

Changing Face Of Indian Media And Entertainment Industry In The Wake Of Globalization

By: Pawan Kr Tiwari* & Deepak Upadhyaya**

Introduction

“Mera jootha hey Janani; ye pathloon Englishtani;
Sar pe laal topi Ruussi; phir bhi dil hey Hindustani”

(My shoes are Japanese; my trousers English;
The hat on my head is Russian; but my heart's Indian)

Song from the Hindi movie- Shree 420 (Mr. 420, Raj Kapoor, 1955)

What is globalization? Is it the integration of economic, political, and cultural systems across the globe? Or is it Americanization of world culture and the United States dominance of world affairs? Is globalization a force for economic growth, prosperity, and democratic freedom? Or is it a force for environmental devastation, exploitation of the developing world, and suppression of human rights? In sum, is globalization "good" or "bad"?

The term globalization was first coined in the 1980s, but the concept stretches back centuries and beyond. The forces and events leading to globalization can be traced as far back as 325 B.C. when King Chandragupta Maurya, triggered the first globalization revolution by combining the expansive powers of a world religion, trade economy, and imperial armies for the first time to connect India with the Mediterranean, Persia, and Central Asia. Between 500 BC –850 AD, Islam followed suit by expanding from Western Mediterranean to India. The discovery of the 'New World' by Columbus in 1492 was significant in that it brought together peoples who had been separated for over 10,000 years. In 1498 Vasco Da Gama started navigating the world waterway in an effort to connect the globe. The former discovered the Americas and the latter discovered the sea route to India. These discoveries set the stage for rivalries that engulfed the advanced capitalist countries between 17th and 19th centuries and sowed the seeds of globalization. The emergence of the world's first multinationals - the British East India Company (in 1600) and the Dutch East India Company (in 1602) - that truly launched the process that has matured into the current economic integration of the world.

Thus, historically, globalization is not a new concept. Thousands of years before the root word for this concept - 'globe' - came into use, our ancestors had already spread across the earth. However in recent years and there has been a growing body of research on the role of mass media in augmenting the process of globalization in all countries across the world, making it a global village. Traditional definitions of globalization, focuses on economics and the effects of multinational corporations. Globalization, in the eyes of some scholars, pundits, and policy makers, is a process, a system, a force, an age, or a revolution. Others have used globalization interchangeably with words like internationalization, liberalization, universalization, and westernization.

The “information superhighway”, the internet, e-commerce, cable TV, and modern transportation also involves the dissemination of new media technologies that have tremendous impact on the polity, society, culture, and every-day lives of citizens living in developing countries. Time-space compression produced by new media and communications technologies are overcoming previous boundaries of space and time, creating a global cultural village and dramatic penetration of global forces into every realm of life in every region of the world.

Among the effects of globalization on culture, the growth of global "pop culture" tends to get the most attention, and to strike people on a visceral level. Many complain that this form of globalization is actually Americanization, because the United States is by far the biggest producer of popular culture goods. Pop culture is manifested around the world through movies, music, television shows, newspapers, satellite broadcasts, fast food and clothing, among other entertainment and consumer goods. For instance, in the United States, the entertainment industry is one of the most important spheres of economic activity. In fact, the U.S. entertainment industry generates more revenue from overseas sales than any other industry other than the commercial aerospace industry. Many would say that this new juggernaut of American industry has propelled the American pop culture around the world at a frenetic pace.

Former Canadian Prime Minister Kim Campbell observed that "images of America are so pervasive in this

global village that it is almost, as if, instead of the world immigrating to America, America has immigrated to the world, allowing people to aspire to be Americans even in distant countries."

This paper examines the topic of globalization from the perspective of the mass media interplay in the process of globalization. It has been established that the primary vehicle oscillating the phenomenon of globalization is through media products of the multinational corporations. The popularity of U.S. films, music, books, and other cultural commodities in countries across the globe is a case in point. Media globalization has aided in both the production and distribution of information. For instance, American movies and television shows, which are commonly referred to in trade parlance as audio-visual services, are therefore an important commodity among U.S. exports. As is often the case with exports and imports, exporting nations rarely acknowledge problems when one of their industries is able to capture a large or steadily increasing share of export revenues. However, when any sector of a nation's industry is threatened by foreign imports, voluminous concerns are raised. The globalization of the world economy and communications has been a vehicle for the Americanization of the globe.

Globalization enables foreign companies to distribute American cultural products, including music and books. The spread of American restaurant chains and consumer products worldwide is accompanied by the spread of American popular culture. In recent years, American movies, music, and TV shows have consistently gained more and more audiences worldwide. The products of popular musicians are also likely to be distributed by non-U.S. companies such as Japan's Sony, Germany's Bertelsmann AG, France's Vivendi, or the United Kingdom's EMI Group. Similarly, American authors are increasingly published by foreign media conglomerates, such as Bertelsmann, which owns Random House and Ballantine, or Australia's News Corporation, which owns Harper Collins Publishing and the Hearst Book Group. It is interesting to note that foreign media groups contribute to the spread of American popular culture as well. Foreign corporations earn profits by selling U.S. products, and U.S. products become more accessible worldwide. CNN exemplifies the global news network. After starting as a cable news network for the U.S. viewers only, CNN now reaches over 200 million households in over 212 countries and territories. However, television as a mass media remains there for a synergy of globalization more than movies, music, or publications.

Critics of globalization charge this phenomenon, especially spread through pop culture, is perpetrating a kind of cultural genocide on the world—that the largest, most dominant cultures are becoming larger and more dominant at the expense of many others. In this view, globalization is in fact another word for Americanization. However, others argue that globalization offers the potential to enrich the world culturally. To these people, the notion that the opportunities for cultural exchange brought about by globalization can help promote tolerance and diversity is very attractive. Their vision is of a multi-cultural "global village," where ideas and practices can be freely exchanged and marketed, of course, under guise by a few to make money out of it.

