

Chapter Title: Film/City: Cinema, Affect, and Immaterial Labor in Urban India
Chapter Author(s): Shanti Kumar

Book Title: Precarious Creativity
Book Subtitle: Global Media, Local Labor
Book Editor(s): Michael Curtin, Kevin Sanson
Published by: University of California Press. (2016)
Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/j.ctt1ffjn40.8>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://about.jstor.org/terms>



This book is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.



University of California Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Precarious Creativity*

Film/City

Cinema, Affect, and Immaterial Labor in Urban India

Shanti Kumar

In this chapter, I argue that Bollywood must be understood as a vital force of immaterial labor for the affective contagion of mass creativity in urban India. I focus on some of the many reasons why politicians, policymakers, film stars, filmmakers, and business leaders in India are turning their attention to the infrastructure of cinema as a potential resource for attracting economic capital and creative labor in urban and semiurban areas. The fusion of cinematic infrastructure with urban architecture is most evident in Indian cities and towns that have, or are planning to have, a “film city” in their master plans for urban development. Recent examples of this popular trend include the inauguration near Kolkata with much fanfare of Prayag Film City by the Bollywood superstar Shah Rukh Khan in April 2012; the announcement in August 2012 by actor Jackie Shroff of his investment in a partnership to build a mini-film city in Ahmedabad; the proposal by the Bihar chief minister, Nitish Kumar, in November 2012 to build a Film City near Patna in response to intense lobbying by actors from the Hindi and Bhojpuri film industries; plans by the Uttar Pradesh chief minister, Akhilesh Yadav, in October 2012 to create an IT/Film City in Lucknow; and much-advertised plans by the corporate powerhouse Sahara India to build the Sahara Pariwar Film City in its Aambi Valley development project near Pune.

The mobilization of the film industry and its infrastructure, including cinema halls, shooting locations, and production facilities, for generating economic development and sustaining growth in urban, semiurban, and rural areas is hardly new in India. For instance, these proposals for film cities take their inspiration from the pioneering efforts of Ramoji Film City, built near Hyderabad in 1996, and Innovative Film City near Bengaluru, which opened in 2008. Many

academic studies have detailed the central role that cinema halls, film studios, cinematic narratives, and Bollywood-inspired consumer culture have played for many decades now in producing and sustaining India's nationalist visions and developmental goals. However, what is new about the recent spate of proposals for film cities is the way the immaterial infrastructure of Bollywood is being integrated into the future designs and architectures of urban life as a whole in India.

Drawing on Nigel Thrift's concept of "affective cities," I examine how film cities—and plans for film cities—are being used in several cities and towns in India to produce and manage mass creativity by transforming urban life into social factories of immaterial labor.¹ As Maurizio Lazzarato defines it, "immaterial labor" is labor that produces the informational and cultural content of a commodity.² The informational aspect of immaterial labor refers to the ways digital technologies, computer networks, and cybernetic controls are becoming integral to the labor practices that workers used traditionally to perform in spaces such as the factory floor. The cultural aspect of immaterial labor involves the affect value of the practices of social life in areas such as fashion, tastes, traditions, and norms, which are usually not deemed relevant to matters of labor in the workplace. As information technologies have become central to all sorts of workplaces in recent times, immaterial labor has become more integral to practices of work and social life at large, according to Lazzarato. The result is that labor is increasingly becoming more "intellectual" in society, and the commodities created through practices of immaterial labor are not only goods made in a factory but also the products of "mass intellect" or "mass creativity" in social life.

I argue that Thrift's concept of "affective cities" is a powerful framework for analyzing how practices of immaterial labor in urban life are shifting the focus of work from capital-labor relations (in spaces such as the factory floor) to capital-life relations (in society at large). Using Thrift's concept of affective cities in relation to Lazzarato's theory of immaterial labor, I examine how cities in India are trying to tap into the immaterial labor of Bollywood by mobilizing film cities for the production and management of mass creativity in urban life as a whole. In this context, immaterial labor in Bollywood is not strictly limited to what is traditionally understood as the creative process of making a film. Instead, it is the workers and consumers at large who produce a range of immaterial goods and services through the constant exchange of communication, information, and knowledge about the film commodity in the political, economic, technological, cultural, and affective realms of social relations. The film city, I argue, is a concrete embodiment of the many ways in which the immaterial infrastructure of Bollywood is being fused with the traditional architectures of cities and towns in India to meet the growing demands of—and desires for—mediated mobilities in the twenty-first century.

