkarta hai. Aadha Kashmir to hamne hasil kar liya, ek din pura Hindostan hamara hoga. (Tara slaps slim here) (2h:10m)*

Ashraf: How dare you to step onto our land? I will kill you so brutally that it will be hard to recognize you. You have had shed a lot of blood of our community.

Tara: Didn't you also shed the blood of our community? You have killed my parents, my siblings, everybody. But that is all over now. Today, I have come to take my wife, the mother of my son. I have forgotten my hatred; you also do the same.

Ashraf Ali: Forget my hatred for you Indians. I could, I would shoot each and every Indian dead.

Tara: How can you kill us (Indian)? You survived because of us i.e., Indian. The whole world knows that we gave you 65 crore rupees at the time of partition, and you talk of killing us.

Salim: You are challenging the Pakistani army; we have taken over half of Kashmir. One day, we will take over the whole of India (English Translation)

The argument in other instances like when Ashraf Ali puts two conditions to Tara Singh can be also taken into consideration. These two conditions also confirm European nationalism. The first condition states that he has to subscribe to the state's religion readily, which is Islam and to be a true patriot of Pakistan. According to European nationalism, one must hate the common enemy of the country which is India for Pakistan. Another condition states that one has to live in Pakistan. Tara Singh accepts both conditions and accepts Islam and hail Pakistan live long. But when he is asked to chant Hindustan Murdabad. He lost his anger on Ashraf Ali because we know that according to the Indian model of nationalism one can love his/her identity at multiple levels simultaneously. Like one can love his/her family, village, state, nation, at the same time. So does Tara Singh when he says Pakistan Zindabad as well as he loves India and his family. Indian nationalism promotes secularism. If one loves Pakistan, then he/she can also love India but in the European model of nationalism if one loves Pakistan then one cannot love India. So, these are the antithesis of two nationalisms. In the movie, we can see that Ashraf Ali represents the European model of nationalism through his dialogues.

In the scene of accepting Islam, we can see instances of the ideology of jingoism or European model of nationalism being very high when Kaji Asks some

questions to Tara Singh and he replies to him. This is the most nationalist scene of the movie, which supports the European model of nationalism.

Kaji: *Islam Kabul hai?*

Tara: *Aadmi ka sabse bada dharam hai apni biwi bachon ki hifajat karana.*

Kaji: *Tumhe Islam Kabul hai*

Tara: *Kashi kabha ek hai ek hai Ram Rahim*

Kaji: *Tumhe islam Kabul hai k nhi.*

Tara: *Kabul hai.*

Ashraf Ali examines his patriotism in a jingoistic way. He asks:

Ashraf Ali: *Kaho Islam zindabad*

Tara: *Islam zindabad*

Ashraf: *Ab Kaho Pakistan zindabad.*

Tara: *Pakistan zindabad*

Ashraf: *Ab bolo Hindustan Murdabad*

Tara: *yell out, Ashraf Ali, ye siyasi khel ku khel rhe aap, aapka Pakistan zindabad hai, is se hame koi aitraj nhi. Lakin hamara Hindostan zindabad tha, zindabad hai, zindabad rahega, Hindustan zindabad, Hindustan zindabad Hindustan zindabad.*

Ashraf: *Bakwaas band kar jab tak tum Hindostan murdabad nhi kahega, hamre logon ko kese yakin hoga ki tu paka Musalman hai,*

Tara: *Is mulk se jyda Musalman Hindostan me hai, unke dilon ki dhadkan yahi kahti hai, Hindustan zindabad, to kya vo pake Muslman nahi hai,*

Ashraf: *Jab tak tu Hindustan murdabad nhi kahega tu Sakina ko nhi le ja skta,*

(2h:16m)

Kaji: Do you accept Islam?

Tara: A man's greatest religion is to protect his wife and children.

Kaji: Do you accept Islam?

Tara: Kashi and Kaaba are one, Ram and Rahim are also one.

Kaji: Do you accept Islam or not?

Tara: I do accept.

Kaji: wonderful; come to the mosque, with all the grace and dignity.

Ashraf: wait a minute, Priest. Before he steps into our sacred mosque. Let us confirm whether he is not worthy of becoming Muslim or not. If you accept Islam say 'Hail Islam'.

Tara: Hail Islam.

Ashraf: Hail Pakistan.

Tara: Hail Pakistan.

Ashraf: Now say India be damned!

Tara: Ashraf Ali! Why are you playing such a political game? I do not have an objection to praising Pakistan. India is worthy of praise, will always. Hail India, Hail India, Hail India.

Ashraf: Stop your nonsense! Until you say damn India, how will our people believe that you are a true Muslim?

Tara: There are more Muslims who are living in India than in Pakistan, aren't they true Muslims? (English Translation)

The characters of Ashraf Ali, Salim, Sarfraz, Sulemaan, and Kaji, portrays a negative attitude towards India. Originally, they migrated from India but in real life, we see that migrated people talk about their old friends and love them and are attached to their original places. Another feature of the European model of nationalism is the issue of language. The language of another nation is not acceptable especially if it is the language of the common enemy's nation:

Salim: *Agar ye Thumri Urdu me hoti to gajab ho jata, kaha Urdu jaban ki nafakat, or kaha ye pechida Hindi,*

Karim: *To goya ye farma rahe hai bhaijaan ki desh ke sath-sath moski ko bhi taksim kar dena chahiye tha,” (1h: 44m)*

Salim: If this Thumri would be in Urdu, then it would be fabulous. Urdu is such a descriptive language and Hindi is very complicated.

Karim: Do you want to say that even art (music) should have been partitioned along with the country. (English Translation)

Some props are used to make this movie more jingoistic. Flag is one of them and lots of flags are visible in the first scene. Villagers have put flags of Pakistan on their houses. There are numerous scenes in the movie where we see the flags of Pakistan. Generally, we put a national flag on a government office but in this movie, we see flags on the house of Ashraf Ali's and also where Tara Singh takes an oath and, in the streets, from where Tara Singh tries to escape. Thus, giving space to flags shows Jingoism in which one loves symbols rather than concrete ideas like the national flag, anthem etc. Therefore, in the movie flag motifs try to establish jingoistic ideology.

The title of *Gadar: Ek Prem Katha* Sunny Deol talks about it in an interview that Tara Singh fights for his family and not for any nation or religion but in this movie, it seems that nationalism is overstated in a certain way. The director deliberately wants to portray that Tara Singh loves his nation above all. This movie also includes the idea of nationalism or Cine Patriotism. Some violent and action scenes are also placed in the movie. This approves that this movie is inclined towards jingoism rather than a secular or neutral approach. In this movie, Tara Singh's struggle for his family is also depicted with the nationalistic idea of patriotism.

There are numerous instances in the form of dialogues, one of them is "*Pakistan Ki Naak Kat Gai*" (2:32:19). We see how individual struggle is embedded with national pride like, "*Har Taraf Dhundo Us Hindustani Kutte Ko* (2:38:18)" (Find that Indian

everywhere). The names *Hindustani*, *Hindustani Kutta (Dog)*, *Hindustani Suar* (pig) are used repeatedly. Tara Singh has been portrayed as Indian rather than a lover, or Hindu or Sikh. Ashrafi Ali hates him because he is Indian and Hindu. Director used Tara Singh to make the subject of national pride. He is made a common enemy of Pakistan according to the traditional European model of nationalism. According to this model, he should be Hindustani and speak Hindi or Punjabi. (2h 35m.)