Former Director General of WTO has rightly said that "telecommunications is creating a global audience; transport is creating a global village. From Buenos Aires to Boston to Beijing or Bombay, ordinary people are watching MTV, they're wearing Levi's jeans, and they're listening to Sony Walkman as they commute to work or home" This global culture includes the proliferation of media technologies that veritably create Marshall McLuhan's dream of a "global village." These technologies allow transnational media and information companies to instantaneously traverse the globe from North to South. This process has led some to celebrate a new global information superhighway and others to attack the new wave of media pervasiveness in their lives as cultural imperialism. Dominick (2002) has noted that the production rate of information doubles every eight years. In addition, "information is being produced at a rate that is four times faster than the consumption of information". The phenomenon of media globalization along with the increasing abundance of media-text production has produced various effects which are being researched by communication scholars. Media globalization or the role of mass media in globalization is a broad topic, which includes television, radio, film, music, the internet, and other forms of new digital media.

Media globalization can be defined as the phenomenon of expanding multinational corporate media investment, resulting in the emergence of a global oligarchy of first tier corporations, which own and operate a variety of mass media content and distribution technologies including: television, radio, film, music, broadcasting,

satellite, telecommunication, cable, newspapers, magazines, publishing companies, Internet content providers, and other forms of converged digital media. In this context, it would be pertinent to say that the creation of a "global oligopoly" is taking place among a handful of multinational organizations which control worldwide media production that is giving impetus to globalization process (McChesney, 2005).

Media globalization has been a natural extension of corporate expansion on an international scale. Globalization is being driven blindly by strong international market factors fueled by organizations such as the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and of course, the World Bank. The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) is another significant stakeholder in promoting globalization policies and discourses. Sean Mac Bride and Roach (2000) pointed out, that the UNESCO constitution which was adopted in 1946 addressed the flow of international information by charging the agency to "collaborate in the work of advancing mutual understanding of people and knowledge through all means of mass communication and to that end recommend the free flow of ideas by word and image. Without question, the driving force behind globalization is motivated by economic interests of the rich nations of the First World who are holding the purse and veto to all the above mentioned international agencies. Much of the current climate of international investment and global business is a direct result of global reconstruction, which followed World War II. Both the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund were founded within a few years after the end of World War II. Critics of globalization say that capitalism is the driving force behind world economics. According to Amnesty International (2000), "of the 100 largest economies in the world, 51 are now global corporations; only 49 are countries". Critics of globalization, such as Amnesty International are concerned that developing nations are losing their national sovereignty and that, human rights violations are taking place rampantly. According to Amnesty International, "The developing nations have diminishing power to control mergers, take-over and liquidations, may not know who plans to buy or sell a major industry or utility; a telephone, TV or water company may change ownership overnight".

Another challenge of globalization is the perception that trade liberalization has exacerbated the gap between rich and poor countries in the macro level and in micro level between the rich and poor within countries that have liberalized. In trying to explain why globalization is not a win-win game, we must ask fundamental questions in terms of these four concepts: Is the information revolution beneficial to all or to some well-endowed countries? Is trade liberalization really a free trade or there are some elements of protectionism acting as a stumbling block on the way of some countries? Does internationalization of capital add up to monopoly capital, which might stifle competition or does it allow infant industries from the South to compete fairly? Does the new international division of labor engender comparative disadvantage or will it relegate the weak economy to the periphery merely as supplier of raw materials, cheap labor, and market for finished products? These questions relates to how unbridled globalization—technological innovation, trade liberalization, internationalization of capital, and the new international division of labor—could wreak havoc on some countries while simultaneously opening the doors of opportunity to others.

Sean MacBride and Roach (2000) while reviewing 1974 UNESCO study by researchers like Nordenstreng and Varis and have noted that, "The study demonstrated that a few Western nations controlled the international flow of television programs, with the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and the Federal Republic of Germany accounting for the largest shares". According to Mac Bride and Roach (2000), media globalization gained further momentum in the 1980's, when a prevailing policy of deregulation of media in many developing nations along with openness to private investment occurred. McChesney (2005) also noted this trend of free-market deregulation occurring in the eighties and the nineties, in the cable and digital satellite systems around the world.

Critics of media globalization have long held that the United States of America is far too powerful and that it exercises cultural imperialism over smaller nations by overwhelming them with media products like movies and television programs produced in the United States of America. According to Dominick (2002), there has been international reaction to charges of cultural imperialism by certain nations including Canada, Spain, and France that have placed quotas on the amount of foreign material that can be carried on their broadcasting systems.

Such is the power of the mass media in garnering international support or mobilizing public opinion and re-

sources in today's globalized world, that foreign policy decisions are sometimes driven by, especially television, images beamed around the world by satellites channels justifying war on Al Quaeda or killing of Osama Bin Laden and Gaddafi by allied forces. Who will forget Vietnam War, Weapons of Mass Destruction found in Iraq, Incubator baby being burned alive in Kuwait, recent Afghanistan War, and Libya War by the US. In this context, globalization enables a newscaster to humanize an event overseas. Seeing images of starving children and other stories of human suffering by television creates a much more powerful emotional reaction in the minds of an observer than reading a newspaper report that says "100,000 people have died as a result of a natural disaster in the floods of Koshi in Indo Nepal region".

Media Globalization or Media Imperialism

Thus from the above we have seen that although complaints of U.S. cultural imperialism are a recent phenomenon, the spread of the culture of a dominant world power is not. From the Roman Empire to 19th century European colonizers, dominant powers have spread their language and culture as a means of indirect control over their subordinates. In addition, throughout human history, people have exchanged cultural experience, ideas, values, and goods through art, trade and migrations. But never before has technology in the wake of media globalization been able to spread ideas to the masses in quite the same fashion. The massive scale in which the U.S. cultural products are being distributed and consumed has reached a level never before achieved. Researchers have noted a variety of cultural and sociological effects resulting from media globalization.

According to George Gerbner, the most successful television programs are no longer made for national consumption but rather for international distribution. George Gerbner, further, noted that the content of the television programme is affected by the desire to increase the marketability of international television program distribution. Programmes that contain violent or sexual material are considered to "travel well" according to Gerbner. In contrast, development communication programs which may be quite successful in some countries do not necessarily do well in other countries. For instance, comedy is culturally defined, and what is deemed funny by one cultural group may, in fact be, offensive to another. In comparison, violent material has a very simple story line of good versus evil. It is universally understood and in many ways culturally transparent and can make inroads to other cultures. Perhaps this explains the reason why Bollywood cinema is trying to ape Hollywood these days with extra dose of violent and explicit sex content to make inroads into newer international markets, like its American counterpart has been doing since its inception.