BOLLYWOODIZATION, IMMATERIAL LABOR, AND
MASS CREATIVITY

The term *Bollywood* was coined in the 1970s to capture—often pejoratively—the similarities between India’s national Hindi film industry based in Bombay (now Mumbai) and the globally dominant Hollywood film industry in the United States. However, as Ashish Rajadhyaksha argues, *Bollywood* in recent times has been used not just to describe Hindi films produced in Bombay but also to refer to “a more diffuse cultural conglomeration involving a range of distribution and consumption activities from websites to music cassettes, from cable to radio.”³ Therefore, Rajadhyaksha uses the term *Bollywoodization* to signify a very recent phenomenon in Indian cinema that has emerged since the 1990s as a result of the “synchronous developments of international capital and diasporic nationalism.”⁴

In the dominant “national” model of Indian cinema, the relationship between production and consumption has always been clearly demarcated, dividing those who make films (directors, producers, writers, actors, and other crew members or below-the-line workers) from those who watch films (moviegoers, fans, and consumers of film-based media, memorabilia, and culture). As Derek Bose argues in *Brand Bollywood*, when hundreds of formulaic Hindi films are being mass-produced in Bombay, the process of filmmaking often resembles the assembly-line mode of industrial production on a factory floor.⁵ Recounting a time in the 1990s when industry output had reached over 900 films per year and over 14,000 titles were registered with the Indian Motion Pictures Producers Association (IMPPA), Bose writes, “Actors like Govinda and Anil Kapoor were doing as many as five shifts a day and Mahesh Bhatt acquired the distinction of being India’s first ‘director by remote control.’ At any given time, he had three or four projects on the floor and he would sit at home, instructing various assistants on telephone to can his shots. Films were thus directed by proxy, in keeping with the best traditions of assembly-line production.”⁶

Many of these films were major box office hits because the assembly-line mode of mass production was sustained by a national network of financier-distributors whose monopoly over clearly demarcated distribution territories could ensure that mass audiences would always throng into theaters to watch their favorite movie stars on the big screen. The fairly standardized model of formulaic filmmaking and the national system of financing and distribution did not allow for—or did not require—much input from the mass audiences in relations of production. In an industry driven by what Tejaswini Ganti calls “the ratio of hits to flops,” filmmakers considered the commercial success or failure of films “as an accurate barometer of social attitudes, norms, and sensibilities, thus providing the basis for knowledge about audiences.”⁷ Of course, the failure—or the fear of failure—of big-budget, big-star films was always a good reason for producers to incorporate

audience feedback into the production process. But the creative power of the mass audiences to reframe cinematic narratives or to reshape filmmaking practices was limited in the national model of mass production, mass distribution and mass consumption in Indian cinema.

However, with the Bollywoodization of Indian cinema since the late 1990s and early 2000s, a more diffused, global model of cultural production has emerged where the relationship between film producers and consumers has, of necessity, become less hierarchical and more transversal. The changes in creative and industrial practices produced by the Bollywoodization of Indian cinema have been deftly analyzed by Aswin Punathambekar in *From Bombay to Bollywood: The Making of a Global Media Industry*. Contrasting the new Bollywoodized mode of production with the traditional model of filmmaking in Indian cinema, Punathambekar argues that the “ongoing changes in the domain of marketing and promotions are emblematic of broader reconfigurations of relations between capital, circuits of information and forms of knowledge . . . in Bombay’s media world.”⁸ For instance, discussing the growing centrality of paratexts such as trailers, posters, music videos of song and dance sequences, and media events such as the *mahurat* (ritual inauguration of a new production) and promotional tours by film stars and singers, Punathambekar examines how marketing and promotion have become new sites of decision making, communication, and knowledge about the film commodity even before a film is released or produced.

Since the paratexts and media events discussed by Punathambekar are not traditionally considered integral parts of the filmmaking process or the film commodity, the labor involved in their production (including advertising, marketing, promotion, spot films, web sites, online chat sessions with fans, and games and contests for mobile devices) is what Lazzarato would define as immaterial labor. To recall Lazzarato’s definition outlined earlier, immaterial labor consists of two types of work in the capitalist production of a commodity (such as a film): informational labor (such as the use of digital technologies, paratexts, media events, marketing, and promotion materials before, during, and after production) and cultural labor (the production of affective value through the circulation of the film commodity in social life—such the pleasures of producing and consuming the texts and paratexts of a film, the thrill of participating in media events, the social bonds of sharing and recommending “free” marketing and promotional materials about the film to online and offline friends, and so on). Taken together, the two types of immaterial labor—informational and cultural—produce affective value for the film commodity in all aspects of social life.

