

Ideology and Representation of the Nation: Aggressor and Transgressor in Film Sarfarosh

Qaisar Khan^{1*} and Muhammad Ramzan Pahore²

Abstract

This paper analyses the narrative of Bollywood film Sarfarosh which portrays the ethnic, cultural and religious issues between majority Hindu-minority and Muslim communities in India with projection of identifying politics between India and Pakistan. Further, it reveals that Pakistan army constitutes spies who are behind the plot of cross border terrorism and supplies of arms through their local agents in the Indian state of Rajasthan. The agents and their activities are projected as the machineries that are firmly responsible for a series of havocs and killings of innocent people in the most of cities and towns within their reach. Through crafting the notions of national (in) securities, the film picks up an Urdu Ghazal singer, the Pakistani who migrated from Rajasthan during the partition of the subcontinent in 1947. The singer as a metaphor of terrorism often sings Ghazals among Indian dignitaries in the front of his weaponry smuggling to India. The paper finds out that the historical traumatic event of partition is used for posing the Muslim minorities, 'Other' as cultural methodological device, whereas Pakistanis understood as extremely dangerous enemy of the Indian nation. The identity politics of the film results the conflicting ideologies of Hinduism and Islam. This is due to the cultural industry's ideological apparatus for making strategies to manage and maximize the profits by seeking wider audiences through its well-established capitalist system. Bollywood cinematic apparatus should be cautious of essentialist form of nationalist narratives and the post partition conflicts should be avoided for authentic peaceful cultural-social relationships between India and Pakistan.

Keywords: Bollywood; Cross Border Terrorism; Partition; Social Relations; Cultural and Religious.

1. Introduction

This research paper analyses the nationalist narrative of Mattan's Bollywood film *Sarfarosh* (Martyr, 1999). Further, it illuminates the anxieties of historical partition that was covered through metaphoric and symbolic messages of terrorism as cinematic device to project ethnic, religious and cultural issues. Hence, this poses that Pakistan defense forces are behind the Indian societal upheavals by sending its agents to India which covered in the cultural celebrities including ghazal singers and state representatives to attend cultural activities and celebrations. Tending inwardly Mattan's nationalist cinema

¹ Department of Media Studies, Bahria University Islamabad

² Department of Media and Communication Studies, University of Sindh, Jamshoro

*)Corresponding Author.

Email: khan.media68@gmail.com

portrays the Pakistani ghazal singer as a guest of the Indian state that turns out to be the dangerous terrorist at the end.

Since, the independence in 1947, both India and Pakistan are in consistent border tensions and technological rivalries. These giant nuclear armed South Asian countries with extremely large populations face the enormous civic, scientific and educational setbacks as caused by partition anxieties, and four wars fought between them. In addition, the social relations and cultural conflicts never normalized but worsen through the ages. While studying narrative on the representation of cross border terrorism: the paper contextualizes the problematic through the larger historical, economic, social, political and cultural dynamics.

The problem began with the liberalization of Indian economy in the 1990s paving the way for cultural transformation, however; it boosted the dramatic development of Hindu nationalism. Sen (2010, p.147) points out as: “It has been repeatedly argued that Hindi cinema is the most salient bearer of nation-ness and national identity in India. This ability to ‘imagine’ the nation – inscribe it textually, as it were – functions as the strongest legitimization of Bombay cinema’s claim to the status of ‘a national cinema proper.’ Not surprisingly then, the popular Hindi film did not remain insulated from the changes that were sweeping across India over the 1990s.”

Hindutva’s nationalism actively functioned on cultural and ideological association with liberalization favouring both middle-upper classes. Hindutva interpreted this in Hindu mythological narratives for gaining greater consent of the Indian public. Therefore, Sen (2003) insists that it diminished ancient Indian secularism, by disturbing culture structure, social fabric and distorted “collective imagination of the nationhood.” ‘Liberalization and Hindu nationalism as economic and free market’ sum up the decade of 1990s in ‘dyad’ as culture, economics and politics that unofficially dominated the cultural industry as well. It consistently articulated the subcontinent Muslim as bad and the ‘Other’, although it is integrationist on agenda, but largely focuses on inward cultural politics, at the same time brings cultural differences with Pakistan and other countries.

Border function is to identify territory and the national population for national consciousness for dominant ideological construction. The contemporary social realities around border signification are associated for the most part with ‘symbolic, behavioural and spatial aspects’ (Schoene, 2004; DeChaine, 2009; Newman, 2006) which signify the functional, geographic and symbolic position. The symbolic thus, clues us to understand that it produces aggression and transgression. Aggression is to protect the nation and its territory of the country that transgress the border or challenge the sovereignty of the other.