This movie is also received as anti-Muslim by some groups. There are a number of illustrations. There were some controversies over the scene in which Sakina is converted to Hindu or Sikhani. Sakina's conversion into a Hindu wife was also objected. Sakina is converted to Hindu Sikh by Tara Singh just by putting some blood on the forehead of Sakina as a symbol of vermilion. She becomes Sikhani, by a very simple method of conversion but in the real love story, Boota Singh had to pay some money to the rioters to save her from them.

Later, in the movie, Sakina's marriage takes place according to Punjabi Sikh culture (01:21:03). Before her marriage, she was praying *Namaz*, though she was converted to the Sikh religion by Tara Singh. After her marriage, she puts vermilion on her forehead. When she goes to Lahore; she puts vermilion there too (01:44:56s) She wants to express that she is a married woman and wife of a Hindu man. By doing so she wants to prove that she is also Hindu. Therefore, Indian Muslims had an objection against this conversion. They argue that he cannot put vermilion on a Muslim girl (Unnithan)

Another feature of the European model of nationalism is that it uses the policy of Imperialism. Salim says, "*Addha Kashmir to ham ne ne hasil kar lia ek din pura*

Hindustan Hamara hoga” (2:11:44) ‘We have taken half of Kashmir and we will win India another day’ (English translation). These dialogues portray that a big part of the movie supports the European model of nationalism.

Hindi cinema has stereotyped the characters of Muslims as ‘Others’. The last decades have seen another representational scheme in which Muslims become the enemy of the nation. Fareed Kazmi and Sanjeev Kumar (2011), Karen Gabriel and P. K. Vijayan (2012), Shobha Rajgopal (2011), Moidul Islam (2007), Ronie Parciack (2013) Amit Rai (2003), and Sanjeev Kumar have studied the influence of *Hindutva* nationalism on the negative cinematic representation of Muslims from the early 1990s. These moviemakers made movies supporting the rhetoric of ultra-nationalism during the unstable political situation and thrived on those who made movies that are accepted by audience eagerly. Frequently, in these movies the characters of Muslims are portrayed as extremists or terrorists and as underworld dons, and also as an anti-social element. Thus, a threat to the majority community of India. This argument is put forward by Shobha Rajgopal when he writes, “Indian mainstream cinema too which has perfected propaganda to an art form. A plethora of Indian movies demonstrates this process through their representation of the Indian family threatened by menacing Islamic terrorists” (241). In the movie, there is a dialogue by people representing Pakistan, "*Hindustaniyo Katana Hamse Se Sikho*"(00:06:44) (Indians learn to kill from us). Since Pakistan and Muslims are used synonymously, thus it become easy to establish that the Muslims are the murderers. Every Pakistani and Muslim character in the movie portrayed as evil and deceitful.

Gadar became a blockbuster just like *Border* (1997). It is claimed that these movies are anti-Pakistan, but not anti-Muslim. Moviemakers are not intending to

polarize themselves even further, but they are cashing in on what is happening in society. It seems that the director never wants to see Hindu and Muslim communal problems from a secular point of view. The biased narrative begins at the very beginning of the movies when Om Puri narrates: “Thus, lakhs of Hindu families were uprooted from their homes, and went wandering around all over... Thus, dead bodies of the Hindu and Sikh from different parts of Pakistan were sent to Hindustan” (*Gadar*). But the narrator gives less space to incidents against Muslims in India. Instead of a secular approach they demonstrate the bad attitude of Muslims towards Indian police and India. Paul Brass points out, “the maintenance of communal tensions, accompanied from time to time by lethal rioting at specific sites, is essential for the maintenance of militant Hindu nationalism” (9).

In the form of new changes, the Hindutva doctrine of the promised Hindu nation (Hindu Rashtra) also made its appearance in popular Hindi cinema. Moviemakers are not inherently extremists themselves, nor are they driven by the ideology of Hindutva. But there is a preference for movies which portray a narrow majoritarian agenda because of the prevailing divisive political situation in this country. Moviemakers attempted to capitalize on right-wing agendas, sensing the demand of the audience.

Bollywood created an imaginary vision of the Hindu nation after 1990, by creating the Muslim as the ‘Other’ and enemy of nation-state. Consequently, to fuel the ideology of Hindutva, Bollywood implemented various strategies. First, India is projected as a land of Hindus by the Hindutva ideology and the followers of this ideology are committed to preserving the Hindu Rashtra's cultural and geographical boundaries. Stereotypical representations of Muslims, such as strict devotion to Islamic religious codes and dress, were deployed in movies to mark a sharp contrast with a

progressive and secular projection of Hindu. For instance, Muslim in movies such as Ghulam-E-Musthafa (Ghosh, 1997) is also an 'outsider', an alien to the country. (Khatun) In these types of movies, Muslims are represented as villains, terrorists, and anti-nationals. Sharma also argues that, "Pakistan is solely an enemy of India, throughout this period and after. Pakistan and Muslims became synonymous and both became a threat to the nation, as demonstrated in movies like *Gadar: Ek Prem Katha*" (2001).

The secular angle is missing in *Gadar* from the very beginning of the movie. It is portrayed that the Muslims were responsible for provoking the riots. At the time of partition, it is said in the agreement of two countries that countries will be divided but not the population. Muslims can live in India and Hindus and Sikhs can live in newly formed Pakistan.

Gurdeep: Mujhe kya pata tha ki Pakistan ki sarkar hamare sath dhokha karegi

O faisla to huwa tha na ki Pakistan me rahne wale Hindu te Sikh yahi rahenge"

(Gadar 0:1:40s)

Gurdeep: How did I know that the Pakistan Government would betray us. It was decided that the Hindus living in Pakistan, and Sikh, could stay back (English Translation)

Pakistan did not follow this agreement, and Hindus and Sikhs felt betrayed by the Government of Pakistan. Muslims killed Hindus and Sikhs in Pakistan. Hindus and Sikhs began running away from Pakistan to India due to fear. During this migration,

they were also killed in large numbers. Tara's father and sister in this movie were killed during their journey to Amritsar. Ashraf Ali's son was also killed during his journey from Amritsar to Lahore. But this movie tells us a lot beyond the literal meaning. In this movie, the perspective of the director about partition is historically incorrect. For instance, in a scene with Ashraf Ali, Tara Singh says:

“Ham Hindustani ki vajah se apka vajud hai. Duniya janti hai ki bantware ke vakat ham logon ne apko 65 crore rupay diye the. Tab jaker apke sir per tarpaal aayi thi.”

“You exist because of us. World knows the fact that at the time of partition we gave you 65 crore rupees to cover your head.” (English Translation)

Here this scene reminds us of the time when Gandhi Ji kept fast to release the 55 crores rupees amount to Pakistan. So, this amount is 55 crores rupees, not 65 as stated in the movie. This reveals that Pakistan is subordinate to India. This is also validated in another dialogue between Dharmiyaan and Sulemaan, a police officer when Darmiyaan says:

Dharmiyan: *Niyazuddin Allah ko pyare ho gye. Ham Hindustaniyon ka picha mat karna, nhi to tum bhi Alah ko pyare ho jaoge*

Sulemaan: *Kya Matlab?*

Dharmyaan: *Baap, baap hota hai. Beta, beta hota hai.*

Sulemaan: *Hain,*

Dharmiyaan: *Nahi Samjhe Beta baap me se hi to niklta hai. Ye tumhara Pakistan nikla to Hindustaan se hai. (1h:28m)*

Dharmiyan: Niyazuddin has gone up to Allah. And do not follow us otherwise we will kill you too.

Sulemaan: what do you mean?

Dharmiayan: I mean the father is father and son is a son.

Sulemaan: what?