The affect of immaterial labor is, of course, difficult to track. As Thrift points out, there are many definitions of affect, and they are often “associated with words like emotion and feeling, and a consequent repertoire of terms like hatred, shame, envy, fear, disgust, anger, embarrassment, sorrow, grief, anguish, love, happiness,

joy, hope, wonder.”⁹ However, Thrift finds that these words are not good translations of affect and therefore proposes to move away from definitions that focus on individualized emotions. Instead, Thrift favors approaches that define affect in terms of general tendencies and lines of forces. Of these approaches, Thrift highlights four: affect as embodied knowledge, affect theory associated with but differentiated from psychoanalytic conceptions of libidinal drives, the Spinozian-Deleuzian notion of affect as emergent capacities, and neo-Darwinian frameworks of affect as a universal expression of emotion. Summarizing his extensive review of the literature on these four approaches to affect, Thrift writes, “Four different notions of affect, then. Each of them depends on a sense of push in the world but the sense of push is subtly different in each case. In the case of embodied knowledge, that push is provided by the expressive armoury of the human body. In the case of affect theory it is provided by biologically differentiated positive and negative affects rather than the drives of Freudian theory. In the world of Spinoza and Deleuze, affect is the capacity of interaction that is akin to a natural force of emergence. In the neo-Darwinian universe, affect is a deep-seated physiological change involuntarily written on the face.”¹⁰

Although affect—as general tendencies and lines of force—is a widespread and crucial element of urban life, Thrift argues that the affective register has been largely neglected in the study of cities. Defining urban life through the concept of “affective cities,” Thrift argues that affects like anger, fear, joy, and hope manifest themselves in “the mundane emotional labor of the workplace, the frustrated shouts and gestures of road rage, the delighted laughter of children as they tour a theme park or the tears of a suspected felon undergoing police interrogation.”¹¹ Equally, for Thrift, affect in urban life is evident in the “mass hysteria” surrounding major media events like the spectacular life or the death of a global superstar or the roar of a crowd celebrating a point scored by their team in a sports stadium. To Thrift’s descriptions of the affective registers in urban culture, one could add, in the Indian context, the many ways Bollywood culture permeates the everyday lives of Indians in terms of fashion, clothing, style, song and dance, rituals, and so on. One can also point to the affective domain of “mass worship” of Bollywood stars and Bollywood culture along with the “mass fanaticism” of fans who flock to see their favorite film star at a shooting location or in a film city, or the masses of cinemagoers who insist on catching a new release in a cinema hall on the first day in cities and towns across India.

As Amit Rai’s brilliant work on affect in India’s new media assemblage demonstrates, film (in the traditional sense of movie-making and movie-going) is now only one of the many elements in a highly diffuse agglomeration of material and immaterial practices of production, distribution, and consumption in Bollywood.¹² Therefore, filmmakers have to make creative decisions about the film-making process in relation to a range of immaterial practices taking place—or

which have already taken place—in diverse locations, such as malls, multiplexes, homes, and local marketplaces, and on multiple platforms, such as movie theaters, television channels, FM radio, online media, and cell phones. Foregrounding the affective connectivities between cinema and other media technologies along with the sensations generated among bodies, populations, and various graphical interfaces at locations such as the single-screen cinema hall, the multiplex, the mall, the television screen at home, and the mobile phone in public places, Rai redefines Bollywood as a new media assemblage that is “necessarily constellated, remediated and multiply overlapping.”¹³ Rai argues that through remediation of old and new media connectivities and sensations in and through Bollywood, affect plays a crucial role in the transformation of technologies, labor, and aesthetics in production and consumption practices of everyday life in India.

