INTRODUCTION:
FILMED SPACE

Histories reside where we seek to find them. They are in our bodies and memories; in objects, archives, and territories; in words, images, committees, and communities; and they are endangered when unsought.[1] I accept all these possibilities in writing a history of films on places, and a history of places on film. Mrinal Sen's *Akaler Sandhaney* (*In Search of Famine*, Bengali, 1980) conveys the treacherous passage of a place—and what film scholars call the "profilmic"[2]—into visual history. In this self-reflexive film, a movie crew arrives from Calcutta to the village of Hatui in Bengal, India. The crew is on a location shoot to film a story set during the colonial Bengal famine of 1943, which caused approximately three million Indian deaths. Rained out of an outdoor shoot, lead actress, Smita (played by the late, acclaimed Smita Patil), devises a game to pass time. She holds up photographs of emaciated bodies and asks fellow cast members, sprawled across the director's room, to guess when the images were taken. Amid banter and incorrect answers, she reveals that the first photograph was taken during India's northeastern famine of 1959, the second in 1943, and the third during the 1971 Bangladesh war. She holds up a final photograph in jest. It is black. "Load shedding, power crisis," shouts someone, referring to India's frequent cuts in electrical supply. "Darkness at noon!" pronounces another. "Past, present and future," intones Smita.

Lacking context, the image becomes an unreliable witness of the place and time of its filmed subject: in this case, the irreducible human body in hunger

FIGURES I.1 AND I.2 Smita holding up photographs of famine in *Akaler Sandhaney*. Courtesy of the National Film Archive of India.

and death, whose horror is more profoundly captured by an abstract black frame than by photographic realism. In this sequence, *Akaler Sandhaney* also conveys the fallacy of thinking that additional historical information with events and dates will bring accurate comprehension to those who do not share experiences and sympathies. The film is about the failure of a well-intentioned urban film crew that arrives on a location to shoot the story of a colonial-era famine but loses its way in the chasm between middle-class empathies for a rural past and the complex lives of thin-limbed villagers facing food scarcities in their present. Cinema is revealed to be a floundering cross-cultural and interclass encounter between a place and the filming of it. Frictions between the film and its location also point to the opacity and manipulability of the image itself, raising questions about the most accurate and ethical way to cinematically portray the stories of a place and its people given the limitations of perspective, gulfs of experience, and permeability of the past.

And yet it is a film, after all, that limns the differences between a location and its visual representation. This brings provisional faith in the cinematic medium, and in the possibilities of filmed space. *Filmed space*, that captured artifact of an encounter between a camera and its environment, serves as this book's focus and its point of departure. As a focus, it draws this project to feature-length commercial and art cinema and theatrical as well as nontheatrical shorts that are either shot in real locations or reimagine actual locations and built environments. Traces of reality in cinematic recordings and imaginations of it—appearances of "*the* world" in "*a* world" of fiction[3]—pull this book equally to the documenting impulses of cinema as to its abstractions, by disarticulating distinct forms of presentation while always considering the substratum of locations and architectures underlying such films. As a point of flight, this book is animated more by a sustained historical and philosophical investigation into the two handles of the phrase "film" and "space" than by the aesthetics, economic logics, or industrial practices of location shooting, though these remain important preoccupations.

I contend that a broad investigation of film and space is warranted because the full force of a spatial critique in film studies remains unrealized, despite influential discussions of screen space that were launched primarily in relation to the imaginary or implied subject's inscription within cinema's "narrative, apparatus and ideology"[4] in 1970s *Screen* theory and in more recent scholarship on spaces of film production, exhibition, urban life, and digital media.[5] Questions of space in film are taken up piecemeal in the analysis of one or the other aspect of the medium's materiality or immateriality, neglecting film's heterogeneous

artifactual status as a framed and scaled visual image (and now increasingly an immersive environment) that is also an ideological apparatus, economic commodity, technological platform, site of exhibition and consumption, fragment of memory, and geopolitical instrument, *each* of which has its own particular spatial and social dimension.[6]

I refer to cinema's spatiality as artifactual here to underscore its constructedness; as something that calls on skill, craft, art, labor, politics, and commerce to facilitate the technology's mimetic and plastic capacities. The recurrent question "What is cinema?"[7] takes on a different inflection when we attend to the medium's spatial and social qualities. Whether construed as reams of stock footage or streaming digital content, film functions as a politico-economic commodity, aesthetic form, representational system, social object, and affective experience. In other words, we could deliberately misread the ontological question to say that cinema, in its functions, is many things. What this entails for the ontological question is the insight that cinema, with its referential powers (as a technology that can record or simulate reality) and representational apparatus (as an economic, industrial, and artistic form that can generate symbolic meanings), exemplifies and authorizes specific kinds of intersections between the material, social, and imagined spaces that constitute our world. Focusing on these intersections, my first task is to sketch out an itinerary of the social and spatial encounters that define and are enabled by film. That is, I need to outline the sociospatiality[8] of film as a multifarious object.