Dharmiyan: What you did not understand? Son comes from father; in the same way, your Pakistan comes from India. (English Translation)

Pakistan is the son of India and India is the father of Pakistan. It is rendered in the movie that Pakistan is not considered equal rather subordinate. However, they could have defined Pakistan as a younger brother of India. Bangladesh as the youngest brother of India and Pakistan. But in this movie, the image of Pakistan is portrayed negatively.

Jeet says: “*mama Ji, mama Ji, what is wrong with Pakistanis. Hamne unka kya bigada hai. Vo log hamre Piche kyon Pade hai.*” (2h:30m)

(What harm have we done to them? Why are they looking for us?)

Tara Singh says that there are more Muslims, who are living in Hindustan than Pakistan. But in fact, there are Hindu and Sikhs, who are also living in Pakistan. This

fact is overlooked by the director. No Hindu or Sikh is shown in Pakistan, neither a Gurdwara nor Hindu temple. Rather Pakistani flags are displayed everywhere in the streets, in villages, at Ashraf Ali's house and also at the railway station. Moreover, this movie shows not only the bravery of Tara Singh but also depicts how a single Indian man can fight hundreds of Pakistanis with bravery. It also tells us that the Pakistani army is not able to confront a patriotic Indian.

In the movie, Hindus and Sikhs are killing Muslims too, but less exposure is given to the killing of Muslims. Muslims seem more anonymous in the scenes. The pains and suffering of Muslims seem deliberately overlooked by the director to some extent as compared to Hindus and Sikhs except Sakina. But when Muslims are killing Hindus and Sikhs, there are a lot of details of violence in the scenes. They are not composed of an anonymous crowd. When a Muslim kills a Hindu or Sikh with a sword, then the falling of Hindus and Sikhs on the ground is portrayed and their bleeding neck is depicted in detail. In the case of Muslims, the director gives less screen space to them. It seems that the director wants to show more empathy towards the suffering of Hindus and Sikhs by giving less space to Muslims, except Sakina. Thus, the director victimises Hindus and Sikhs, but no Muslims except Sakina.

When Muslim mob attacks Hindu and Sikh on the train, they are shown chanting "Allah Hu Akbar, Nara-E- Takbir" (00:04:51). Then, one of them says "*Budon jwano bachon ko katal kar dolo or Hindunion ko utha le chalo chhodna mat kisi ko*" (0:05:02) (Kill the young, old men and children, and pick up the Hindustani women). This scene in the movie makes them the 'other' and depicts a negative image of Muslims.

Train loaded with the dead body of Hindu and Sikh is portrayed in the movie. Tara Singh receives this train at Amritsar Junction, on which, it is written: “*Hindustanio Katna hamse sikho*” (00:06:44) (Indians, learn killing from us’ in Urdu). It is tried to establish that newly formed Pakistan has adopted the Urdu language immediately. The director has tried to establish that Urdu which originated in India, is the language of Muslims or Pakistan.

With the chants of “Jo bole So Nihal” and “Har- Har Mahadev” (00:06:45), Hindus and Sikhs start killing Muslims. The killing of Muslims by Hindus is justified because they have killed their brothers and fathers. Muslims are not given the chance to justify the massacre of Hindus and Sikhs in the movie. No prior scene or information is given to justify the violence of Muslims. The director tries to stereotype that Muslims are by default violent. Hindus are calm but they only do violence when there is no way to escape. It may also be possible that the director has kept the Hindu viewer in India in his mind while making this movie. He may want to win the hearts of the Hindu majority. One thing which is very clear is that this movie suits the propaganda of majoritarianism.

It is ironic that *Gadar: Ek Prem Katha* is a love story. There is love, but there is more violence than love. Patriotism is made strong by jingoism and extremism. Not only in this movie are emotions against Pakistan used, but also tension is optimized by the director. This movie propagates jingoism and fanaticism when a lone Indian confronts Pakistani police and Pakistan’s army.

It is depicted in the movie directly or indirectly that only the Muslim league is responsible for partition. This is portrayed by the scene in which Ashraf Ali, who is a rich Muslim affiliated with the Muslim league Party says:

“Kitne rupey diye the hamne Muslim league ko, or kitni koshis ki thi ki Lahore ke sath-sath sara Punjab Pakistan me aa jaye, lakin sab bekar. Ek roti ke tukde ki trah chota sa Pakistan Hamari jholi me daal diya. (00:09:20s)

“We have given so much money to the Muslim League and had tried so hard to see that together with Lahore, the whole of Punjab too should go to Pakistan. But all was of no use. Like a morsel of bread, a small Pakistan has been put in our lap.” (English Translation)

It is a totally forgotten fact that imperialists were responsible for big partitions and migrations in the world. This is not the case only with India. In India, they did according to their long-term policies. They divided India into two nations because they wanted to secure their politics and hegemony afterward. By doing so, they were securing their financial guarantees in the future. It is now established that a communal perspective ignores these facts. This occurred in this movie too.

The negative image of Pakistan and Muslims is depicted in the movie. The movie conveys that Muslims are looters as made to infer from the dialogue, *“Loot lo Sab Maal”* (00:05:05s). Many dialogues delineate that the director has stereotyped Muslim characters, like that of Ashraf Ali. It is known that those who migrated from here wanted to stay in this country more than Pakistan. They desired to meet their old Hindu and Sikh friends even after migrating. But in this movie, a different approach is

used. After partition, when Ashraf Ali comes to India to take Sakina with him, it is demonstrated that Ashraf Ali hates India, and Indian people and its religion. It is stated in the conversation between Ashraf Ali and Sakina in the aeroplane.

Sakina: *Abbu, aap yaha taka aye or niche utre bhi nahi.*

Ashraf: *Agar ham hindostan ki jamin pr paanv rakhte to hajaron jakham ubhar aate is jameen ne hamre bete Aslam ko bhi hamse chheen liya. Or vese bhi ab na to ye jamin hamari hai, na ye mulk, or na hi yahan ke log. Hmari jamin, hamare log, hamra vatan he ab Pakistan.” (1h:34m).*

Sakina: Father! you came here and did not step down?

Ashraf: If I had stepped out on the soil of India, it would have reopened a thousand wounds. This land has even snatched my son Aslam from me. And anyway, neither this land, nor the country, and neither its people are ours. Our motherland, our people, our country, is now Pakistan. (English Translation)

By hearing this, Sakina is shocked, because her father has a very opposite viewpoint. There are other instances of stereotyping Muslim characters. One is that Muslims produce many children. Gul Khan has six children which are not managed by him properly. So, these are the instances of stereotyping Muslim characters and making them ‘Other’ along with Pakistan, thus depicting them as the enemy of the Hindu nation which is India.

The movie *Gadar* reveals that it is the politics which divide people. The people of India and Pakistan want to live peacefully with brotherhood, but politicians do not

like this idea of unity. As Sakina says in the movie “*Siyasi log faisle peda kare or anjaam awaam ko bhugtana pade.*” (1h: 40m) “Political people create the differences and common people have to suffer.” (English Translation). Ashraf Ali is a politician who has some aspiration for power. He wants to promote his son into politics as his heir but Aslam, the son of Ashraf Ali, gets killed in riots during the partition. Ashraf Ali’s dream does not come true because his son Aslam is no more now but when he comes to know that Sakina is alive in India and visiting them soon. Then his political aspiration becomes alive again. He says to Sarfraz”

“*Sakina ke aa jane se hame jine ka maksad mil gya. Ab hame Aslam ki kami mahsus nhi hogi.*” (1h:37M)

“Because of Sakina now I have found the purpose of life. Now, I don’t feel Aslam’s need”

We can see the political aspiration of Ashraf Ali when he talks to Sakina:

Ashraf Ali: *Saku, Hamara har kadam aage ki or jata hai or tumhare sahmne political ki vo jeena h jiski sidhiya siyasat ki sabse uchi kursi tak jati hai. Me tumhe Pakistan ka mustkhibil banne dekhana chahta hu.*”

Ashraf Ali: Saku our every step goes further. This way goes to the highest power. I want to see you as a successful leader of Pakistan. (English translation)

When Sakina comes to Lahore, Ashraf Ali wants to keep Sakina with him and wants to achieve political benefits by marrying her to Salim, an army man, and the son of Sarfaraz but Sakina perpetually refuses to do so. She wants to go back to India and wants to live her life peacefully with her husband and son. Ashraf Ali gets angry at her. He tries to marry her forcefully without taking her consent. Sakina's mother also supports her father and tries to convince her. Thus, we see the role of politics in human relationships and how it teaches us to hate other people or divide us for their personal gains.