In many ways, affect has always been a central concern in Indian cinema and in the production of creativity in India more generally. In *Bombay before Bollywood*, Rosie Thomas argues that the spectator-subject of mainstream Hindi cinema has always been addressed and moved through film primarily by affect. Tracing the genealogy of Bollywood through the history of Bombay cinema, Thomas finds that in commercial Hindi films, the emphasis was—and still is—more on emotion and spectacle and less on the tightness of a linear narrative. Or, as Thomas puts it, the emphasis was more “on *how* things would happen rather than *what* would happen next, on a succession of modes rather than linear denouement, on familiarity and repeated viewings rather than ‘originality’ and novelty, on a moral disordering to be (temporarily) resolved rather than an enigma to be solved.”¹⁴ The pleasure value of repeat viewing, for instance, was recognized by filmmakers early on, and was built into film narratives by foregrounding the affective power of stars, music, spectacle, emotion, and dialogue. Thomas argues that affect was thus “structured and contained by narratives whose power and insistence derived from their very familiarity, coupled with the fact that they were deeply rooted (in the psyche and in traditional mythology).”¹⁵

Among the deeply rooted cultural narratives and traditions of everyday life that Thomas refers to are “Hindu caste, kinship and religious ideologies, in particular beliefs in destiny and karma [that] position a decentered, less individuated social subject”; “specific cultural traditions of performance and entertainment . . . notably the forms on which early cinema drew, from the performances of the professional storytellers and village dramatisations of the mythological epics, to the excesses of spectacle (‘vulgar’ and ‘garish’ according to contemporary critics) of the late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century Urdu-Parsi theatre with its indulgent adaptations of Shakespeare and Victorian melodrama”; and the *rasa* theory of aesthetics, which rejects “the unities of time and place and the dramatic development of narrative . . . [and] is concerned with moving the spectator through the text in an ordered succession of modes of affect (*rasa*), by means of highly stylized devices.”¹⁶

Thomas claims that “all Indian classical drama, dance and music draw on this aesthetic,” and argues that the traditions of *rasa* theory deeply inform the production practices of Indian cinema. However, she also finds that most filmmakers do not make any conscious reference to this cultural heritage. Similarly, Thomas wonders whether or not the emergence of the spectator-subject of Indian cinema—who is primarily addressed and moved by aesthetic modes of affect (*rasa*) in film narratives—can be related in any useful way to a more general history of the evolution of the “social audience” in India. Arguing that traditions of Bollywood cannot be used to provide neat causal explanations of contemporary Indian cinema and culture, Thomas suggests that traditions (such as *rasa* theory) must be seen “as a framework of terms of reference within which certain developments have been stifled, others allowed to evolve unproblematically, and which can be used to throw light on the different possibilities of forms of address which might be expected or tolerated by an Indian audience.”¹⁷

As Rajinder Dudrah and Amit Rai remind us, the role of affect (or *rasa*) in Indian cinema cannot be understood simply through critiques of the political economy of the Hindi film industry (to make money, filmmakers have to produce emotional melodramas with song and dance to reach a “mass audience”) or through cultural studies of the textual pleasures of moviegoing for spectator-subjects of Indian cinema (Indians like Bollywood films because emotional melodramas are part of their essential cultural traditions).¹⁸ Highlighting the risks of reading *rasa* as the “essence” of Indian culture and cautioning against the dangers of embracing elitist or high-brahminical ideologies of *rasa* as the pinnacle of Hindu philosophy or aesthetics, Dudrah and Rai examine *rasa* in Bollywood as a “contact zone” of affect. In this zone of affective contagion, Bollywood is a new media assemblage “through and in which bodies, sensations, capital, sexualities, races, technologies and desires rub up against each other, producing differing and differential rhythms, speeds, juices (or *rasas*), intensities, technologies, combinations, codes, possibilities, and even languages.”

Bollywood’s affect (or *rasa*) thus functions as “a framework of terms of reference” at the infrastructural level of cinema and urban life for the creation of new architectures of cities and film cities in India. In the next section, I discuss how the affective value of Bollywood circulates at the infrastructural level in the immaterial production and management of mass creativity through the concept of the film city in urban India.

THE FILM CITY AND/AS THE IMMATERIAL INFRASTRUCTURE OF URBAN LIFE

In Bihar—considered to be one of the least economically developed states in India—Chief Minister Nitish Kumar announced in November 2012 that his

government was seriously considering plans to build a film city near the capital city of Patna. The announcement by the chief minister was in response to intense lobbying by actors, producers, and directors from the Mumbai-based Hindi film industry and the local Bhojpuri film industry, which has in recent years witnessed an amazing growth and rise in popularity in India.¹⁹ For more than a decade, major Bollywood stars from Bihar, including Shatrughan Sinha, Manoj Bajpai, director Prakash Jha, and Bhojpuri film star Ravi Kissen, have aggressively promoted proposals to set up a film city in their home state. A home-grown film city, they argue, would not only attract talent and resources from Bollywood and other regional film industries into Bihar but also stimulate the local Bhojpuri film industry. In 2013, the consultancy firm Grant Thornton submitted a feasibility report to the government of Bihar recommending the construction of a film city in the state. However, in 2014, the chief minister announced plans for building an IT city in Nalanda (his home district) in Bihar.²⁰