Robert McChesney (2005) is another scholar who has vehemently criticized multinational corporations and their role in present-day globalization in a number of ways for evils of unrestricted globalization. First, that the global media market is dominated by eight multinational corporations which also dominate the world media productions and distributions. These companies are General Electric, AT&T, Liberty Media, Disney, Time Warner, Sony, News Corporation, Viacom and Seagram, and Bertelsmann, the Germany-based conglomerate. Second, multinational corporations are increasingly becoming horizontally integrated, meaning that, these companies both create content and own publishing companies or broadcasting networks, and are able to distribute their own product. Cross-media ownership is responsible of homogenization of cultures in the media poor countries of the South. Third, international deregulation and free-market policies have created a climate that has been conducive to foreign investment in media of the developing countries. Fourth, that the World Trade Organization is threatening local culture by encouraging foreign investment in local media. McChesney has observed a trend of cultural protectionism from developing nations: Fifth, there is a well defined second tier of media conglomerates which are increasingly competing on the international level through foreign investment, mergers, and acquisitions. Half of these corporations are based in North America while the others are based in Western Europe and Japan. This observation by McChesney is interesting since the Trilateral Commission encourages economic trade between precisely these three regions. Second tier corporations include, "Dow Jones, Gannett, Knight-Ridder, Hearst, and Advance Publications, and among those from Europe are the Kirch Group, Havas, Media-set, Hachette, Pisa, Canal Plus, Pearson, Reuters and Reed Elsevier". Sixth, merger mania seems to be the rule of the day when it comes to multinational corporations. McChesney noted that sixty or seventy, first and second tier multinational corporations control a major portion of the world's media in the areas of publishing, music, broadcasting, television production, cable & satellite distribution, film production, and motion picture theater exhibition etc. Seventh, McChesney concluded that

the effect of the spread of multinational media corporations has resulted in cultural imperialism, a loss of local cultural identity. McChesney summarized the motivation of multinational media corporations as such, "The global commercial-media system is radical in that it will respect no tradition or custom, on balance, if it stands in the way of profits".

Advertising and culture of a country are related to each other. Advertising as a symbolic form of the capitalist economic system governs the principles of the social exchange in which the reciprocal limits of the world of objects and subjects are elaborated (Gallissot, 1994). The cultural significance of advertising is that it has become, in its multiple forms (printed ads, Posters, films and so on) as well as in its techniques (marketing), a full-fledged consumption goods which is part of the cultural industries as a cultural object and constitutes one of its dominant modes of production. Rise in consumer culture, mall culture in countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America where there are thousands of hungry mouths to be fed, the effects of advertising on such a society or on a group like women, children, ethnic minorities, middle class, youth etc., are devastating. It does more harm than good by giving rise to expectations and frustrations. The conception here is that advertising and mass society are at poles in the developing countries. Enticing advertising by the multinationals companies simply gives rise to a quagmire of spiraling frustrations among the masses whose expectations cannot be met in a poor society where people are living below poverty line, in less than a dollar a day who cannot afford two meals of coarse rice are shown Mc Donald's hamburger every day. The forces of globalization are intent upon giving family a new image-an image that is perfectly compatible with consumer culture and conspicuous consumption pattern attained in a society where there is no hunger and diseases.

TV and Globalization- reversal of skyvasion from India

With respect to TV it was first Indianization of the programme contents and then globalization of Indian TV fare. Prof. Daya Kishan Thussu is of the opinion that media globalization and the resultant expansion of mainly Western transnational media empires have transformed broadcasting in India. An exponential growth in the number of television channels from one state-controlled channel in 1991 to nearly 500 channels at present, within such a short span of time has profoundly changed the electronic media landscape. Introduced in 1959, television was seen as a means for disseminating state policies and public information. The main aim of the national broadcasters — AIR and Doordarshan(the national television network) was to educate, inform and create a feeling of national identity and help maintain national unity. Sky invasion by CNN and Hong Kong based STAR (Satellite Television Asian Region) TV, now part of Rupert Murdoch's News Corporation, was the first to exploit this demand when, in 1991, it started beaming a five channel satellite service (Star Plus, Prime Sports, Channel V, the BBC World and Star Movie). In 1996, STAR Plus began telecasting locally made programmes in English and Hindi, in addition to Western programmes. Other global players have followed the market leader in Asia by localizing their products to reach a wider market and increase advertising revenues: the Discovery channel, which started beaming to India in 1995, dubs its documentaries into Hindi; BBC began broadcasting Hindi news.

The implications of globalization for the Indian media are strikingly evident in the example of Zee TV, India's first private Hindi-language and most successful satellite channel. The Zee network has aimed to reach the mass market by pioneering movie-based television entertainment. Launched in 1992 by Subhash Chandra Goel, Zee TV set the standards for private television in India, breaking new grounds in domestically-produced entertainment. Employing metropolitan broadcast language codes and conventions and in adapting programme formats, such as game and chat shows, unknown in India before globalization, Zee TV scripted the most successful story in broadcasting history. Zee's success is based on a mixture of Hindi film and film-based programming, serials, music countdowns and quiz contests, aimed at a younger audience. Zee's innovative programming — such as the development of an Indianized version of MTV and use of 'Hinglish' (a mixture of Hindi and English) — has made it very popular with its growing audience. Hinglish, whose roots are in the spoken languages of north India, has been steadily gaining acceptance among urban youth across the country. In the past few years Hinglish has become the standard language in serials and game and chat shows, but Zee was the first network to elevate this new language by using it in a more serious genre such as news.