Indian nationalism is very inclusive in nature. We can see the mixed culture of India in the movie. In pre-partition India where we see that missionaries are running the college and Hindu and Muslim girls are pursuing studies there. Tara Singh and Dharmiyan are Sikhs who supply things at the college canteen. The canteen manager is also Hindu.

We see Sakina performing western dance and playing badminton at that time. Two Sikh soldiers are also guarding Ashraf Ali. Gul Khan's relationship with Tara Singh and his family shows harmony and tolerance. Thus, we see a lot of cases of Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, and Christians, which illustrate mixed culture or inclusive nationality in pre-partition India. We know that Indian nationalism is anti-colonial in nature.

We see many scenes in the movie which represent Indian nationalism. For example, Wali Mohammad is a symbol of Indian nationalism. He is a follower of Mahatma Gandhi. He has worked as a freedom fighter. He represents thousands of Muslims, who have fought along with Hindu and Sikh against Britishers. Now, in the

movie, he has lost control over his mind. He lives in the past in 1946. In his fantasy Hindustan has not got freedom yet. We see Wali for the first time when Sakina comes to Lahore airport. Through his dialogues, we can agree that he is an anti-Britisher and still thinking that Nehru Ji is coming and by seeing the Britisher he chants “Go Back Britishers” (01:36:07s). He says:

Wali: *Aajadi mil gai, aajadi mil gai, Hindustan aajad ho gya. Mulk ajaad ho gya! Band karo ye sab kya bja rhe o aap log, agar bajana hai to ye bajao. Sare Jaha se Acha Hindostan hamara!*

Someone: *Roko Ise.*

Wali: *“Dur hato, Dur hato a duniyawalo Hindustan hamara hai”*

Ashraf Ali: *Chup kar Hindostan ke bache*

Wali: *Me kyon chup rahu. Me ek sachha Hindostani hu”* (2h:1m)

Wali: we are free now, India got freedom, stop It! If you want to play music, then, play India is best. (*Sare Jahan se Accha*)

Someone: What are you saying? Stop him!

Wali: Move back, move back, O people of the world, India is ours!

Ashraf: shut-up, you fool!

Wali: Why should I shut up? I am a true Indian, (English translation)

The song ‘*Dur hato a duniyawalo Hindustan hamara hai*’ (02:02:09s) is taken from the movie *Kismet* which was released in pre-partition India in 1943. In this song, Indian nationalism is depicted which is anti-colonial; and where both Hindu and Sikhs were fighting against the British Government. Britishers stopped this type of movie which spreads messages against them, through censorship but Indians, however, very cleverly managed to release this movie. Britishers wanted to arrest Kavi Pardeep, but he convinced Britishers that this song is against the Japanese not Britishers. Kavi Pardeep used the word ‘German’ ‘*Ya Japani*’ to pass the song against censorship of the British Government. He knew that they would not let him release this song. He fooled the Britishers. However, Indians understand the meaning of this song that it was against Britishers. Britishers realised very late that it was against them. Till then, this song was on the lips of every freedom fighter. They used to sing it in jails. This song is very inclusive and pluralistic in nature. It supports Indian nationalism. This song mentioned all the religious groups which were together fighting against the colonial power at that time. At the end of the movie, Wali Mohammad delivers Gandhiji’s message when he says:

Wali: “*Ye duniya insaniyat se chalti hai, mohabbat se chalti hai, Gandhi Ji ne bhi yahi kaha hai, Ahimsa Paramo Dharma*”, which means: non-violence is the highest moral virtue or that humanity is the biggest religion above all other religions” (02:54:56s).

In this chapter, the movie *Gadar: Ek Prem Katha* have been studied as a text by applying the theme of nationalism. This movie clearly illustrates the evidence supporting nationalism. The European model of nationalism which mainly occurs after the partition of India in this movie, has been observed. Indian model of nationalism

which mainly occurred in pre-partitioned India has been also observed. Muslim, Islam, and Pakistan are made 'Other' in the movie. This movie supports the jingoistic form of nationalism on the name of patriotism. *Gadar: Ek Prem Katha* is a jingoistic movie than other movies which are based on the same love story of Boota Singh. Hence, *Gadar: Ek Prem Katha* supports the European model of nationalism predominantly.

Works Cited:

- Ahmed, Rauf (2013), personal interview by Najma Khatun, Mumbai, 28 August.
- Bhaumik, S. N. (2005), 'Politics of Indian War Movies', *South Asian Journal*, 10, October-December, pp. 116–126.
- Dadhe, Kasturi. *Religious and Nationalist Trends in Modern Bollywood Cinema*. ZAA 57.1 (2009): 9-20.
- Khatun, N. (2016), 'Imagining Muslims as the "Other" in Muslim political movies', *Journal of Arab & Muslim Media Research*, 9: 1, pp. 41–60, doi:10.1386/jammr.9.1.41_1.
- Rajgopal, S. S. (2011), 'Bollywood and neonationalism: The emergence of nativism as the norm in Indian conventional cinema', *South Asian Popular culture*, 9: 3, October, pp. 237–246.
- Unnithan, Sandeep. "Religious Protests against Period Film *Gadar* Put Free Speech on the Boil." *India Today*, 18 Oct. 2012, www.indiatoday.in/magazine/controversy/story/20010709-religious-protests-against-period-film-gadar-put-free-speech-on-the-boil-773738-2001-07-09.

CHAPTER – III

A STUDY OF *LAGAAN*: *ONCE UPON A TIME IN INDIA*

Movies affect our consciousness and one become passive and unresponsive while consuming the movies. They impact our mind, shape us, and make our opinion, identity, and create our desires subtly or impliedly. As the director of *Lagaan* states: “Movies must entertain, but also must leave something behind with the audience” (Ashutosh Gowariker *Live Journal*). The movies tell us and inform us in a subtle but powerful way - who and what we are; what we really want; what is right and what is wrong and what we should aspire to be?

There is no single movie without a message. It is impossible to watch a movie without being affected by these messages. On a surface level, “*Lagaan* is a movie about the tenacity of the human spirit, realizing impossible dreams. *Lagaan* is an anti-colonial narrative, a tale of collective movement, and the victory of the underdog” (LiveJournal *Lagaan*).

According to Farred, “*Lagaan* is posited simultaneously as a critique of the anticolonial past and the postcolonial present. Through the 19th century event of the cricket match between the British cantonment and Champaner’s villagers” (94)

Lagaan is a period movie. The story of *Lagaan* is set during the colonized India of the 1890s. Britishers used to take taxes from local kings and rulers and in exchange of protection from another ruler or king. They had settled this deal with each king to maintain their exploitation. In this deal, the kings had to give half of the tax to the Britishers and a half they kept for themselves to sustain their luxurious life. Both

Britishers and local rulers had no problem with this type of system. Both were enjoying this deal but only the poor peasants were suffering the burden of this deal. For crop production, they had to depend on seasonal rain. If there was no rain, then there would be no crop. There might have been the chances of drought due to scarcity of water. If this type of situation arose, then in order to pay the taxes, they had to sell their home and land.