Sarfarosh ideologically highlights cultural identity through intra-interstate representation between India and Pakistan by projecting rivalries due to cartographic anxieties of the partition narrative that create the concept of “US and Them.” The images of Indian Muslims in the films that construct as

being affiliated religiously with Pakistan are plenty (Booth, 2005; Chakravarty, 2000; Chaudhuri, 2005; Khan, 2009; Mallhi, 2006). The film's fetishism of has already been affirmed borders. However, it revealed political tendencies that propagate Pakistan as a rogue state and involved in terrorism in India.

Prakash (2000) pointed out that the border conflicts between India and Pakistan are due to the unjustified division of Kashmir, which is 75% Muslim majority state, without their consent that led to anger and frustration in Pakistan and Muslims in Kashmir. The symbolic portrayal of the cartographic anxieties in Bollywood films although harmless yet it has greater increasing cultural effects on Pakistani audiences.

2. Literature Review

Akhtar, Amirali, and Raza (2006) asserted that the relationship of Islam and politics with Islamic Republic of Pakistan is always perceived the controversial. Pakistan and Israel are particularly considered as the two modern states whose foundation is based on religious identities. The idea that Muslims must be free of Hindu hegemony and must have a separate homeland to enjoy all kinds of social, cultural, religious and political activities with freedom, and without any intervention, therefore, Islam became the prioritized religion. Kumar (2007) as pointed out that in the making of Pakistan, Hindu nationalists had great contribution who intended to subordinate the Muslims of India by keeping them in the position of 'consistent' minority status.

British, with transferring power, to Indians, restricted only to provinces in 1937, the "communal situation in India worsened" (Aziz, 1979; Gupta, 1966; Pandey, 1978). Muslim League expected congress of sharing power with Muslim League before the election to form a considerable Muslim minority in the assembly. Muslim League excelled in the united provinces (U.P.) and Bombay/Mumbai, "where the Indian National Congress had an overwhelming majority in the assembly" (Gupta, 1966). However, the results were not in favour of Muslim League thus, it formed none, while congress formed seven out of eleven.

To Muslim League, the congress offered a coalition on unacceptable condition that joint ministry could be formed after members of Muslim League should join the congress legislature party. Abul Kalam Azad declares that 'the subsequent course of Hindu-Muslim relations and of the whole constitutional controversy would have been the different if the congress had accepted the League in U.P. as the coalition partner" (Gupta, 1966).

As perplexed for consistent minority status under Hindu majority rule in India, the Muslim League gave up the demand for Muslim minority rights from their political platforms from then onward insisted that Hindus and Muslims are two nations in India. Therefore, Muslim League represented the Muslim nation similar to congress' representation of Hindu nation. Besides, resolution of Pakistan demanding a separate homeland for Muslims took place

at a meeting in Lahore in 1940, called as the Resolution of Pakistan (Gupta, 1966; Moore, 1983; Sarkar, 1989).

In this context, Hindu extremists contributed largely in dividing the country. Furthermore, Aneesh (2010) asserted that language politics also played a crucial role in the partition of subcontinent alongside religion. A well-known scholars such as Viridi (2003) argued that after the partition, Urdu as the language of Muslims was not given its official identification. It was replaced by Hindi through one of the Hindu nationalist movements in spite of its popularity in Southern and Northern India.

Rai (2003) pointed out that the depiction of disturbances ignited by communal violence in a number of Bollywood films that has weighed down the recent history of India. In addition, these films not only suspect and associate Muslims with terrorism but also address them as “other” from Hindu national family. The debate on terrorism in the film *Sarfarosh* also targets a responsible and peaceful character of Gulfam Hassan who brings public of both the countries into contact through the cultural activities such as music and poetry.

Bhaumik (2005) asserted that although the film tackles the issue of patriotism: *Sarfarosh* is a problematic film engaging Muslim cop as led by Ajay Singh Rathod, its dilemma is that its Indian patriotism is often questioned. The film handles the sensitive issues of Muslim cop, while, the villain comes to surface as the Pakistani Ghazal singer. The film signification appears with all Pakistanis as being apparently dreadful. However, it is unfortunate that the film hit a person who brings peace and becomes a unifying symbol that helps to get people of both the nations in contacts. Further, language is the most capable factor of any culture to understand others.

In this regard, scholars such as Kesavan cited in Viridi (2003) pointed out that in language politics, Hindi language consumed in the films that is contradictory in the project of nation-building. The language used in the films parting with itself from the classical forms although it is national and official language. The language used in the film *Sarfarosh* is ideological that reflects the society. He further, explains that Urdu language in Bollywood cinema is the last stronghold of the ‘Parsee theatre’. Viridi points out that Urdu not Hindi was the literary and sophisticated language of elites in eighteenth and nineteenth centuries that experienced all kinds of complexities with the artful awareness like other literary languages. Urdu has the credit to expose itself to the stylized melodrama. It has greater influences of song and dance segments that ignore the unity of time and space, metaphoric and representational unfairness which is element of excesses. It contributes to the lack of genuineness of Hindi cinema resulting from Parsee theatre. In opposite to Hindi drama it fails to sustain the audience in this regard (Viridi, 2003).