By 1998, Zee was claiming to be 'the world's largest Asian television network', covering Asia, Europe, the USA and Africa, catering to the 24 million strong Indian diaspora. In Asia, the network spans more than 40 countries and offers round the clock programming on four channels—Zee TV, Zee Cinema, Zee TV India and Zee Music Asia. Having already reached approximately 750 million homes in India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and United Arab Emirates, Zee's strategy now is to expand its operations in the lucrative markets in Western Europe and Indian heritage and culture. The expansion and global broadcast of premier Indian television channels such as Zee TV, Sony Entertainment Television, Doordarshan, and Star Network have consistently brought homegrown cultural entertainment to the diaspora. These media channels have delivered popular serials such as the hugely successful television adaptation of Mahabharata, Ramayana, and then the onslaught of family saga soaps such as Kahani Ghar Ghar Ki (The Story of Every Home), Ghar Ek Mandir Hai (Home is a Temple), and Kyunki Saas Bhi Kabhi Bahu Thi (Because a Mother-in-Law was once a Daughter-in-Law too). These shows were designed for the burgeoning middle-class in India and also served as a bridge to the growing thirst for Indian culture among the diaspora. Similarly, the diaspora established various publications in their host countries to create a sense of common cultural unity. Examples of these include Asian Bride, Asian Woman, Little India, BizIndia, The Asian Age, and Eastern Eye. The Hindi film industry has visibly been a prominent part of this bridging, despite its own unflattering portrayals of the diaspora and the West during the 1960s and 1970s.

There is a significant trend in local and regional programming in developing nations, and that much of this is in response to charges of cultural imperialism. Thus the key to bridging India with Indian diaspora has been Cinema and Cable Television channels that are coming up with immensely popular soap operas in Hinglish to cater to NRI and Indian diasporic viewers scattered in Asia, Africa, America, UK and USA. This dual cultural synchronization goes a long way in spreading Indian cultural nationalism among home sick Indian diasporic viewers in all the continents. On the other hand, cable TV is helping to create a demand among the burgeoning middle classes in India who have aspirations to a 'Western' lifestyle, by diffusion of entertainment.

With the winds of globalization getting strength in India, the AIR also has gone an extra mile to expand its FM coverage by giving licenses to private operators in all the metropolitan cities, such as Times FM, Radio Mirchi, Radio Uulala, Radio etc. Despite being limited to the major cities, the FM listenership is soaring up with introduction of mobile phones with radio receivers from early 2000s in the wake of globalization. AIR is also now allowing that foreign companies could hold up to 25 percent equity in FM radio. Who does not like to tune in to India's Vividh Bharati in the South East Asian region and UK to listen to nostalgic filmigeet? A time was when during the post independence period, the Binaca Geetmala broadcasted by Radio Ceylon, would come every morning and evening to wake up Indians with film music and Bhakti geet now the Vividh Bharati does the same thing to the British consumers and South Asian diasporic audiences with its melodious songs that have been archived richly by the commercial service. Vibidh Bharati, the commercial services wing of the All India Radio which saw the light of the day in 1957 has come a long way and presently it conveys an altogether different image of India through its spreading of tentacles in DTH platform.

Commercialism is also increasingly making inroads into the traditionally serious and staid Indian press, which is copying the US-style sensational journalism, with its emphasis on entertainment-oriented news agendas. The managerial approach to running editorial operations, most acutely seen in the Times of India, is symptomatic of how globalization is affecting Indian newspapers. By degrees several foreign publishing houses like Readers Digest, Time Magazine etc are beginning to have tie ups with Indian counterparts for publication bases. Thus with the liberalization and globalization of Indian economy, the country has waken up from decades of slumber and India is soon becoming one of the fastest growing and potentially the biggest English language media software markets in the world.

Communication convergence in the wake of globalization and digital realm, which affects the internet, telecommunications, television, movies, radio, and satellite distribution of content, is based on increasing interactivity. Consumers and media users increasingly seek interactive environments in which they can use these types of services in a seamless manner. Consumers and customers in India are already able to use their cell phones to make purchases from vending machines, fill recharge vouchers and transfer money into others

accounts. The successful marketers of the future will be those who discover new interactive solutions for a public which seeks ubiquitous solutions from a variety of digital devices. Interactive capabilities create a new growth curve, which in turn will expand the customer base of mature media technologies. On the other hand, the global spread of the Internet and the increasing trend of digital media convergence is an emerging face of media globalization. Television is becoming increasingly interactive army of globalization with its metamorphosis in HD TV, IP TV and DTH versions coming up. Millions of viewers are called upon to vote, as in the case of the popular television reality shows like Indian Idol which benefits the telephone multinationals like Vodafone, Airtel, Aircel etc become rich in no time High Definition Television (HD TV) have built in two-way interactive capabilities. Cable television currently has interactive capabilities allowing viewers to order a pizza directly through the cable connection.

Global Bollywood

One of the main drivers of Indianization in post liberalized economy after 1990s is cinema. The role of the Bollywood cinema in globalization process within India and outside India deserves a special mention in any discourse on the role of media in globalization process. Indian movie industry, notably Bollywood, has come a long way in the last two centuries. Producing roughly 1100 films annually, double that produced by USA, India is the world's largest film producer and is arguably one of the world's most prolific cultural industry clusters. With its growing global impact upon films, music, dance, and other art forms, Bollywood is developing its own strong global brand and is also becoming big business, attracting massive investments. Whereas Hollywood film producers and investors are comparatively unable to make inroads into India, Bollywood companies now export at a massive scale to USA and other attractive consumer markets, and acquire cinemas and production companies abroad.

The year 2000s saw a growth in Bollywood's popularity in the world. This led the nation's filmmaking to new heights in terms of quality, cinematography and innovative story lines as well as technical advances in areas such as special effects, animation, and so on. Some of the largest production houses, among them Yash Raj Films and Dharma Productions were the producers of new modern films. The opening up of the overseas market, more Bollywood releases abroad and the explosion of multiplexes in big cities, led to wider box office successes in India and abroad, including Lagaan (2001), Devdas (2002), Koi... Mil Gaya (2003), Kal Ho Naa Ho (2003), Veer-Zaara (2004), Rang De Basanti (2006), Lage Raho Munnabhai (2006), Krrish (2006), Dhoom 2 (2006), Om Shanti Om (2007), Chak De India (2007), Rab Ne Bana Di Jodi (2008), Ghajini (2008), 3 Idiots (2009), My Name is Khan (2010), and Dabangg (2010).