Frustrated by lack of progress on a film city in Bihar, director Prakash Jha and actor Shatrughan Sinha are now trying to convince the government of Madhya Pradesh to set up a film city in Bhopal. The government of Madhya Pradesh has already set aside one thousand acres near Bhopal for a proposed film city complex. Bhopal, known as the “city of lakes,” has emerged as a recent favorite of many Bollywood filmmakers, who are drawn to the scenic locations and picturesque beauty of the city’s many lakes and gardens. Prakash Jha shot four films in Bhopal from 2010 to 2013. These films, *Raajneeti* (2010), *Aarakshan* (2011), *Chakravyuh* (2012), and *Satyagrah* (2013), are among some of the most popular Hindi films of the past few years.²¹

When Amitabh Bachchan—without any doubt the biggest film star in the history of Indian cinema—was in Bhopal to shoot for Jha’s film *Aarakshan*, he was warmly welcomed by fans and embraced by the city as its unofficial brand ambassador-in-law because Bachchan’s father-in-law had lived in Bhopal long ago (when Bachchan’s wife, Jaya, was a young girl). It is important to note that Bachchan has also served as the brand ambassador for the Department of Tourism in Gujarat since 2010, and was appointed the brand ambassador for the Health Department in Andhra Pradesh in 2015. Following Bachchan’s “Khushboo Gujarat Ki” (the fragrance of Gujarat) campaign for Gujarat tourism, it was reported that the number of hotel reservations in the state rose from 4,500 to 6,400 within two years. During that time, the number of tourists visiting Gujarat reportedly increased by 55 lakhs (one lakh is equal to 100,000). Vipul Mittra, secretary of tourism for the state of Gujarat, claimed that the state’s efforts to promote tourism with Bachchan as its brand ambassador helped because “he has great credibility and people take him seriously.”²² While it is practically impossible to posit a causal relationship between the growth of tourism in Gujarat and Bachchan’s position as the ambassador of the state’s Tourism Department, the affective value of his promotion of the “fragrance” (*khushboo*) of Gujarat is undeniable.

Such is the respect and popularity that Bollywood superstars like Bachchan enjoy among fans across India, and the branding of cities through identification with film stars shows how cinema and celebrity culture are considered crucial for generating a buzz for public-private partnerships in government-sanctioned plans for urban development in India today. Following Bachchan's appointment as the brand ambassador of Gujarat, West Bengal roped in Shah Rukh Khan as its brand ambassador, and many other states soon followed suit. As Tanvi Trivedi of the *Times of India* reports, "Prachi Desai represents Goa tourism, Hema Malini is the face of Uttarakhand's *Sparsh* [clean] *Ganga* campaign, Saina Nehwal, badminton champ is the brand ambassador for Andhra Pradesh since 2010. Interestingly Haryana (where she was born) also wanted her to be the face. Preity Zinta is the only celebrity representing Himachal Pradesh, Celina Jaitley is the brand ambassador for Egypt, Mountaineer Anshu Jamsenpa who conquered the Mt Everest in 2011 is set to become the brand ambassador of North East India Tourism campaign. Reportedly Arunachal Pradesh wants Aamir Khan, Madhya Pradesh is interested in Abhishek Bachchan (mom Jaya Bachchan is from the state) and Chhattisgarh has asked Sushmita Sen to be their brand ambassadors."²³ Trivedi quotes filmmaker Aniruddha Roy Chowdhury, who directed Shah Rukh Khan's promotional films on West Bengal, as saying, "Even though a Bachchan or Shah Rukh don't [*sic*] have any connect with Gujarat or Bengal, their global appeal does the magic."²⁴

As Nigel Thrift points out, in a crowded marketplace, the only way to make a commodity stand out from its competition is through "a series of 'magical' technologies of public intimacy."²⁵ Thrift argues that these "magical" technologies work through qualities such as the allure of glamour, style, and celebrity to produce intangible affective value for a commodity or a brand. For instance, describing how glamour works through and for commodities, Thrift writes, "For all its breathtaking qualities, glamour does not conjure up awe. It operates on a human scale, in the everyday, inviting just enough familiarity to engage the imagination, a glimpse of another life, utopia as tactile presence. . . . Glamour is about that special excitement and attractiveness that characterizes some objects and people. Glamour is a form of secular magic, conjured up by the commercial sphere."²⁶