Das (2006) argued that Hindutva (Hindu extreme nationalist movement) under the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) government encouraged the communal conflicts, arming people and supported violence of Hindu

patriarchy. Hindutva considered mothering and regulated Hindu men for Hindu women, Hindu Muslim identity distinction and identities of India and Pakistan. Further, scholars such as Malhotra and Alagh (2004) argued that the agenda of Hindutva is developed from the book written in 1923 by Vinayak Damodar Savarkar (1883—1966) who was the prominent ideologist of the early twentieth century that recommended “new” political identities based on the conception of Muslim “Other.” This ideology was also supported by other leading ideologist Dayanad Sarawsati (1824—1883).

Bhugra (2005) pointed out that majority of Hindi speaking people became the audiences of Hindi films after the BJP governments provided businesses and social changes to the middle class and brought religion to the center stage of politics. This movement changed the cinematic script. The combined family system, religious sacraments along with the shifting environment of nationhood that cover religion obviously became the most focusing elements of Bollywood cinema throughout the 1990s.

Virdi (2003) and Saksena (2006) argued that the narratives of terrorism in Bollywood cinema manipulate the family system with intelligent and stylish integration of local culture to represent the nation as a family for the signification of Indian nationalism’, Prasad (2000) calls it ‘modern Indian nationalism’. Gupta (2009) pointed out that the films’ narratives depict women as an iconic image that only serves to represent minority status and possesses no authority to challenge this sort of nationalism.

Vitali (2004) asserted that Bollywood cinema in the political deception of religious representation that displays the development of oriental approaches through using the 180-degree rule instead of the 360-degree rule so as to establish it as pre-modern cinema. However, using the 180 degree; rule is employed for the most part to demonstrate “frontality” for delivering dialogues as inspired from mimetic narratives or the art of dramatics of the Parsi theatre.

2.3 Theoretical Framework

The paper focuses on the theory of nationalism by Smith (2008) to look at socio-cultural phenomena in accordance with historical representation in order to find out their social relationships to the film’s representation of the issues of cross border terrorism.

Smith argues that:

“The ‘nation,’ as a named and self-defined human community whose members cultivate shared myths, memories, symbols, values, and traditions, reside in and identify with a historic homeland, create and disseminate a distinctive public culture, and observe shared customs and common laws” (Smith, 2008, p.19).

3. Methodology

The paper is set out to examine the narrative through interpretation by segmenting it into the sections to find out the plot, text style and treatment as

well an act. The contextual significance of the film text; it analyses thematic problematic in finding out how it signifies legalization of national population and territory as space of cultural difference into constructing the dominant Indian national consciousness. For this purpose, the paper segments along with the full story into parts designed to find out the overall structure and pattern of the themes and symbols. Hence, it divides the story in sequences where each takes place at single time and space having interrelated scenes. The sequences that contain the interrelated scenes that are numerically highlighted as ABC... and according to chronological order of the entire film plot; the film has the multiple plots therefore; the action is divided accordingly. Being an anthology film, several scenes that seemed as saturated, and are removed from the sequences in order to simply reveal the plot and narrative structure and their broader social signification of culture to answer the research thematic problematic.

4. The Film Analysis and Findings

4.1 Terrorism and cultural ethnography

The paper divides the narrative into three major segments. **First**, by establishing relationship of terrorism with Pakistan and cultural gatherings in Mumbai in honour of a much loved and respected Pakistani Ghazal singer Gulfam Hassan (**Sequence A**). **Secondly**, the suspicion of Indian Muslim inspector national loyalty (**Sequence B**), and **thirdly**, Gulfam Hassan friendship with ACP Ajay becomes deeper (**sequence C**) and (**sequence D**) telling about the killing of Gulfam Hassan and terrorists affiliated with him.

Sequence A

The film begins with the credit frames showing camels without riders coming from Pakistan to a border village Bahid, Rajasthan to smuggle arms into India. The film's plot deliberates a song in the background and synchronizes several other scenes of automobiles used potentially for arms smuggling.

After, the local agents in Bahid village who receive the arms on board the camels and many other arms deliveries that ends up in a small tribal countryside of Chandrapur, the town where a local criminal and arms dealer Bala Thakur (Rajish Joshi) transport weapons to Veeran (Govind Namdeo), the insurgent tribal leader of forest lodgings famous for his ferocity and viciousness in the area. As the sequence that shows the innocent people aboard the bus blocked by a bunch of donkeys surprisingly come under attack in the middle of the road by the terrorists who were affiliated with Veeran. The highly dramatized and dynamic camera movement; the angles and cuts definably establish this sequence of brutal killings of the innocents as cause of the narrative to develop further for effects. The flash of bright light fades out of the last gunshot of the scene in which an innocent boy is brutally shot dead and the shot cuts to furious journalists that question the interior minister in a village nearby the place of an incident. A journalist asks as:

- Journalist: “How can the government get the criminals?”
Minister: The government is thinking the same.”
Journalist 2: How can you promise that the massacre of this intensity will never take place again?”
Minister: I promise it will never happen again, for this purpose, we have given the task to special branch Mumbai police to investigate the case.”