The lure transnational gold has led Bollywood cinema to come out of its cocoon and reach offshore, is an open secret to viewers and film scholars as well, with Gokulsing and Dissanayake noting that people of South Asian ancestry, who can be found in areas ranging from Sri Lanka to the Caribbean to Australia to Canada, often find that their understanding of what is Indian is derived, in large part, from Indian films. There is certainly no shortage of films to choose from, with India's prolific industry churning out approximately 1100 pictures a year. It is estimated that roughly ten-twelve million people a day purchase tickets to see a Bollywood movie and some of these will return repeatedly to view a favourite movie (Gokulsing & Dissanayake, and Rajadyaksha). Despite producing more films a year than any other country, including the United States, India typically did not export its films at the same rate in the 1990s. Nonetheless, there is an emerging global market for Bollywood cinema after late 1990s. Most of the costs generated by Bollywood films are actually recouped through the overseas market, rather than within India, due to "the growing market of non-resident Indians, or Indian expatriates, nostalgic for all things Indian" (Rajadyaksha). The immigrant Punjabi, Sindhi, Gujarati, Bengali families sometimes use Indian films to ensure that their grand children receive a sense of their cultural heritage, while Ray (2001, 2003) describes a similar use of Bollywood cinema by twice-displaced Fiji Indians in Australia to build a sense of identity and community. The Indian diaspora, like other diasporas, rather than realizing "the myth of return to the homeland", the Indian diasporas act out their longing for the homeland through symbolic acts, such as consumption of cultural products through Bollywood cinema.

Since the 1930s, Bollywood had enjoyed a small but stable export to India's main trade partners (e.g. Russia and the Middle East), cultural neighbors (e.g. Pakistan, Bangladesh, and Afghanistan), and countries where

centuries of migrations and British colonialism had created large Indian diasporas (e.g. Nepal, Burma, South Africa, and Sri Lanka). Traditionally, main exports of Indian films (in all languages) were to the Arabian Gulf, USSR, Indonesia, Sri Lanka, and Burma. With the passage of time Morocco, Jordan and Fiji were almost as big importers as UK and Ireland (NFDC, 2007).

After Indian independence, new Indian diaspora began to grow rapidly in countries offering education and work opportunities, such as USA, UK, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Canada, Singapore, Australia and New Zealand, Kuwait and Oman. By the year 2001, the old (Indian diasporas included Nepal, Burma, Malaysia, South Africa, Sri Lanka Mauritius, Trinidad and Tobago, Guyana, Fiji, Russian Union, CIS, Kenya, Yemen and Tanzania) and the new Indian diasporas (which included USA, Saudi Arabia, UK, United Arab Emirates, Canada, Singapore, Oman, Kuwait, Netherlands, Australia, Thailand, Japan, Bahrain, and New Zealand) combined were conservatively estimated to a size of 20 million people globally. At that time, in 11 countries, the Indian diaspora exceeded half a million people, and in at least 48 countries, there were more than 10,000 Indian diaspora members (Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India 2001; Walton-Roberts, 2004). Given the rate of Indian immigration over the last decade, the diaspora in some of these countries are now notably larger.

From the year 1990s, and at first largely inadvertently, Bollywood saw a sudden growth in export earnings from the new Indian diasporas in North America, the UK, and a range of Arab countries.² Soon after, East Asian and markets such as Singapore and Australia began to rise. Exact export data cannot be provided, but two leading Bollywood distribution companies (of both film and TV) report that USA and UK now account for 50-60% of their export revenues (Ernst and Young, 2008). Today, Bollywood is the largest foreign exporter to the US entertainment market, and successful films are currently screened in up to 75 US cinemas, some earning in excess of USD 1 million in their opening weekend, making them appear in the top 20 box office charts (Times of India, 2006). The new Indian diasporas constitute very profitable export markets, because their purchase powers are much higher than those of the Indian home consumers or the old Indian diasporas.

Global Bollywood's influence on Hollywood

Since the fifties Indian movies like *Mother India* (1957), for example, continued to be played in from Russia to Nigeria decades after its release Indian movies have also gained ground in West Africa so as to alter the style of Hausa fashions. Bollywood songs have also been copied by Russian singers and stories have influenced the writings of Nigerian novelists. Stickers of Indian films and stars decorate taxis and buses in Northern Nigeria, while posters of Indian films adorn the walls of tailor shops and mechanics' garages in the country.

Unlike in Europe and North America where Indian films largely cater to the expatriate Indian market yearning to keep in touch with their homeland, in West Africa, as in many other parts of the world, such movies rose in popularity despite the lack of a significant Indian audience, where movies are about an alien culture, based on a religion wholly different, and, for the most part, a language that is unintelligible to the viewers. One such explanation for this lies in the similarities between the two cultures. Other similarities include wearing turbans; the presence of animals in markets; porters carrying large bundles, chewing sugar cane; youths riding Bajaj motor scooters; wedding celebrations, and so forth. With the strict Muslim culture, Indian movies were said to show "respect" toward women, where Hollywood movies were seen to have "no shame". In Indian movies women were modestly dressed, men and women rarely kiss, and there is no nudity, thus Indian movies are said to "have culture" that Hollywood films.

In the year 2000s, this trend picked up the climax when Bollywood began influencing musical films in the Western world, and played a particularly instrumental role in the revival of the American musical film genre. Baz Luhrmann stated that his musical film *Moulin Rouge!* (2001) was directly inspired by Bollywood musicals.⁴² The film incorporated an Indian-themed play based on the ancient Sanskrit drama *The Little Clay Cart* and a Bollywood-style dance sequence with a song from the film *China Gate*. The critical and financial success of *Moulin Rouge!* renewed interest in the then-moribund Western musical genre, and subsequently films such as *Chicago*, *The Producers*, *Rent*, *Dreamgirls*, *Hairspray*, *Sweeney Todd*, *Across the Universe*, *The Phantom of the Opera*, *Enchanted* and *Mamma Mia!* were produced, fueling a renaissance of the genre.