The movie *Lagaan* is set in this background. The movie represents India of 1893 in the kingdom of Champaner. Raja Puran Singh is the king of the Champaner. The peasants have paid half taxes last year due to inadequate rain. This year too, there is not a single drop of rain. Consequently, there is no crop. Thus, the people of the Champaner are not in a condition to pay the full taxes to the Britishers. They believe that they have not prayed in a specific temple, which lies in a different kingdom. Raja Puran Singh has a hostile relationship with that ruler. He wants Andrew Russell to meditate on this matter, but Andrew Russell puts one condition to Raja Puran Singh that if he can eat meat which is lying in front of him, then only he can help Raja Puran Singh. As told in the movie that Raja Puran Singh is vegetarian. He refuses to eat meat. Then, it makes Andrew Russell angry and he says that the people of Champaner have to pay double Lagaan (tax). He states the reason for this being that last year they had paid half tax. Now, they have to pay their rest and same year tax as well, even though the King had already informed Russell of the inability of the peasants to pay the taxes. Raja Puran Singh is also an arrogant person. He does not pay much attention to his people. He sends his men in the kingdom to announce the double 'Lagaan', which they had to pay immediately. So instead of relief, the suffering of peasants is further increased. The burden of taxation has no effects on Raja Puran Singh. The people of Champaner go to

meet Raja Puran Singh, where they find that the Raja is busy watching a cricket match with Britisher. There Andrew Russell encounters Bhuvan. Thinking about the previous matter, Captain Russell gambles with the peasants of Champaner to enter into a bet, according to which if the peasants manage win a game of cricket against Britishers' team, then the tax will be waived off for three years, not only for the village, but also for the entire province but if they lose, they will have to pay triple tax (*Lagaan*). With courage and conviction, the spirited young farmer, Bhuvan persuades his villagers into accepting the bet. He also makes a team and tries to learn a game they have never heard of or seen before. He accepts the challenge thrown down by Russell. The decision of accepting the challenge by Bhuvan is not welcomed by the villagers at all. They request Andrew Russell to reconsider this issue, but he clearly says no to it. Bhuvan tries to convince his people. He says that they have no choice, except to accept this challenge. In the village, no one comes with Bhuvan except Gauri. Then, the farmers of other villages come to beat Bhuvan for his deed. Bhuvan is saved by the village's chief, who convinces Bhuvan to seek pardon from Andrew Russell. Raja displays the inability to convey this message to Andrew Russell. Then, Bhuvan comes to the village and starts making a cricket team. He is joined one by one, except for Lakha. Lakha likes Gauri, but Gauri does not reflect the same feelings as Lakha has for her. She has already reserved her feelings for Bhuvan. Lakha wants to possess Gauri by hook and cook. After that, to learn the game of cricket, Bhuvan with his fellows, goes to watch the game. They watch it secretly. Elizabeth spots them while watching secretly. She talks to them through a translator. She falls in love with Bhuvan at the first sight. She believes that the game should be fair, so she promises to help them in learning cricket. When she comes to train them, Lakha learns of her love for Bhuvan, and he directly goes to Andrew Russell to report it. Then Lakha is instructed to be a part of Bhuvan's

team and help the Britishers in winning the cricket match. However, this secret is revealed by Elizabeth to the villagers. By observing the truth, they run after Lakha to kill him. Lakha runs into the temple to save himself from the mob. In that situation Bhuvan saves Lakha from the mob, after which Lakha promises to help them secretly. Bhuvan gives one chance to Lakha to prove his loyalty to his people. Next day, Lakha proves his loyalty by taking numerous catches during fielding. Finally with the help of Lakha, Buwan is able to win the match. At the end of the match, clouds appear in the sky, and it begins to rain. It seems that rain is welcoming their victory over the Britishers. Thus, Bhuvan is able to save tax for three years. A few months later, Britishers removed the cantonment in that area. After losing the match, Andrew Russell is transferred to South Africa and he has to pay the rest of the tax by himself. When Elizabeth realizes the fact that Bhuvan loves Gauri and vice-versa, she initially feels upset but says nothing. She goes back to London, where she never marries anyone throughout her life. This movie ends with a happy conclusion.

In the movie, there are many subplots, which run simultaneously. There are two love triangles in the movie. The one has Gauri in the centre with Bhuvan and Lakha, both being fond of Gauri but she loves Bhuvan, not Lakha. On the other hand, there is Bhuvan in the centre, and both Gauri and Elizabeth love Bhuvan but he loves Gauri and not Elizabeth, even though he has some hidden feelings for her. This love triangle reminds us of the story of Radha and Krishna, where Krishna loved Radha but married Rukmani. In this movie, Elizabeth symbolizes Radha, and as Radha could not marry Krishna, Elizabeth could not marry Bhuvan. Bhuvan symbolizes Krishna, who marries Gauri just as Krishna married Rukmani. Only the fundamental difference is that, Radha marries another person but, in the movie, Elizabeth remains celibate throughout her

life. There is a song in the movie which tries to depict the story of Radha and Krishna. In *Lagaan*, Gauri plays the part of Radha and Bhuvan the role of Krishna in the song and dance "*Radha Kaise Na Jale*"(01:32:08s) (Why Radha shouldn't be jealous?). However, Elizabeth seems to embody the character of Radha by loving Bhuvan (Krishna) and never marrying, while Gauri, like Queen Rukmini, is expected to marry Bhuvan (Krishna).

Lagaan is set in the late nineteenth century when Indian cricket was born and its first achievements were recorded. The first Test (International match) between India and England was played in 1932 at Lords, the game's spiritual home. Ashis Nandy, a cultural theorist, writes, "Cricket is an Indian game accidentally discovered by the English". Cricket is the most popular sport in India. (*A Tao of Cricket*) Historically, it was a sport reserved for the upper caste. Before the introduction of the one-day format, a match would take a full six days to complete (rest day included). Spectators must have five whole work days as holiday if they want to watch a test match.

The final 80 minutes of an approximately 4-hour movie are devoted to a cricket match between the villagers of Champaner and the British cantonment but this movie has something else beyond a cricket game. Farred says "*Lagaan* dramatizes the historic role cricket plays in developing and expressing a subaltern Indian consciousness" (97). James also argued that, "cricket is the primary vehicle for Black Caribbean resistance to White colonial rule". "They", the brilliant Trinidadian all-rounder Learie Constantine reminded his friend James, "are no better than we" (James 112). Farred says that, "Cricket was the cultural and political language of democracy transcribed onto the ovals of England, the Raj, and the Caribbean" (94). A Victorian poet, Andrew Lang, remarks, "Cricket is a very humanizing game. It appeals to the emotions of local

patriotism and pride. It is eminently unselfish; the love of it never leaves us and binds all brethren together, whatever their politics and rank may be” (Daft 13-14).

The theme of nationalism is predominantly depicted in the movie through images and dialogues. In the movie, we see a local rural cricket team, which qualified as a national team because it has some characteristics of a national team, just like our modern national cricket team. In the national cricket team, players come from many places and with cultural diversity. For instance, they may belong to different states, religions, languages, cultures, castes, and creeds but they come together for some sort of common goal. The moviemaker has ensured sufficient diversity in the team, with Bhuvan, the upper caste Hindu, Deva, the Sikh, Ishmail, the Muslim potter and Kachra, the untouchable. Sengupta describes this in his words as:

The moviemaker creates an environment of nationalism even under circumstances where there is no conceptual understanding of the ideal. Therefore, *Lagaan* is more a metaphor for organization and strengthening from within at a moment of crisis than attack or resistance directed at a colonial adversary. The characterization, however, reflects the nationalist and cinematic discourse on cultural diversity as a strength rather than a drawback of the Indian national character (67).