The film cuts to Pakistan army headquarters Karachi through tilting shot with large lavish office space where major Baig briefs a Pakistani general about the massacre taken place in Chandrapur, India. The ISI general (Khodus Wadia), through cartographs, observes Chandrapur and gesticulate to encourage terrorism in India through the Indian local agents by the provisions of money and arms. The film effectively establishes the causes to bring out cinematic realities through the logic of narrative time and space. The film thus signified Islamic Republic of Pakistan’s covert involvement in terrorism in the Indian states.

The next scene shows a concert that is arranged in a huge hall in Mumbai in the honour of Gulfam Hassan (Naseeruddin Shah) who thanks the host Seema (Sunali Bandre) for her kind words. Seema speaks to the audiences and links Gulfam Hassan’s childhood with Indian state of Rajasthan and his young age with Pakistan. She enunciates the singer’s global popularity as “despite being a Pakistani, he also belongs to India and rest of the world...” Her speech signifies Indians’ love for Ghazals and much respect for Gulfam Hassan a symbol of peace and unity between arch rivals of India and Pakistan. Ajay enters in a long static-an arret shot to the surprise of Seema on stage stuns to her beat as an allegory (extended metaphor).

The singer acknowledges Seema’s as: My relationship with both the countries is heartiest-emotional and called love in the language of ghazal...” He lap synchronizes with Jagjeeth Singh’s “Hosh walon ko khabar kia bekhodi kia cheez hay” (how, those consciously know what unconsciousness is?).

During the concert, *Rathod* a.k.a. Ajay who, by now, is Assistant Commissioner of Police (hereafter A.C.P) Mumbai special branch exchanges the eye contact with Seema, and flashes back at the terrorists abducting and killing of his older brother (Varun Vardhan). Later on, the terrorists debilitate his father (Akash Khurana) for being a witness against them in the court, always keeps Ajay revengeful. At the same time, the shy Ajay flashes back his unsuccessful attempts to attract Seema in Delhi College. As the concerts comes to an end, Seema announces Ajay for meeting. Both exchange contacts and she also introduces him to his brother. Afterwards, the lavish life styles of both Ajay and Seema in Mumbai deliberates that their shifting to the cosmopolitan city of Mumbai brands them social and economic life better than the conservative city of Delhi.

4.2 Indian Muslims and Identity Crisis

Sequence B

As the plot gets the narrative forward through the main character, an honest and dedicated Muslim inspector Salim (Mukesh Rishi), is well-known for the vast network of intelligence gathering in the special branch of police force, fails to capture a Muslim criminal Sultan (Pradeep Rawat) during a combat next to red light district. Salim loses his three constables and thus, gets disappointed and the film cuts to the office of the Deputy Commissioner of Police (hereafter DCP-Sunil Shende).

The DCP puts inspector Salim responsible for the deaths of constables and in appropriation to the situation, he removes Salim from the critical case on the suspicion of letting Sultan a Muslim member of the notorious criminal gang for safety.

While ignoring Salim's insistence on truthful justification, the D. C. P orders ACP Ajay a former trainee under Salim to take charge of the case embarrassing Salim. The offended Salim says "I know sir, why are you removing me from the case." As he comes out of DCP office in frustration, Ajay pursues Salim for joining the case unofficially and help him for the sake of national interest.

The next morning, Salim hands over the file of a case to Ajay, in anger, and refuses to help him.

Ajay: "So this is your decision?"

Salim: "I don't have the status to decide, it is the authority that decide...all the department including DCP whisper and target me because I am a Muslim. Today a criminal was killed in your custody (an earlier scene in which Ajay fails to capture a gang member who kills his own member in custody of ACP Ajay), no one blamed you because you are a Hindu and the son of a rich man...."

Ajay tells about terrorists' atrocities on his family pointing towards his handicapped father and widowed sister-in-law the verandah), and credits his hard work for being successful in the competitive examination to become ACP in hope to eliminate the terrorists.

Ajay: "I tell this not because this is my home affair, but of my country."

Salim: "Is this not affair of my country?"

Ajay: "May be not. That is why you are getting away with the responsibilities. I need to save my country as a home and I do not need any Salim for this."

On the one hand, the film suggests the bringing of a Muslim minority group into nationalistic fervor. On the other hand, it consciously or unconsciously 'Orientalizes' the Muslims as thick minded and sluggish. It is only the under pressure Muslim Salim who reconsiders his job and proves his national patriotism, by providing a picture of a female dancer whom Salim deceits to a friendship and persuades through offering money for providing address (earlier ACP Ajay fails in his investigation to find Sultan in her mother

Surekha Skiri house and second time in red light district), that leads him to arrest notorious criminal Muslim gang member Sultan. To Ajay Salim says “never suspect my honesty again” and they become trustworthy colleagues once again.