I start with the distinctions traditionally drawn between the terms "place" and "space" to explain how I think expansively about space (as a concept) in relation to cinema (as image and object) while involved in a fine-grained scrutiny of India's filmed place-images. A caveat: this book, with historical intent, primarily focuses on film in its celluloid form, but it should be understood as an open invitation to further discussions of the spatiality of film and media in their evolving formats. "Space," Yi-Fu Tuan notes, is an abstraction compared to the concrete materiality of "place," which leads us to understand, for instance, that finance capital's spatial reach is vaster than a particular steel-and-glass corporate building headquartered on a street in New York, London, or Bombay (now Mumbai).[9] Despite this deceptively neat division (inherent as well in Michel de Certeau's formulation of space as "practiced place" wherein the particularity of places are abstracted, vectorized, and temporalized by their use),[10] value-laden deployments of the terms "space" and "place" have provoked disagreement among social theorists. Place, Doreen Massey argues, is forced to play the part of a reactionary, fixed and outmoded idea or thing in the era of

hypermobility and "time-space-compression" as proposed by Marxist geographers David Harvey and Fredric Jameson.[11] According to Harvey, "The incipient tension between place and space can get transformed into an absolute antagonism"[12] when localism and nationalism recuperate a reactionary politics of aestheticized place, against the annihilation of a place's particularity by the leveling forces of multinational capital. As Harvey notes, capital solves the problems of excessive accumulation through the spatial fixes of globally distributed risk, investment, and labor. In the face of this, disenfranchised and minoritized populations (and, in the Brexit and Trump era, we may add as well the majoritarian populations that perceive themselves as aggrieved minorities) articulate their resistance around place-based identities. To the extent that these constituencies are "disempowered" to define global space while being "empowered" to organize locally, they reaffirm a spatial fragmentation that "mobile capitalism and flexible accumulation can feed upon."[13] Massey finds such formulations of space and place constrictive because they shut out the possibility of a "progressive sense of place."[14] Place, for Massey, is not static and bounded but in a perpetual process of being defined by the "power-geometries"[15] of global capital in combat with those structurally denied access to geographical and class mobility.

Similar to Massey, Elena Gorfinkel and John David Rhodes express a comparable affinity for political and differentiated recuperations of place in the field of film studies. In their anthology on location filming, the authors note that space is "a uniform property of cinema" because the commercial cinematic apparatus is invested in conventions of perspectival and ideological coherence that, in Stephen Heath's words, habitually transforms the particularity of what is "seen" into the abstractions of a "scene."[16] Against this homogenizing tendency of cinema, profilmic place is understood as the "heterogeneous and specific element recorded by or sensible in film." It is in *place*, they argue, that history accrues and accretes, so that locations provide "the traction necessary for resonant and forceful political intervention" and critical recuperation.[17] For Gorfinkel and Rhodes, place becomes the "tactic" to unravel cinema's relationship to its hermetically sealed diegetic world, making place the "product of an agonistic relation" between the spatiotemporal world outside the film's frame and the fictional world constructed by its formal artifice.[18] This is an important point and makes intuitive sense. The cinematic lens's ability to capture the incidental and ephemeral makes each film frame potentially rich with visible realities that exceed those of a fictional narrative or plot.[19] Moreover, in industrial practice, actual locations frequently become proxies for other places, with North Wales doubling for Pakistan in *Welcome to Karachi* (Ashish R. Mohan,

2015), China for Afghanistan in *The Kite Runner* (Marc Foster, 2007),[20] and Toronto for Chicago in *My Big Fat Greek Wedding* (Joel Zwick, 2002). As Brian Jacobson shows with regard to early cinema in Southern California, locations served as a "studio beyond the studio," staged to play the role of *any* place in the world.[21] Spectatorial and scholarly acts that use the materiality of places to dislodge their visual representation from hermetically sealed frames and fictionalizations return interpretive command to the historian, the spectator, or the critic.[22] This intimacy with the real leads to what Gorfinkel and Rhodes call modalities of spectatorship that are "distracted and overcathected"[23] to visual details and ephemera not subsumed within a film's narrative.