Likewise, it happens in modern nation-states. People come together with some common values and code. They are bound together by the spirit of the constitution, which considers everyone as equal and ensures the fundamental rights of every citizen. Diversity in the cricket game suggests our inclusiveness, which is also one of the main characteristics of Indian nationalism, as discussed in the first chapter. Indian

nationalism is inclusive in nature. There is no discrimination based on language, religion, gender, caste and creed and race. So, in the making of the cricket team, we see nation-building. Farred writes: “*Lagaan* represents an imagining of how Hindus, Muslims, Dalits, and Sikhs can cooperate to defeat the Raj by joining together in a single cricket team” (104). Sengupta also approves this by saying, “The contest that ensues is an inspiring nationalist metaphor that depicts the villagers coming together in the face of opposition in spite of internal factions such as caste divisions and untouchability” (67).

Just like the diversity of India, Bhuvan’s cricket team also represents diversity. As India is composed of Hindu, Muslim, Christian, Sikh, Dalit etc, so is Bhuvan’s team. There is Hindu, Muslim, Sikh, Dalit, physically challenged, and even a Christian (Elizabeth), who supports them in winning the match. The team members belong to different castes and religions in the village. This demonstrates the making of a nation by different groups. This is also the second feature of Indian nationalism, which is its anti-colonial nature. People came together from different areas, and with linguistic and cultural diversity, to fight against colonial power during the freedom struggle. They consisted of Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs etc. In the movie, people come from different backgrounds to fight against colonial power to save them from taxes. They are also composed of different religious groups and different castes from the villages. People from another region also join them to defeat the Britishers. One of them is a Sikh, who is an ex-soldier in the British army.

The future of India is constructed through the cultural accomplishments of the past. In this case, Champaner represents India as it is imagined as the future of the secular Indian nation, imagining how Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, and Dalits

(‘Untouchables’), can collaborate and defeat colonial power. The movie idealizes a fictional national community that evokes India's core principles of a democratic, secular state, the honourable mansion of free India in which all her children may dwell. The only difference is that in real situations, people were fighting against Britishers with weapons like pistols and swords but in this movie, they are fighting with bats and balls. In a real situation, they might have to lose their life but, in the movie, they are afraid of triple tax if they lose the match. Just like in real situations some Indians had betrayed other Indians, in the movie, Lakha betrays his people. Indians defeated Britishers in 1947 and forced them to leave the country and, in the movie, Bhuvan’s team defeats them. In consequence, they remove the cantonment from that area. In the context of the movie, it suggests that this movie supports the theme of Indian nationalism. Therefore, we can say in this movie, nationalism is depicted through a cricket game.

Furthermore, this movie supports the two main ideas of Indian nationalism. One of them is the nature of inclusiveness, and another is its anti-colonial nature. Moreover, there is no support for the idea of imperialism or the policy of expansionism. The movie depicts the acceptance of all cultures, castes, religions, and languages. These are the chief characteristics of Indian nationalism. This movie truly represented the idea of Indian nationalism at a time when there was insurgency in the Kashmir valley and tensions across the border area. Kargil war had happened at that time. Babri Mosque had been demolished. Riots in Bombay and other areas had taken place. Tension was at its peak with Pakistan. The movie *Lagaan* was released after or during these incidents, but without showing minority communities as ‘Others’ and stereotyping them. The director made this movie at a very vulnerable time. This is the main reason that this

movie was commended by international audiences and critics in many movie festivals. This movie delivers the message of inclusiveness and the power of tolerance to an Indian audience. This movie is also successful in conveying the theme of Indian nationalism.

Moreover, different aspects of Indian nationalism are discussed in *Lagaan*. In this movie, cricket is depicted as a national allegory. Indian cricket team players have no uniform in the match while Britishers wear a white uniform, which represents the uniformity or singularity - one of the main characteristics of European nationalism. It implies that they are acknowledging the European model of nationalism, which supports the idea of one nation, based on one language, one religion, one race, one ruler. Thus, the uniform of the Britisher's player suggests the same, which means they believe in singularity.

On the other hand, the Indian cricket team in the movie depicts different colours and diversity through players. This also signifies that India is a land of different colours and diversity. India consists of different geographies, for instance, mountains, plains, plateaus, desert, rivers, and forests. India has different weather seasons. India is a multicultural, multilinguistic, multi-religious society. In this movie, we see people from different strata of society, speaking dialogues in several dialects of Hindi. They communicate with each other in Purvi Hindi, Awadhi, Braj, standard Hindi, and Britishers speak English. This is also the main feature of Indian nationalism, which is acknowledged by the clothes and language of players of the Indian cricket team. The language and uniform of Britishers make them close to the European model of nationalism.

Initially upper-castes dominated the cricket game. In this movie also, it is portrayed that who should be included and who should be excluded from the game, is decided by upper-caste Hindu. For instance, in the movie, when Bhuvan decides to include Kahchra in the team, other members of the team do not welcome the decision taken by Bhuvan. They say if he includes Kachra in the team, they will not play. We can see an initial aversion against Kachra in the movie. So, it is decided by upper-caste Hindu people whom to include and whom to exclude in the team. Likewise, in the nation-state, whom to include and whom to exclude is the significant question. Who will decide the inclusion and exclusion of other groups becomes a very significant question of the day? This also remarks about Muslims in India, who are legally included in the nation-state but actually, they are excluded. Thus, we can say that this movie is about inclusivity and exclusiveness, both in society and nation-state. Cricket should be viewed as an allegory of the nation.

If we observe world politics, we can see a lot of instances where majoritarian groups play an important role in deciding the policy of the nation. Hindus make up the majority in India. They play an important role in Indian politics and any government may try to appease them. Likewise in Pakistan, Muslims make up the majority. They affect the main policies of the government. Pakistan's politicians try to appease them to take the vote from them. Similar policies, politics and methods are followed in the USA and so on.

If we interpret *Lagaan* from the postcolonial angle, it has many perspectives. It will also help us define modern nationalism. Nationalism in India means a change in people's understanding of their identity and sense of belonging. The growth of modern

nationalism is closely connected to the anti-colonial movement. People first identified their unity in the process of their struggle with colonialism. Sengupta writes:

A global culture, be it in colonial political form or post-globalization economic form, has always been a factor in shaping national culture in India, including the culture of cinema; nationalism, political resistance and the role of hegemonic discourse in supplanting these. At the same time, any analysis of the strengths of Indian cinema remains incomplete without an examination of the extent to which it resists global/western influences and stereotyping through the concepts of nationalism and national identity (11).

We see a white woman offering a cultural education to the colonized in the movie. The white woman teaches the villagers the game of the British, an interference that serves both as an anticipatory and mediating function in the movie and as an ideological betrayal of the colonial rule by one of its own.

Bhuvan becomes the embodiment of Indian resistance - he represents a Gandhian India, with the entire subcontinent united. He is the brave and courageous villager who has grown tired of colonial rule's injustices, as well as the colonizer's complicity and extreme poverty. In this movie, the director never thought about bringing the match to a draw. In this, it is expected either you will win the match or you will lose the match. As in nationalism either one achieves a nation-state or one gets suppression like, rebellion either succeeds or crashes.