4.3 Cultural Industry and relationship between the two countries

Sequence C

Gulfam Hassan’s friendship with Ajay gets the deeper at times when Ajay gifts Gulfam Hassan a cassette of his young age-ghazals collection. He thanks him as “it is so nice of you, I was in search of this old collection, but I could not find anywhere, how could you listen these old ghazals despite of young age?”

Seema’s brother who often arranges Ghazal singing nights for Gulfam Hassan receives a Pakistani diplomat Mr. Asalm Baig (Vallabh Vyas played as a secret ISI major) and Gulfam Hassan in a cultural gathering. During the poetry gathering in Mumbai, the Indian dignitaries stress on Gulfam Hassan about the exchange of cultural activities between the two countries irrespective of political tensions. He speaks well in favour of unity and peace between the two countries... When he gets a break at a corner along with Mr. Baig, he whispers “How is Mr. General?”

Baig replies “the general is fine but suspects that you enjoy cultural activities more, rather than the real mission (terrorism).” Mr. Baig secretly delivers the message of a Pakistan army general complaining about his cultural gatherings more than terror activities. The spectators come to know for the first time that the Pakistani singer is a dangerous terrorist.

The General stresses to remind you”, the singer interrupts “thank you very much for reminding me. Tell him “you get happy with accomplishment of the prescribed goals. Gulfam has the feeling of his responsibility.” Baig reminds his promise to general of producing hundreds of terrorists instead of only Veeran.”

The singer feels bad, Baig says “never mind; the general has complete confidence in you. That is why even being a “*Muhajir* (Refugee),” in spite of hard criticism; the general gives you immense task.” The singer becomes upset to hear the word *Muhajir*. Meanwhile, Seema and Ajay get there. The singer responds to the question of Seema that “yes, there are many of his fans in Pakistan, but even after 50 years they call us *Muhajirs* not Pakistanis.” The film thus disseminates overt propaganda against Pakistan Urdu speaking ethnic community and discourage them towards national loyalty and reminds them their historical mistake of migration to newly established state of Pakistan.

Sequence D

The film enters into a state of double crisis (double disequilibrium) when an inspector Yadav (Salim Shah) briefs Ajay in his office. He surprises by glancing at the photographs of Mr. Baig as a Pakistani diplomat, Shafiq (Ali

Khan) as a Pakistan ISI captain and others. He flashes back into his meetings with them in Mumbai, the subtext associates past deep friendship activities of the singer and his cultural integrity of the two countries into suspicion at present time and space. He suddenly decides to take his team to Bahid village, Rajasthan for possible raid.

One of the most remarkable scenes, of the sequence D, the film develops the narrative into climax with parallel shots. The singer along with Major Baig enjoys music and dance party in his ancestral mansion in the night, while, in parallel shots the smuggling of arms takes place in the premises of Haji Seth (Ahmed Khan) and Mirchi Seth (Akhilendra Mishra). The plot of *Sarfarosh* that begins with smuggling event and ends up the arms delivery to Mirchi and Haji Seth through police raid lead by Ajay.

A police team arrives at the gate of Bahid fort and occupy all the entrances with heavy gun shots causing stampede on film time 2.28.20, and concluding 11:20 (eleven minute and twenty seconds) long sequence comes to the end at 2:39:40 with killing of Gulfam Hassan.

As the shooting stops with Gulfam's pleading; Ajay flashes back and regrets. He loudly shouts for their arrests linking each of them with Pakistan army and its terrorism. He shows up handcuffed Shafi "Pakistan army captain as proof. "We will put your evil face before the world."

Major Baig: Due to diplomatic immunity you cannot even touch me...otherwise the response will be given in Islamabad." Inspector Salim proposes A.C.P. Rathod to let him shoot Baig without a proof, while; Ajay needs Gulfam's guilt with proof. Thus, the film illegal proposal of Salim links Muslims with abnormalities, extremism-terrorism and fanaticism.

Ajay offers Baig again "if you shoot him, I will let you go for safety." Combating for personal safety, Mr. Baig tells a terrified-broken hearted Gulfam that "in case of his killing the nation gets no damage as he is Muhajir" instead.

Towards furious Gulfam, Ajay throws loaded gun. As Baig shoots with empty gun, Gulfam in no time shoots him to death. Ajay appears from hiding with Gulfam tending to say "you made me commit this bigger sin."

To Gulfam's furious expression about his ancestry and displacement during partition, Ajay replies: "it was and a trauma for us...Majority of Muslims reside in India than Pakistan. You are enemy of the entire humanity." Surrounded by police force, Salim arrests him.

Ajay's final dialogue metaphorically suture Gulfam Hassan's deceitful character representing Pakistan by calling him an 'evil face' unveiled to the entire world. It embarrasses Gulfam and in the try to snatch a gun, the soldier stabs him to death with bayonet.