Nowhere is this link among the "secular magic" of Bollywood, political considerations of governance, and commercial logics of the marketplace more clearly articulated in public policy than in the state of Uttar Pradesh in northern India. In October 2012, Chief Minister Akhilesh Yadav declared a new master plan to create a TV/film city in Lucknow and an IT corridor in Agra (which will connect with the existing media and industrial enclaves of Noida near the nation's capital, New Delhi). It is significant that plans for the Lucknow-Agra-Noida TV-film-IT corridor also map onto the chief minister's proposal to extend the six- to eight-lane super-highway called Yamuna Expressway (which currently connects Noida to Agra) to

the state's capital, Lucknow. The chief minister's plan to create the Lucknow-Agra-Noida corridor of media industries and superhighways is a clear indication of how media in general, and cinema in particular, are increasingly viewed by politicians and policymakers as keys to the rapid growth of urban infrastructure in India. In 2003, a report by Mckenzie, Crisil, and ICICI commissioned by the government of Uttar Pradesh recommended creating the "right mix of policies" to develop proper infrastructure to fast-track the state's growth rate by 2020. Although the report was commissioned by a previous government, the current chief minister, Akhilesh Yadav, has embraced the 2020 vision to promote "brand UP" by integrating film policy with industrial policy and infrastructure policy. The plans for a film city in the Yamuna Expressway corridor are considered crucial to promoting "brand UP."²⁷

The merging of political and economic activities with the glamour of Bollywood celebrity and culture is engendering new forms of public intimacy in urban India. As Thrift reminds us, the aim of public intimacy in urban life is not simply to create new subjects for the global capitalist order (or other disciplinary regimes).²⁸ Instead, Thrift argues that these spaces are also "new forms of body with the capacity to alter us to that which was previously unable to be sensed—with the corollary that certain objects can no longer be sensed—so producing the potential to generate new kinds of charms."²⁹

In addition to the above-mentioned state-supported plans for integrating the allure of Bollywood into the infrastructure of urban life, some corporate houses in India have embarked on creating private versions of public intimacy through the construction of film cities. The much advertised plans by the corporate powerhouse Sahara India to build the Sahara Pariwar Film City in its Aambi Valley development project near Pune are indicative of this popular trend (www.saharaindiapariwar.org/filmcity.html). One of the largest media conglomerates in India, Sahara India owns TV channels, film theaters, sports teams, hotels, retail outlets, and financial services. The founder of Sahara Group, Subrata Roy, was jailed in March 2014 by the Supreme Court of India on charges of financial fraud.³⁰ It is safe to assume that Sahara's plans for a film city may be on back burner for a while.

In August 2012, Bollywood actor Jackie Shroff announced his partnership in a project to build a mini-film city near Nal Sarovar in Ahmedabad, Gujarat. Initially, Shroff was promoted as the brand ambassador for Nal Sarovar Film City with industrialists Mihir Pandya and Kishansinh Solanki as the major financial backers. However, when Solanki decided to quit the project, Shroff joined Pandya as an investing partner in the project. According to Shroff, Solanki, and Pandya, what sets Nal Sarovar City apart from other film city projects in India is that the film city will be developed as part of an urban enclave with residential homes and resort areas.³¹ In the promotional material for Nal Sarovar City, the "film" part of the city is underdeveloped, and the residential plots and resort areas are more

prominently displayed, revealing how the concept of a film city is being used to develop and sell real estate in urban and semiurban areas near major cities like Ahmedabad in India.

If Sahara Film City and Nal Sarovar City are stalled projects, a more successful corporate venture is Prayag Film City, also known as Chandrakone Film City or Midnapore Film City, located in Chandrakone, West Midnapore, near Kolkata in West Bengal. Prayag Film City is being built by the Prayag Group, which has business interests in diverse areas such as real estate, hotels and resorts, biscuits and cakes, cements, bricks and tiles, tea, fruit, fishery, poultry, farming, aviation, news, and electronic media (www.prayag.co.in/filmcity.html). The Prayag Group plans to build its film city in three phases: phase 1 is a film zone; phase 2 consists of an entertainment zone; and phase 3 will include a hospitality zone. Phase 1 of Prayag Film City opened with great fanfare on April 15, 2012, with Bollywood superstar Shah Rukh Khan as its brand ambassador. It is important to note that Shah Rukh Khan is also brand ambassador for West Bengal, the state in which Prayag Film City is located.