The influence of Bollywood film music or known as flimigeet can also be seen in popular music elsewhere in the world. In 1978, technopop pioneers Haruomi Hosono and Ryuichi Sakamoto of the Yellow Magic Orchestra produced an first electronic album *Cochin Moon* based on an experimental fusion between electronic music and Bollywood-inspired Indian music. Devo's 1988 hit song "Disco Dancer" was inspired by the song "I am a Disco Dancer" from the Bollywood film *Disco Dancer* (1982). The 2002 song "Addictive", sung by Truth Hurts and produced by DJ Quik and Dr. Dre, was lifted from Lata Mangeshkar's "Thoda Resham Lagta Hai" from *Jyoti* (1981). The Black Eyed Peas' Grammy Award winning 2005 song "Don't Phunk with My Heart" was inspired by two 1970s Bollywood songs: "Ye Mera Dil Yaar Ka Diwana" from *Don* (1978) and "Ae Nujawan Hai Sub" from *Apradh* (1972). Both songs were originally composed by Kalyanji Anandji, sung by Asha Bhosle, and featured the dancer Helen. Also in 2005, the Kronos Quartet re-recorded several R. D. Burman compositions, with Asha Bhosle as the singer, into an album *You've stolen my heart - Songs From R D Burman's Bollywood*, which was nominated for "Best Contemporary World Music Album" at the 2006 Grammy Awards. Filmi music composed by A. R. Rahman (who has won two Academy Awards for the *Slumdog Millionaire* soundtrack) has frequently been sampled by musicians elsewhere in the world, including the Singaporean artist Kelly Poon, the Uzbek artist Iroda Dilroz, the French rap group La Caution, the American artist Ciara, and the German band Lowenherz, among others. Many Asian Underground artists, particularly those among the overseas Indian diaspora, have also been inspired by Bollywood music. A. R. Rahman, an Indian film composer, wrote the music for Andrew Lloyd Webber's *Bombay Dreams*, and a musical version of *Hum Aapke Hain Koun* has played in London's West End.

A further way the diaspora is contributing to Bollywood is through creating pipelines of talent to the cluster. Increasingly, creative labor from the diaspora gets involved in Bollywood's product development processes. Many allegedly "Bollywood" films popular with Western audiences (such as *Monsoon Wedding*; *Water*; *Bend It Like Beckham* and *Bride and Prejudice*) have in fact been made by diasporic directors abroad. Given the success of these films, Bollywood now seeks to "repatriate" many of these directors through offering them co productions or full-blown Bollywood productions. This strategy worked well for *The Namesake: A Hollywood production* by a director from the Indian diaspora in Canada and with potential to sell both in India and abroad, it was co-produced by leading Bollywood company UTV. It turned out to gross more abroad than any of UTV's pure Bollywood productions.

The Bollywood musical *Lagaan* (2001) was nominated for the Academy Award for Best Foreign Language Film, and two other Bollywood films *Devdas* (2002) and *Rang De Basanti* (2006) were nominated for the BAFTA Award for Best Foreign Language Film. Danny Boyle's *Slumdog Millionaire* (2008), which has won four Golden Globes and eight Academy Awards, was also directly inspired by Bollywood films, and is considered to be 'homage to Hindi commercial cinema'. The theme of reincarnation was also popularized in Western popular culture through Bollywood films, with *Madhumati* (1958) inspiring the Hollywood film *The Reincarnation of Peter Proud* (1975), which in turn inspired the Bollywood film *Karz* (1980), which in turn influenced another Hollywood film *Chances Are* (1989). The 1975 film *Chhoti Si Baat* is believed to have inspired *Hitch* (2005), which in turn inspired the Bollywood film *Partner* (2007).

Besides being popular among the India diaspora, such far off locations as Nigeria to Egypt to Senegal and to Russia generations of non-Indian fans have grown up with Bollywood during the years, bearing witness to the cross-cultural appeal of Indian movies. Over the last years of the twentieth century and beyond, Bollywood progressed in its popularity as it entered the consciousness of Western audiences and producers.

Indian films distributed to parts of developing countries in Asia, Africa, Europe and Russia largely allowed for a new youth culture to follow without such ideological baggage as 'becoming western.' among the and newly independent countries emerging from years of colonialism. Bollywood is also popular among Somalis and the Somali diaspora, where the emerging Islamic Courts Union found a *bête noire*. Chad and Ethiopia have also shown an interest in the Bollywood movies. Several Bollywood personalities have availed to the continent for both shooting movies and off-camera projects. The film *Padmashree Laloo Prasad Yadav* (2005) was one of many movies shot in South Africa. *Dil Jo Bhi Kahey* (2005) was shot almost entirely in Mauritius, which has a large ethnically Indian population.

Despite official ban, Hindi movies are a craze in Pakistan. Many Pakistanis watch Bollywood films, as they understand Hindi (due to its linguistic and cultural similarity to Urdu). Pakistan banned the legal import of Bollywood movies in 1965. However, a thriving trade in pirated DVDs and illegal cable broadcasts ensured the continued popularity of Bollywood releases in Pakistan. Exceptions were made for a few films, such as the 2006 colorized re-release of the classic *Mughal-e-Azam* or the 2006 film *Taj Mahal*. Early in 2008, the Pakistani government eased the ban and allowed the import of even more movies; were screened in 2008. Continued easing followed in 2009 and 2010. The new policy is controversial in Pakistan. It is opposed by ardent nationalists and representatives of Pakistan's small film industry; it is embraced by cinema owners, who are booking large profits after years of poor receipts.

Bollywood movies are also popular in Afghanistan due to the country's proximity with the Indian subcontinent and certain other cultural perspectives present in the movies. A number of Bollywood movies were filmed inside Afghanistan while some dealt with the country, including *Dharmatma*, *Kabul Express*, *Khuda Gawah* and *Escape from Taliban*.

Hindi films have also been popular in numerous Arab countries, including Palestine, Jordan, Egypt and the Gulf countries. Imported Indian films are usually subtitled in Arabic upon the film's release. Since the early 2000s, Bollywood has progressed in Israel. Special channels dedicated to Indian films have been displayed on cable television. Bollywood films are also popular across Southeast Asia (particularly the Malay Archipelago) and Central Asia (particularly in Uzbekistan and Tajikistan).