Sarfarosh projects the dominant national ideological consciousness through killing of aggressor to protect the national borders-citizens and their belongings from the transgressor Gulfam and other Pakistanis who challenged sovereignty of India. It brings all the Indian social communities easily united

at the end by resolving their difficult cultural differences and normalizes the narrative.

5. Discussion

This cinematic discourse as cultural discourse simultaneously signifies a 'product and the composer of hegemonic discourse'. The text of *Sarfarosh* therefore, positioned it as "those who speak and those whom they address," as (Hayward, 1996, 2006) explaining Further, cultural challenges from outside that always constitute inward nationalism in cinema to construct 'state and citizen, citizen and the other' (Hayward, 1993). Bollywood does the same in national level to confront with the cultural and economic globalization of Hollywood and other cinemas.

This cultural discourse thus, targets Hindu male audiences at large for the same purpose and at the same time evokes Indian Muslims their national identity, in doing so, Mattan's cinema uses Pakistani cultural presence in India as 'Other culture' and associate Muslims with crime as a tool to maximize profits in its earlier established market and to evolve the minds of audience. In doing so, the most of this genre films portray Pakistanis hindering the ways of peace-binding by secretly orchestrating arms smuggling and framing civil unrest in India.

There are many Bollywood films of this melodrama subgenre such as *Pukar* (call), *Zameen* (Earth), *Fanaa*, *Fiza*, *Roja* (Rose), *Mission Kashmir* (Mission Kashmir), *Deewar* (Wall), *Sarhad Par* (Across the Border), *Border* (Border), *Refugee* (Migrants), *Main Hoon Na* (I am here to help) and *Bombay* (Bombay) to name a few, which are perceived as fostering hatred in the public sphere, in fact harmless and only maximize profits due to Bollywood widespread global presence (Dudrah, 2008; Mehta, 2005; Mishra, 2009; Novak, 2010; Schaefer & Karan, 2010).

This genre highlights Pakistan as 'theocratic state' based on 'Islamic ideology' (Akhtar et al., 2006; Kumar, 2007) an external enemy of the Indian nation-state whose 'Muslim citizens' religious affiliation', Booth (2005) viewed, as 'with Pakistan'. In addition, Mumbai's cosmopolitanism as a hub of commercial and cultural activities signified India's shift towards modernity through economic liberalization of the 1990s, however Pakistan hinders its development.

The releasing of the film *Sarfarosh* on April 30, 1999 was appropriated to the Kargil conflict fought between India and Pakistan in May-July in 1999. Cultural catastrophic events never come at sudden and without cause. Kargil is a district of the state of disputed Kashmir wherein the conflict took place in the government of BJP, whose extreme Hindu nationalist movement Hindutva not only 'attacked Muslims' sacred places' (Vasudevan, 2000) but also demolished the 16th century Babri mosque which led to the Bombay/Mumbai communal riots and the massacre of Muslim minority in the state of Gujarat (Das, 2006). The nation in complete turmoil obliged BJP politicians to find out ways how to bring the angry and marginalized minority Muslim community

back into the national patriotism. As they were suspecting that the Indian Muslims are more loyal to Islam than the Indian nationalism (Kishwar, 1998).

Although, a well-known Indian scholar Bannerji (2006) termed this type of representation of Indian nationalism as Hindu nationalism. The state thus Othered Salim as he did not belong to Hinduism (Bhugra, 2005; Rai, 2003; Saksena, 2006). Salim's removal on religious suspicion given no chance to bring him back officially. It was in fact a patriotic, civilized, cultured and dedicated Muslim cop Salim that gulps down his personal pride-for Indian nation that offered nothing but expected to bring him back to the mission with extra burden of loyalty by working unofficially under the Hindu boss who holds a good position in the government due to his hard work and intellectual abilities. *Sarfarosh* that the poor condition and backwardness of the Muslims in India are not due to state's irresponsibility, but because of their sluggish and emotional state of mind that lead them to subordination.

The film's broader socio-cultural and political signification through the controversial word "*Muhajir*" (refugee) puts Urdu speaking community disrespectful to Pakistan and India either as they migrated in 1947 to Pakistan. As witnessed in Sequence A, the narrative construct relationship of Karachi with Pakistan army ISI headquarter and Urdu speaking community which was mostly settled in Karachi after the partition of India in 1947. Parting with this, the film uncultured ISI and Urdu speaking community with signification of extremism and related with Indian Muslim inspector Salim as an extremist, emotional and dim-witted by suggesting to his boss an extra judicial killing of a Pakistani singer and diplomat in urgency.