In publicity brochures, Prayag Film City presents itself as a city unto itself: “Pesh hai ek city—Prayag Film City” (Presenting a city—Prayag Film City). The prominent status of Shah Rukh Khan as the brand ambassador—in the foreground with a caricatured model of the film city in the background—reminds readers of Prayag Film City’s close connection to the Mumbai-based Bollywood on the west coast even if Kolkata is all the way on the other side of India. What makes this connection even stronger is the promise of “entertainment ka maha dose” (a big dose of entertainment) in Prayag Film City—delivered by none other than Shah Rukh Khan, arguably the biggest entertainer Bollywood has ever produced since Bachchan.

When all three phases are completed, Prayag Film City, according to publicity materials, will be the “world’s largest film city.” Currently, the title of the world’s largest film city currently belongs to Ramoji Film City (RFC) near Hyderabad, which began operations in 1997. According to the Guinness Book of World Records, RFC has surpassed Hollywood’s Universal Studios in both size and the range of media facilities offered. RFC is the dream project of Cherukuri Ramoji Rao, the owner of the Eenadu Media Group in Andhra Pradesh. The Eenadu Group is one of the largest media conglomerates in South India, and Ramoji Rao’s business empire consists of several English and Telugu-language periodicals, including the widely read newspaper *Eenadu*; a multilingual satellite television network, ETV; a film distribution banner, Ushakiron Movies; and a financial services group, Margadarshi.³²

Following the success of RFC, Innovative Film City (IFC) was launched on January 18, 2008, in Bidadi, which is about fifty kilometers from Bengaluru. IFC is part of the Innovative Group, which runs a multiplex cinema business along with

media production and entertainment and leisure activities in Karnataka. IFC has a much smaller portfolio of films made in Bidadi than RFC. However, some filmmakers from Kannada cinema and television and other regional media have used the production facilities at IFC in the past few years, and Innovative Group plans to promote the film city as a tourist destination and production center on a much larger scale in the coming years.

What makes film cities unique in Indian cinema is that for the first time filmmakers from anywhere in the world can make an entire film from preproduction to postproduction in a one-stop studio that provides multiple outdoor locales and diverse indoor settings. In addition to being state-of-the-art media production centers, film cities are major tourist attractions that provide visitors access to a variety of picturesque gardens, entertainment parks and tours of film sets, and production studios.³³

It is important to note that film cities are resource-intensive ventures and take a long time to complete (it took almost a decade each for RFC and IFC to get up and running). Given the intense competition within and across the major centers of film production in various Indian languages—including Mumbai for Hindi/Marathi cinemas, Chennai for Tamil cinema, Hyderabad for Telugu cinema, Bengaluru for Kannada cinema, and Kolkata for Bengali cinema—film cities are financially risky ventures.

In this regard, the value that a film city can generate for an urban center or a small town cannot be estimated in economic terms alone. Instead, it must be understood in terms of the affective value generated by a film city for an urban center seeking to expand its reach into regional, national, and global circuits of production and consumption. A growing number of cities in India are using proposals for film cities to generate a buzz and create a brand identity that sets them apart from similar cities. By embracing Bollywood stars as ambassadors and closely identifying with the latest Bollywood narratives, fashions, and trends, political and cultural elites in urban India are vying to brand their cities as the newest and best centers of creativity, innovation, and invention.

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I have argued that Nigel Thrift's theory of "affective cities" can be a powerful tool for analyzing the rise and popularity of film cities in India. Drawing on Thrift's theorizations of affect, I have examined how the buzz generated by the circulation of Bollywood's glamour and star power is becoming integral to urban planning and development in India. I have tried to show how—beyond the economic value of creative clustering—the concept of a film city adds value to urban life in the affective realm due to Bollywood's immense popularity as a cultural phenomenon.

With growing media capacity—from low-cost outsourcing to high-tech film cities—in peripheral locations of Bollywood, workers in midsize cities and small towns in India are finding more options for immaterial labor through telecommuting, freelancing, flex time, and so on. But this kind of work does not provide the guarantees of traditional forms of industrial labor with union contracts or state-sponsored employment. The rising precarity of labor relations produced through the immaterial exchanges of media, information, and communication has put pressure on state authorities to provide a semblance of stability and order in the everyday lives of their citizens.