Champaner's victory is negligible, given the cultural inequities. However, *Lagaan* suggests that Bhuvan does not want to fight directly with colonial power, though he is portrayed as a nationalist hero in the movie. Rather, he just seeks

economic relief. The “Indian” peasantry is oppressed by both indigenous landlords and British colonisers. Raja and members of the British government are in the middle of the political spectrum; they are neither good nor bad. Captain Andrew Russell is the embodiment of evil. *Lagaan* demonstrates how colonialism's violence creates a narrow but deep gap between the 19th-century Indian peasant class and the managerial Indian elite. Puran Singh may be colonised, but his slavery is not on the same level as Bhuvan's or the villagers of Champaner province. Recognizing the inequity within the ‘Indian’ community, *Lagaan* shows how Indian society was divided during the British Raj.

Thus, Champaner acquires anticolonial politics through cultural conflict. Thus, cricket provides a place where the ideal nation's fantasy can be imagined, recovered, and realized, although within the boundaries of Bombay cinema's fictional world. Every nation-state has a boundary; therefore, the game of cricket has a boundary too. Cricket plays a huge role in the movie. The villagers can become nationalist warriors by learning the game. Therefore, it serves as a metaphor for political adulthood. The anticolonial past coincides with the reimagined Indian future in *Lagaan*. In a single gesture, the movie expresses both grief and hope. It is an imagining of what India symbolically was during the Raj system and what it could be in the future, as a product of the past. Thus, in *Lagaan*, the future of India is constructed through the cultural accomplishment of the past.

This movie also suggests that the people of Champaner do not rebel against the British oppression. The challenge of the cricket match is accepted either out of desperation or as an opportunity. The movie delivers a message to the viewer that

oppression is tolerable until it becomes a question of life and death. Thus, *Lagaan* strengthens the notion of hierarchy and does not challenge the status quo.

The plot revolves around the central theme of the *Lagaan* (tax) and cricket match, the question of caste comes up in the movie for five minutes only. However, those five minutes are very important in order to understand the roles of the different castes in a filmic village. The director, in fact, never revealed the identities of the other characters. In the movie, they are referred to as peasants. The burden of caste was only carried by Kachra.

It was not decided by the *Mukhia* (chief) to fight against British forces. It was Bhuvan, who on behalf of the villagers and province, accepted the challenge of playing a gamble in the form of a cricket match. Bhuvan, though a common villager, has a more powerful position in the village than *Mukhia*. He was the one to challenge the British forces in such a game that was not played by the common person in India at that time. Bhuvan also gives very weak arguments in favour of Kachra, which all villagers agree upon. The profession of Kachra and other Dalits in the village is not depicted at all.

From the Dalit perspective, there arise many questions. Kachra's character is supposed to be based on Baloo Palwankar, the first world-class spinner the country produced (the 1910s, 1920s. In India, the word Kachara means 'garbage', or 'useless'. Kachra was selected in the cricket team because of his disability, not for his genuine talent. He was instructed to use his disabled hand to throw the ball instead of his normal hand. It is clear that Kachara could not make decisions about his bowling. Thus, a Dalit is further marginalized. Bhuvan is the one who notices this innate talent. Kachra

is not aware of it. Kachra here is wordless, as if he is dumb. The subaltern cannot speak. Dalits have no agency of their own to talk about themselves. They have to depend on the upper castes for everything. They have no right to make any decision. Then, why is he helping Bhuvan? In the movie, the consent of Kachra is also not taken. He has to do whatever the upper castes order him to do. A question about whether double taxation affects Kachra also arises? It is unclear whether Kachra is even aware of why the game of cricket is being played. Another question is: what are the major problems that Dalits are facing with the white colonizer-state? Are not their problems more closely linked to the caste-colonialism sustained by the Raja and the upper caste Hindus of the village. In the movie, we can ask why Kachra is playing for Bhuvan and the upper castes in the village? Kachra is not a peasant in the village. This is how *Lagaan* affects the Dalits of Champaner.

Lagaan needs to have a Dalit character to make the movie more inclusive. In the final scene, Kachra is presented as someone completely useless to the team at a moment when winning the match matters the most. The traditional notion that the Dalit cannot be a hero is also maintained in this movie. The hero must come from upper-caste Hindu. By chance, there happens to be a no-ball and a single run is taken, and control comes to Bhuvan who hits the winning six on the last ball and becomes the hero of the match. Thus, we see how the Dalit character is further marginalised in mainstream Hindi Cinema.

Works Cited:

Daft, Richard. *Kings of Cricket*. J.W. Arrowsmith, 1893.

G Farred, 'The double temporality of Lagaan: cultural struggle and postcolonialism',
Journal of Sports & Social Issues, 28 (2), 2004, pp 93 – 114.

James, Cyril Lionel Robert. *Beyond a Boundary*. Amsterdam-Netherlands, Netherlands,
Amsterdam University Press, 1993.

Lagaan, A Khan (producer) & A Gowariker (director), India: 2001, 215 minutes.

Lagaan_Mania. "Lagaan" 13 Apr. 2007, lagoon-mania.livejournal.com. <http://lagoon-mania.livejournal.com>.

Sengupta, Aparajita, "*Nation, Fantasy, And Mimicry: Elements of Political Resistance in Postcolonial Indian Cinema*" (2011). University of Kentucky Doctoral Dissertations. 129. https://uknowledge.uky.edu/gradschool_diss/129.

CONCLUSION

Hence, it can be concluded that both the movies adopted a different approach in representing nationalism. Both movies are period movies, meaning set in the past. Both movies take the story from the Indian epic the *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata*. The story of *Gadar* is inspired by the *Ramayana*. Ram goes to Sri Lanka and destroys it to save his wife. Same way in *Gadar*, Tara Singh goes to Pakistan to save his wife, and destroy Pakistan's army and Ashraf Ali's man. Both have a common enemy as another country and people of another nationality. In both movies, the hero fights for himself and his family. The villain is defeated at the end of both movies. A challenge or conditions are put in front of the hero and the hero accepts the challenge along with the condition.

Captain Andrew Russell is made the villain in the eye of the spectators, and they ignore caste, gender and religious issues that are already hierarchical economically, as well as the complex and ambiguous relationship that exists between some colonizers and some Indians. Farred states in his argument that *Lagaan* is presenting the secular future of India through the past: "*Lagaan* offers itself as the future anterior. Champaner represents the future of the secular Indian state imagined through its anterior location in the imaginary moment" (110).

Further, if we compare both movies based on the theme of nationalism, we will find that *Gadar: Ek Prem Katha* is a more jingoistic movie than *Lagaan: Once Upon a Time in India*. *Gadar: Ek Prem Katha* supports the idea of the European model of nationalism. It depicts Muslim and Islam as 'Other' and enemy of the nation. On the other hand, *Lagaan: Once Upon a Time in India* movie supports the idea of Indian

nationalism. In the movie, we can see people come from different backgrounds and they are fighting together against the colonial power. *Lagaan* does not support the theme of the European model of nationalism at all. In conclusion, we can say that *Lagaan* demonstrated true nationalism. Limitation of *Lagaan: Once Upon a Time in India* is only from a Dalit perspective.

In order to solve the problem of modern nationalism, we have to be united on such nationalism which has no threat to modern society. We must be united on some common modern values, which are more democratic, secular, and must develop the culture of pluralism. The focus on the idea of multiculturalism, diversity in language, must be increased. The rights of minorities in terms of religion, language, race, etc. must be protected. These common modern values must be humanitarian in nature. Only with this kind of nationalism can we live united in the time of globalization. It is observed that the European model of nationalism is not affordable. The world has to follow the idea of inclusive Indian nationalism or Third world nationalism which shows that multiple cultures can co-exist with tolerance.