Some Hindi movies also became big successes in the People's Republic of China during the 1940s and 1950s. The most popular Hindi films in China were *Dr. Kotnis Ki Amar Kahani* (1946), *Awaara* (1951) and *Two Acres of Land* (1953). Raj Kapoor was a famous movie star in China, and the song "*Awara Hoon*" ("I am a Tramp") was popular in the country. Since then, Hindi films significantly declined in popularity in China, until the Academy Award nominated *Lagaan* (2001) became the first Indian film to have a nation-wide release there in decades. The Chinese filmmaker He Ping was impressed by *Lagaan*, especially its soundtrack, and thus hired the film's music composer A. R. Rahman to score the soundtrack for his film *Warriors of Heaven and Earth* (2003). Several older Hindi films also have a cult following in Japan, particularly the films directed by the late Guru Dutt.

The awareness of Hindi cinema is substantial in the United Kingdom, where they frequently enter the UK top ten. Many films, such as *Kabhi Khushi Kabhie Gham* (2001), have been set in London. Bollywood is also appreciated in France, Germany, the Netherlands, and the Scandinavian countries. Various Bollywood movies are dubbed in German and shown on the German television channel RTL II on a regular basis.

Bollywood films are particularly popular in the former Soviet Union. Bollywood films have been dubbed into Russian, and shown in prominent theatres such as Mosfilm and Lenfilm. The popularity of Bollywood in the CIS dates back to the Soviet days when the films from Hollywood and other Western countries were banned in the Soviet Union. As there was no means of other cheap entertainment, the films from Bollywood provided the Soviets a cheap source of entertainment as they were supposed to be non-controversial and non-political. In addition, the Soviet Union was recovering from the onslaught of the Second World War. The films from India, which were also recovering from the disaster of partition and the struggle for freedom from colonial rule, were found to be a good source of providing hope with entertainment to the struggling masses. The aspirations and needs of the people of both countries matched to a great extent. These films were dubbed in Russian and shown in theatres throughout the Soviet Union. The films from Bollywood also strengthened family values, which was a big factor for their popularity with the government authorities in the Soviet Union. (Excerpts from Ashok Sharma, former Indian Ambassador to CIS and Suriname).

The film *Mera Naam Joker* (1970), sought to cater to such an appeal and the popularity of Raj Kapoor in Russia, when it recruited Russian actress Kseniya Ryabinkina for the movie. In the contemporary era, *Lucky: No Time for Love* (2005) was shot entirely in Russia. After the collapse of the Soviet film distribution system, Hollywood occupied the void created in the Russian film market. This made things difficult for Bollywood as

it was losing market share to Hollywood. However, Russian newspapers report that there is a renewed interest in Bollywood among young Russians.

Bollywood has experienced a marked growth in revenue in North American markets, and is particularly popular amongst the South Asian communities in large cities as Chicago, Toronto and New York City. Yash Raj Films, one of India's largest production houses and distributors, has reported that Bollywood films in the United States earn around \$100 million a year through theater screenings, video sales and the sale of movie soundtracks. In other words, films from India do more business in the United States than films from any other non-English speaking country. Numerous films in the mid-1990s and onwards have been largely, or entirely, shot in New York, Los Angeles, Vancouver and Toronto. Bollywood's immersion in the traditional Hollywood domain was further tied with such films as *The Guru* (2002) and *Marigold: An Adventure in India* (2007) trying to popularize the Bollywood-theme for Hollywood.

Bollywood is not as successful in the Oceanic countries and Pacific Islands such as New Guinea. However, it ranks second to Hollywood in countries such as Fiji, with its large Indian diaspora Australia and New Zealand.

Australia is one of the countries where there is a large South Asian Diaspora. Bollywood is popular amongst non-Asians in the country as well. Since 1997 the country has provided a backdrop for an increasing number of Bollywood films. Indian filmmakers have been attracted to Australia's diverse locations and landscapes, and initially used it as the setting for song-and-dance sequences, which demonstrated the contrast between the values. However, nowadays, Australian locations are becoming more important to the plot of Bollywood films. Hindi films shot in Australia usually incorporate aspects of Australian lifestyle. The Yash Raj Film *Salaam Namaste* (2005) became the first Indian film to be shot entirely in Australia and was the most successful Bollywood film of 2005 in the country. This was followed by *Heyy Babyy* (2007) *Chak De! India* (2007) and *Singh Is Kinng* (2008) which turned out to be box office successes. Following the release of *Salaam Namaste*, on a visit to India the then Prime Minister John Howard also sought, having seen the film, to have more Indian movies shooting in the country to boost tourism, where the Bollywood and cricket nexus, was further tightened with Steve Waugh's appointment as tourism ambassador to India. Australian actress Tania Zaetta, who co-starred in *Salaam Namaste*, among other Bollywood films, expressed her keenness to expand her career in Bollywood. Bollywood movies are influential in South America, though Bollywood culture and dance is recognized. In 2006, *Dhoom 2* became the first Bollywood film to be shot in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

Ominously, however, the popularity of old Bollywood versus a new, changing Bollywood seems to be diminishing the popularity on the continent. The changing style of Bollywood has begun to question such an acceptance. The new era features more sexually explicit and violent films. Nigerian viewers, for example, commented that older films of the 1950s and 1960s had culture to the newer, more westernized picturizations. The movie of old days of India were avidly "advocating decolonization ... and India's policy was wholly influenced by its missionary zeal to end racial domination and discrimination in the Third World Countries" were replaced by newer realities.

The Bollywood cinema is not just about Indians in India, it is about Indians in silicon valleys or wherever they are today in the Indian diaspora. Thus, the phenomenon of emergence of Noe Global Bollywood, in the region can be easily felt and seen. Critics are of the opinion that, due to globalization of Bollywood cinema post liberalizations of 1990's, has worked in tandem with the sexualisation of Indian films so as to become more like American films, thus negating the preferred values of an old Bollywood culture where songs and dances were at the centre stage.

Conclusion:

Whatever may be the colour of media globalization happening in our country, India has done extremely well within a short span of opening up from decades of isolation. The Indian government in 1991 made a radical policy shift towards free market forces, which strongly impacted the informatization and globalization of Indian society, opening the nations boundaries to Coca Cola, McDonalds and Nike, as well as allowing exports

of highly profitable computer software and telecommunication companies, Private Television channels and Bollywood cinema to the world.