The nationalist plot of *Sarfarosh* deploys the rejection and recognition of Muslims at a time. The character of Gulfam Hassan proved its duplicity as a conspirator but not a true friend (Hirji, 2008). No doubt, he is a committed Ghazal singer and respected guest of the Indian government that in fact brings the national disaster to Indian society by smuggling arms and murdering its citizens. He never comes to the surface and remains subversive in its direct involvement of any criminal behavior (Bhaumik, 2005).

Sarfarosh textual subjectivity revealed partition of the country in 1947 as Indian national trauma as national citizens became refugees and displaced in its own home land. Therefore, Indian national cartographic anxiety signified in *Sarfarosh* construct Pakistan as transgressor and responsible for Indian disasters.

The conflicting ideologies of Hinduism and Islam existing for centuries and showed no evidence of conflicts between Hindus and Muslim communities in India, it was Nehru's Indian national congress option to not undo the partition by not giving minority status to the Muslims in constitution as in the making of Pakistan, the Hindu extremists subjected Indian Muslims to minority status as Kumar (2007) insisted and revealed Gupta in his statement in (1966) that congress did not offer the coalition in U.P. to Muslim League.

The construction of Muslims and Pakistan in the *Sarfarosh* as enemies of the Indian nation-state is due to social absorption of Hindutva movement influence to promote technological competition, cause ethnic and cultural wars and border conflicts with Pakistan on the representational level. Cultural gatherings, economic growth and cosmopolitanism in society indicated potential economic policies of the Bollywood cinema during 1990s as well. However, Adorno and Horkheimer (1946) had suggested that the growth in economy in society should not minimize the performance of a culture product.

Nevertheless, in addition to this, as perceived and motivated by the economic liberalization and free media exchange, Urdu language may be the last stronghold and source of survival in Bollywood cinema (Aneesh, 2010; Virdi, 2003). The increasing global popularity of Bollywood films is due to the song and dance sequences and is the contribution of the Parsee theatre and Urdu language (Dudrah, 2008; Mehta, 2005; Mishra, 2009; Novak, 2010; Schaefer & Karan, 2010).

About hegemony, Storey (2006) argued that the production and reproduction of the idea of bourgeoisie class intends not to 'force consciousness' of the masses, but to get consnetof the people for 'getting allied with the interest of the hegemonic alliance of 'power bloc'. Adorno (1997) insisted that in search of profits and homogeneity, the cultural industry deprives 'authentic culture' of its critical function, its mode of 'contradiction'. Commercialization makes 'authentic culture' cheaper and accessible without any effort, devising it into cultural commodity.

As Horkheimer (1944) declares that "One day we may learn that in the depths of their threats, the masses... secretly knew the truth and disbelieved the lie..." Bourgeoisie class always create media institutions for controlling willpower of the masses all the way through difficult language and particularities that carry messages with loaded meanings in natural mode though seem making common sense, but they are, in essence, always contradictory (p. 108). Because, these media institutions fabricate the lies and transmit to the minds of audiences to pursue and make them believe.

6. Conclusion

Sarfarosh's dominant discourse at times reproduces and emphasizes the dominant ideology through social relations between India and Pakistan wherein it communicates sovereignty of the national-state. It concludes that behind the bad socio-political relationships between these two countries perceived as cultural differences are due to cartographic anxieties of the partition of the country in 1947. Therefore, it links history with contemporary political developments including the economic liberalization, nation-state and its position in the globalized world. Bollywood as an Indian National cinema cultural challenges from Hollywood production, thus, it always constitutes inward nationalism by constructing 'state and citizen, citizen and the other' as seen in *Sarfarosh*. The film as a family melodrama depicted a small Hindu family used as a metaphor for a united Indian nation under the attack of an

“Other culture”, perceived as Pakistan, for maximum profit strategies. Mattan’s cinema controls the will power of audiences, especially Hindu males through stylistic cinematic language loaded with cultural meanings based not on real social events. It constructs to betray audiences’ common sense and believing.