However, due to the growing interconnectedness and rapid deterritorialization of the global economy, the traditional command-and-control structures of the Indian nation-state are no longer capable of exerting—or inclined to exert—their sovereign authority over their territories and populations. Moreover, since the global economy also enhances possibilities for producers across the world to be in direct contact with each other, labor-capital relations can be remotely managed in various locations, often without recourse to the central authority of the nation-state. As the task of regulating global-local relations shifts toward state governments and regional authorities, film cities—or plans for film cities—have emerged as the blueprints of a new architecture for the capture and control of capital and the management and dissemination of creative labor by mobilizing the immaterial productions of cinema in the social life of cities in India.

NOTES

1. Nigel Thrift, *Non-Representational Theory* (New York: Routledge, 2008).
2. Maurizio Lazzarato, "Immaterial Labor," in *Radical Thought in Italy*, ed. Paolo Virno and Michael Hardt (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 133–150.
3. Ashish Rajadhyaksha, "The Bollywoodization of the Indian Cinema: Cultural Nationalism in a Global Arena," *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies* 4.1 (2003): 6.
4. *Ibid.*
5. Derek Bose, *Brand Bollywood: A New Global Entertainment Order* (New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2006).
6. *Ibid.*, 21.
7. Tejaswini Ganti, *Bollywood: A Guidebook to Popular Hindi Cinema* (New York: Routledge, 2004), 62–63.
8. Aswin Punathambekar, *From Bombay to Bollywood: The Making of a Global Media Industry* (New York: New York University Press, 2013), 82.
9. Thrift, *Non-Representational Theory*, 175.
10. *Ibid.*, 182.
11. *Ibid.*, 171.
12. Amit S. Rai, *Untimely Bollywood: India's New Media Assemblage* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2009).
13. *Ibid.*, 70.

14. Rosie Thomas, *Bombay before Bollywood: Film City Fantasies* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2013), 239. Emphasis in the original.
15. *Ibid.*, 240.
16. *Ibid.*
17. *Ibid.*
18. Rajinder Dudrah and Amit Rai, "The Haptic Codes of Bollywood Cinema in New York City," *New Cinemas: Journal of Contemporary Film* 3.3 (2005): 143–158.
19. Ravi Dayal, "Film City Feasibility Report Submitted," *Times of India*, December 2, 2012, <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/patna/Film-city-Feasibility-report-submitted/articleshow/17445887.cms>.
20. IANS, "Bihar to Build IT City near Nalanda: Nitish Kumar," *Times of India*, February 20, 2014, <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/tech/tech-news/Bihar-to-build-IT-city-in-Nalanda-Nitish-Kumar/articleshow/30736559.cms>.
21. "Bhopal Best Place in Country for Shooting of Hindi Films: Prakash Jha," *Daily Pioneer*, April 10, 2013, www.dailypioneer.com/state-editions/bhopal/bhopal-best-place-in-country-for-shooting-of-hindi-films-prakash-jha.html.
22. Tanvi Trivedi, "After Big B-SRK, Other States Too Roped In Stars," *Times of India*, November 22, 2012. <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/entertainment/hindi/bollywood/news/After-Big-B-SRK-other-states-too-ropped-in-stars/articleshow/17309052.cms>
23. *Ibid.*
24. *Ibid.*
25. Nigel Thrift, "Understanding the Material Practices of Glamor," in *The Affect Theory Reader*, ed. Melissa Gregg and Gregory J. Seigworth (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010), 290–308.
26. *Ibid.*, 297.
27. Manish Chandra Pandey, "Coming Up: A Film City in Uttar Pradesh," *Hindustan Times*, June 29, 2013. <http://paper.hindustantimes.com/epaper/viewer.aspx>.
28. *Ibid.*
29. Thrift, "Understanding the Material Practices of Glamor," 295.
30. Gardiner Harris, "Court Jails Indian Tycoon," *New York Times*, March 13, 2014, www.nytimes.com/2014/03/14/business/international/subrata-roy-of-india-under-court-scrutiny.html?_r=0.
31. India Glitz, "Ahmedabad to Get Mini Film City, Courtesy Jackie Shroff," *India Glitz*, August 13, 2012, www.indiaglitz.com/ahmedabad-to-get-mini-film-city-courtesy-jackie-shroff-hindi-news-84713.
32. Renji Kuriakose, "Down in the Clouds," *Week* (India), October 19, 1997.
33. Shanti Kumar, "Mapping Tollywood: The Cultural Geography of Ramoji Film City in Hyderabad, India," *Quarterly Review of Film and Video* 23 (2006): 129–138.