Although Indian Society has strong historical roots in socialism, the young Indian businessmen and women who are pioneering high technology companies, private television networks and advertising industry, are super capitalist. The new economic policy of 1991 allowed India to become a major player in the global village. Dramatic changes have occurred as a nation of bullock carts became a nation of cyber marts. No other nation provides a better example of the role of mass media and new communication technologies in the development process through a country moves from being an agriculture-based economy towards an information society. In the recent decades, the United States, Japan and most European nations have become information societies, but India as a nation is still far from becoming an information society. India has made a remarkable progress in certain sectors. But India is an unusual paradox. India has more university students than any other nation in the world today, but India is also a home to most illiterates. Globalization and informatization is powerful, but every thing about it may not be beneficial, especially for the disadvantaged sections of Indian society. Globalization and material progress has to do more to improve the quality of the life of India's poor whose main occupation is with arranging two square meals a day, not with Coca Cola and McDonald's. If mass media can help in this front by diffusion of usable information then that would be truest globalization achieved in a newly liberalized country like India.

References and works cited

1. International Monetary Fund, Retrieved from www.imf.org on 15.10.2011.
2. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Retrieved from www.unesco.org on 15.10.2011.
3. Audience research: Cultivation analysis. Retrieved from www.museum.tv/archives/audienceresearch on 15.10.2011
4. World Trade Organization Retrieved from www.wto.org on 15.10.2011.
5. Banerjee, I. (2002). The locals strike back? Media Globalization and Localization in the new Asian Television landscape. *Gazette: The International Journal for Communication Studies*.
6. Bloch, L.-R., & Lemish, D. (2003). The megaphone effect: The international diffusion of cultural media via the USA. , *Communication yearbook*. pp-303-318.
7. D. McQuail (Ed.), *Mcquail's reader in mass communication theory*: Sage Publications. pp-200-210.
8. Compaine, B. (2005). Global media. In E. P. Bucy (Ed.), *Living in the information age: A new media reader*: Wadsworth Thomson Learning pp-178-186.
9. Cullity, J. (2002). The Global Desi: Cultural nationalism on MTV India. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 26(4), pp 408-425.
10. Dominick, J. R. (2002). *The dynamics of mass communication: Media in the digital age*. : McGraw Hill pp 23-45.
11. FICCI-Pricewaterhouse Coopers. 2011. *The India entertainment and media industry: Unraveling the potential*. Retrieved from www.pwc.com/extweb/pwcpublications pp 81-96.
12. Ferguson, M. (2002). The mythology about globalization. In Denis McQuail (Ed.), *Mcquail's reader in mass communication theory*, Sage Publications Ltd. pp 31-45.
13. Gokulsing, K.M. and Dissanayake, W. (1998) *Indian Popular Cinema – a narrative of Cultural change*. New Delhi, India: Orient Longman Private Limited, pp 11-23..
14. Gerbner, G. (1977). Comparative cultural indicators. In G. Gerbner (Ed.), *Mass media policies in changing cultures*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, pp137-151.
14. Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Morgan, M., & Signorielli, N. (1986). Perspectives on media effects. In J. Bryant & D. Zillmann (Eds.), *Living with television*. Hillsdale: Erlbaum. pp 304-310.
15. Katz, E. (2002). Publicity and pluralistic ignorance: Notes on 'the spiral of silence'. In D. McQuail (Ed.), *Mcquail's reader in mass communication theory*: Sage Publications Ltd. pp136-145.

16. Kohli-Khandekar, India's Media Business: Sage Publication, New Delhi, pp 15-29.
17. Lazarsfeld, P. F., Cantril, H., & Stanton, F. (1939). Current radio research in universities. Journal of Applied Communication. Pp45-67.
18. Littlejohn, S. W. (2002). Theories of human communication. Albuquerque: Wadsworth Thompson Learning. pp 21-31.
19. MacBride, S., & Roach, C. (2000). The new international information order. In F. J. Lechner & J. Boli (Eds.), The Globalization Reader: Blackwell Publishers. 405-417.
20. McChesney, R. W. (2005). The new global media. In E. P. Bucy (Ed.), Living in the information age: A new media reader: Wadsworth Thomson Learning pp 300-312.
21. McLuhan, M., & Powers, B. R. (1989). The global village: Transformations in world life and media in the 21st century: Oxford University Press. pp 265-269.
22. Pavlik, J., & McIntosh, S. (2005). Convergence, content, and interactivity. In E. P. Bucy (Ed.), Living in the information age: A new media reader: Wadsworth Thompson Learning. pp 54-67.
23. Pike, R., & Winseck, D. (2004). The politics of global media reform, Media Culture & Society. pp 78-89.
24. Rajadhyaksha, A. and Willemen, P. (1999) Encyclopedia of Indian Cinema. Chicago, IL: Fitzroy Dearborn. pp 700-727
25. Rao, S. (2007) 'The Globalization of Bollywood: An Ethnography of Non-Elite Audiences in India' in The Communication Review, Issue 10, 2007 pp 38-45..
25. Rogers, E. M. (1994). India's Information Revolution: From bullockart to cybermart, Sage Publications, New Delhi. pp 121-130.
26. Rushkoff, D. (2005). Renaissance now! Media ecology and the new global narrative. In E. P. Bucy (Ed.), Living in the information age: Wadsworth Thomson Learning, pp 502-512.
27. Schramm, W. (1954). The process and effects of mass communication. Urbana: University of Illinois Press pp 70-76.
28. Signorielli, N. (1990). Television's mean and dangerous world: A continuation of the cultural indicators perspective. In N. Signorielli & M. Morgan (Eds.), Cultivation analysis: New directions in media effects research: Sage Publications, pp 403-410.
29. Signorielli, N., & Morgan, M. (Eds.). (1990). Cultivation analysis: New directions in media effects research. Newbury Park: Sage. Pp 289-291
30. Straubhaar, J., & LaRose, R. (2004). Media now: Understanding media, culture, and technology: Thomson Wadsworth, pp 63-79.
31. Omlinson, J. (2002). The discourse of cultural imperialism. In D. McQuail (Ed.), Mcquail's reader in mass communication theory: Sage Publications, pp 71-89.

***Pawan Kr Tiwari**

Research Scholar Dept. of Mass Communication
Assam University Silchar

&

****Deepak Upadhyaya**

Assistant Professor, Department of Journalism and Mass Communication,
Tripura University, Agartala-799130.