References

- Akhtar, A. S., Amirali, A., & Raza, M. A. (2006).** Reading between the lines: the mullah–military alliance in Pakistan. *Contemporary South Asia*, 15(4), 383-397.
- Aneesh, A. (2010, March).** Bloody Language: Clashes and Constructions of Linguistic Nationalism in India 1. In *Sociological Forum* (Vol. 25, No. 1, pp. 86-109). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Bannerji, H. (2006).** Making india hindu and male cultural nationalism and the emergence of the ethnic citizen in contemporary India. *Ethnicities*, 6(3), 362-390.
- Bhaumik, S. N. (2005).** Politics of Indian War Films. *Earthquake in South Asia*, 85.
- Bhugra, D. (2005).** Mad tales from Bollywood: The impact of social, political, and economic climate on the portrayal of mental illness in Hindi films. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 112(4), 250-256.
- Booth, G. (2005).** Pandits in the movies: contesting the identity of Hindustani classical music and musicians in the Hindi popular cinema. *Asian music*, 36(1), 60-86.
- Chakravarty, S. S. (2000).** *Fragmenting the nation: Images of terrorism in Indian popular cinema* (M. H. S. Mackenzie Ed.). London: Routledge.
- Chaudhuri, S. (2005).** *Contemporary world cinema Europe, the Middle East, East Asia and South Asia. South Asian Cinema*, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
- Das, R. (2006).** Encountering Hindutva, interrogating religious nationalism and (En) gendering a Hindu patriarchy in India's nuclear policies: Ordering, Bordering and Othering. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 8(3), 370-393.
- DeChaine, D. Robert. (2009).** Bordering the civic imaginary: Alienization, fence logic, and the Minuteman Civil Defense Corps. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 95(1), 43-65.
- Dudrah, R. (2008).** *Queer Desis: Secret politics of gender and sexuality in Bollywood films in diasporic urban ethnoscaes: Ideology and Bollywood cinema. The Bollywood reader.* (R. Dudrah & J. Desai Eds.). Burkshire: Mc Graw Hill.
- Gupta, R. (2009).** Cinema and Terrorism in India: 1990s. *Online*, 3, 1—6.
- Hayward, S. (1996).** *Cinema studies: The key concepts*, (1st ed.) New York: Routledge.

- Hayward, S. (2006).** *Cinema studies: The key concepts* (3rd ed.) New York: Routledge.
- Hirji, F. (2008).** Change of pace? Islam and tradition in popular Indian cinema. *South Asian Popular Culture*, 6(1), 57-69.
- Khan, S. (2009).** Nationalism and Hindi cinema: Narrative strategies in Fanna. *South Asian Film and Media, Intellect Ltd.*, 1(1), 85—99. doi:10.1386/safm.1.1.85/1
- Kishwar, M. (1998).** Religion at the Service of Nationalism. *Manushi*, 76.
- Kumar, P. (2007).** *Islamic "Terrorism" and visions of Justice in Khalid Mohamed's Fiza* (C. K. Creekmur & M. Sidel Eds. Cinema, Law, And The State In Asia ed.). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Malhotra, S., & Alagh, T. (2004).** Dreaming the nation: Domestic dramas in Hindi films post-1990. *South Asian Popular Culture*, 2(1), 19-37.
- Mallhi, A. (2006).** *The Illusion of Secularism: Mani Ratnam's Bombay and the Consolidation of Hindu Hegemony*. Canada: Centre for Asia-Pacific Initiatives,[University of Victoria].
- Mehta, M. (2005).** Globalizing Bombay Cinema Reproducing the Indian State and Family. *Cultural Dynamics*, 17(2), 135-154. doi:10.1177/0921374005058583
- Mishra, V. (2009).** Spectators of sentimentality: the Bollywood Film. *Textual Practice*, 23(3), 439—462.
- Novak, D. (2010).** Cosmopolitanism, remediation, and the ghost world of Bollywood. *Cultural Anthropology*, 25(1), 40—72. doi:10.1111/j.1548-1360.2009.01051
- Newman, David. (2006).** Borders and bordering: Towards an interdisciplinary dialogue. *European Journal of Social Theory Sage, London*, 9(2), 171–186.
- Prakash, S. (2000).** The political economy of Kashmir since 1947. *Contemporary South Asia*, 9(3), 315-337.
- Prasad, M. M. (2000).** Signs of Ideological Re-form in Two Recent Films: Towards Real Subsumption?. *Making meaning in Indian cinema*, 145-167.
- Rai, A. (2003).** Patriotism and the Muslim citizen in Hindi films. *Harvard Asia Quarterly*, 7, 4-15.
- Saksena, R. (2006).** *Mapping terrorism: Amorphous nations, transient loyalties. (Doctoral dissertation)*, University of Maryland, College Park.
- Schaefer, D. J., & Karan, K. (2010).** Problematizing Chindia: hybridity and Bollywoodization of popular cinema in global film flows. *Global Media and Communication. Sage*, 6(3), 309-316. doi:10.1177/1742766510384970
- Sen, M. (2010).** It's all about loving your parents'': liberalization, Hindutva, and Bollywood's new fathers. *Bollywood and globalization: Indian popular cinema, nation, and diaspora*, 145-168.

- Smith. A. D. (2000b).** *Images of the Nation: Cinema, art and national identity. Cinema and nation.* (Mette Hjort & Scott Mackenzie Eds.). London: Routledge.
- Smith. A. D. (2008).** *The cultural foundations of nations: hierarchy, covenant, and republic.* Malden, Oxford: John Wiley & Sons.
- Vasudevan, R. S. (2000).** *Making meaning in Indian cinema: The sociology and politics of the cinematic institution* (R. S. Vasudevan Ed.). New Delhi. : Oxford University press
- Virdi, J. (2003).** *The Cinematic ImagiNation [sic]: Indian Popular Films as Social History.* New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Vitali, V. (2004).** Nationalist hindi cinema: Questions of film analysis and historiography. *Kinema*, 22(3), 299-311.