This research will help in further inter-disciplinary research. More movies can be taken as primary texts to study the various forms of nationalism. We can apply the various themes of nationalism in different cinemas and on the OTT platforms. Web series are a new trend in India. The Muslim characters in the movies can also be studied to examine how they are depicted and stereotyped in cinema.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources:

Lagaan: Once Upon Time in India. Directed by Ashutosh Gowariker. Amir Khan Productions. 2001.

Gadar: Ek Prem Katha. Directed by Anil Sharma. Zee Entertainment enterprises. 2001.

Secondary sources:

Ahmed, Rauf (2013), personal interview by Najma Khatun, Mumbai, 28 August.

Arjun Appadurai, —Patriotism and Its Futures. *Public Culture* 5: 3 (1993): 411-429.

Banerjea, Surendranath. *A Nation in Making*. Rupa Publications, 2016.

Bhabha, Homi K. *Nation & Narration*. Routledge, 2013.

Bhaumik, S. N. (2005), 'Politics of Indian War Films', *South Asian Journal*, 10, October-December, pp. 116–126.

Budha, K. 'Genre development in the age of markets and nationalism: The war film', in Meenakshi Bharat and Nirmal Kumar (eds), *Filming the Line of Control: The Indo-Pak Relationship through the Cinematic Lens*, New Delhi: Routledge, 2008.

Dadhe, Kasturi. *Religious and Nationalist Trends in Modern Bollywood Cinema*. ZAA 57.1 (2009): 9-20

Dadhe, Kasturi. *Religious and Nationalist Trends in Modern Bollywood Cinema*. ZAA 57.1 (2009): 9-20.

Daft, Richard. *Kings of Cricket*. J.W. Arrowsmith, 1893.

Dey, Simantini. “‘When Sr Bachchan Angrily Asked...’: The Man Who Gave ‘Bollywood’ Its Name Shares How Indian Media Became a.” *News18*, 21 Dec. 2019, www.news18.com/news/india/when-sr-bachchan-angrily-asked-man-who-gave-bollywood-its-name-shares-how-indian-media-became-brand-2431941.html.

G Farred, ‘The double temporality of Lagaan: cultural struggle and postcolonialism’, *Journal of Sports & Social Issues*, 28 (2), 2004, pp 93 – 114.

Garner, Bryan A., ed. *"nation"*. *Black's Law Dictionary (10th ed.)*, 2014. p. 1183

Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Cambridge: Blackwell, 1983.

Golwalkar. *Bunches of Thoughts*. First, Sahitya Sindhu Prakashana, 2021.

Guha, Ramchandra. “Four reasons why Hindutva is rising in India: Ramachandra Guha's speech at KLF.” YouTube, uploaded by TNIE videos, 18 Jan 2020, www.youtube.com/watch?v=_hn97l86_Zw.

Ians. “Bollywood, a Derogatory Term, Say Indian Actors.” *DNA India*, 2 July 2007, www.dnaindia.com/entertainment/report-bollywood-a-derogatory-term-say-indian-actors-1107587.

James, Cyril Lionel Robert. *Beyond a Boundary*. Amsterdam-Netherlands, Netherlands, Amsterdam University Press, 1993.

Kautsky, J. *Communism and the Politics of Development: Persistent Myths and Changing Behavior*. 99th ed., Wiley, 1968.

Khatun, N. (2016), 'Imagining Muslims as the "Other" in Muslim political films', *Journal of Arab & Muslim Media Research*, 9: 1, pp. 41–60, DOI: 10.1386/jammer.9.1.41_1

Kohn Hans. *Nationalism: Its Meaning and History*. USA: Van Nostrand, 1965.

---. *The Idea of Nationalism: A Study in Its Origin and Backgrounds*. Routledge Publication, 2017.

---. "Nationalism." *www.Britannica.com*, <https://www.britannica.com/topic/nationalism> accessed by 03 July 2020

Lagaan, A Khan (producer) & A Gowariker (director), India: 2001, 215 minutes.

Lagaan_Mania. "*Lagaan*" 13 Apr. 2007, lagaan-mania.livejournal.com. <http://lagaan-mania.livejournal.com>.

Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. *Karl Marx and Frederick Engels: Selected Works*. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1969.

"Nation" *Online Etymology Dictionary*. www.etymonline.com. www.etymonline.com/word/nation. Accessed 22 Sept. 2021.

"Nationalism" *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*, www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com. <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/nationalism?q=nationalisms>. Accessed 22 Sept. 2021.

Paul, James. *Nation Formation: Towards a Theory of Abstract Community*. London, Sage Publication, 1996.

Rai, Amit (2003). "Patriotism and the Muslim Citizen in Hindi Films." *Harvard Asia Quarterly* 7.3. <<http://www.asiaquarterly.com>> (April 25, 2006).

Rajgopal, S. S. (2011), 'Bollywood and neo-nationalism: The emergence of nativism as the norm in Indian conventional cinema', *South Asian Popular culture*, 9: 3, October, pp. 237–246.

Roy Armes, *Third World Film Making and the West*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.

Sarswati, Swami Dayanand. *Satyarth Prakash*. Abhishek Publications, 2017.

Savarkar, V. *Hindutva*. Hindi Sahitya Sadan, 2003.

Sen, Shiladitya (2013), personal interview, Kolkata, 13 March, 23 August. Khatun, N. (2016), 'Imagining Muslims as the "Other" in Muslim political films', *Journal of Arab & Muslim Media Research*, 9: 1, pp. 41–60, doi:10.1386/jammmr.9.1.41_1

Sengupta, Aparajita, "*Nation, Fantasy, And Mimicry: Elements of Political Resistance in Postcolonial Indian Cinema*" (2011). University of Kentucky Doctoral Dissertations. 129. https://uknowledge.uky.edu/gradschool_diss/129.

Sethi, Manisha, "Cine-Patriotism." *Samar*, Issue 15, 2002. <http://www.samarmagazine.org/archive/article.php?id=115> accessed by March 25, 2021.

Singh, K., and Anthropological Survey of India. *People of India*. Anthropological Survey of India, 1992.

Smith, Anthony D. "Culture, Community and Territory: The Politics of Ethnicity and Nationalism." *International Affairs*, vol. 72, no. 3, 1996, pp. 445–58. *Crossref*, doi:10.2307/2625550.

---. *Nationalism: Theory, Ideology, History*. Polity Press, 2010.

---. *The Nation Made Real: Art and National Identity in Western Europe, 1600-1850*. Illustrated, Oxford University Press, 2013.

---. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1986.

Tagore, Rabindranath. *Nationalism*. Fingerprint Publishing, 2018.

Tejaswini, Ganti. *Bollywood: A Guidebook to Popular Hindi Cinema*. New York: Routledge, 2004.

Thapar, Romila. "The History Debate and School Textbooks in India: A Personal Memoir." *History Workshop Journal*, no. 67, 2009, pp. 87–98. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/40646211.

Unnithan, Sandeep. "Religious Protests against Period Film *Gadar* Put Free Speech on the Boil." *India Today*, 18 Oct. 2012, www.indiatoday.in/magazine/controversy/story/20010709-religious-protests-against-period-film-gadar-put-free-speech-on-the-boil-773738-2001-07-09.

Zocalo. "The Philosopher Who Coined the Term 'Nationalism' Also Preached Inclusivity." *Zócalo Public Square*, 9 Jan. 2019, www.zocalopublicsquare.org/2019/01/09/philosopher-coined-term-nationalism-also-preached-inclusivity/ideas/essay.