I elaborate on the dialectics and frictions between the enframed and profilmic worlds as well, but find that the exclusive emphasis on place and location in film evades a few crucial concerns. First, place and space are experientially linked, which is why we can sometimes feel spatially alienated in our own bodies and homes, or spatially at home in strange locations and with strangers. Something that feels like "undifferentiated space becomes place as we get to know it better and endow it with value. . . . The ideas of 'space' and 'place' require each other for definition."[24] This is also the lesson taught by scholars such as Brian Massumi, Sara Ahmed, and Jasbir Puar, who point out that things (bodies, objects, places) may precede, coincide, or slide outside our rational recognition and knowledge of them, making feelings, intuitions, and mechanisms of interrelationship (affective spaces between us and other bodies, objects, or places) of interest.[25] I do not, therefore, share Gorfinkel and Rhodes's admittedly polemical and "stubborn insistence on place"[26] at the expense of space but give space its due analytic weight.

Second, and this is key: things *other* than place possess and generate spatial qualities. State power, capital, technology, and assignations within gendered, classed, racialized, and sexual hierarchies are central to how we measure our lives, delineate our borders and identities, experience our social worlds, and endow them with value. Thinking in sustained ways about how a place becomes part of cinema's enframed image, and how that cinematic image itself is produced and subsequently takes residence within innumerable spaces—of the state, industry, economy, aesthetics, regulation, ideology, memory, consumption, and everyday life—pushes back the horizon of historical analysis exponentially to multiple sites. If place in film draws our attention to a filmed location's layered histories, space demands an awareness of the *principles* underlying its organization and a sensitivity to the *systems* and *people* participating in the perpetuation or breakdown of that organization. To return to *Akaler*

Sandhaney from this perspective, the film could serve as the starting point of an investigation into a number of relational spaces that determine the look and fate of its place-images. These may range from Sen's access to camera and sound technologies for location filming in India in the 1980s to constructions of the film's cinematic space through shots and edits. It may include investigations into current challenges in finding prints of Sen's film to looking at *Akaler Sandhaney*'s images in relation to other visual records of India's famines. We could write histories that radiate out from a filmed place's relationalities to the other industrial, political, socioeconomic, and experiential sites that give it shape, form, and meaning. For this reason, *space* will refer to different but related varieties of (cinematic and social) space in this book. It will refer to the representational space of a screen and its relation to profilmic spaces. It will refer to the institutional and pre-production contexts from which place-images emerge and to the circuits of their afterlives. It will also refer to the disciplinary, geographical, social, embodied, and geopolitical contexts that give meaning and power to such moving images. Within the historical context of each analysis, I will be demonstrating how this expansiveness is essential to our apprehension of the relational spaces through which cinema is produced, organized, and assimilated, whether as artistic form, social, professional and private experience, or commercial product.

The critical impetus to write a capacious history of space—what we may think of as a deliberately *spatial film and media historiography*—is suggested by the sociologist and philosopher Henri Lefebvre.[27] According to Lefebvre, an analysis of the interrelationships between "physical, mental and social space" dismantles the "fetishization of space in the service of the state, philosophy and practical activity."[28] In other words, space can be as central a heuristic as place in writing film and media histories if we think about how any place becomes part of several (socioeconomic, political, disciplinary, and experiential) sites when it is transformed into an image, and how that process is itself implicated in the rationalizing logics and illogics of each of those social sites. For these reasons, the idea of filmed space performs a double shift in this book. It serves as the smallest unit of analysis, which concentrates our attention on what transpires when a place is filmed. This draws us to ontological questions of cinema's relationship to the real; to formal and aesthetic questions about how the screen or story uses the logic of spatial composition through narrative, edits, camera angles, camera movements, and so on to reproduce reality; and to the material circumstances of production crews and technologies. Filmed space is also the largest concept that drives this project's media historiography to shake out the

processes through which states, institutions, economies, societies, and ideologies acquire an apparently objective status and self-evident territorial fixity.

In the long run, my claim is that spatial film and media historiographies can show us how apparently separate and immutable "physical, mental and social" spaces governing films and filmmaking are a part of interconnected historical and contingent processes. I am further claiming that to be alive to their mutuality is a way of thinking, writing, and mapping history *across* the different spatial registers of cinema as a material, ideological, affective, and social object.[29] I consider this book to be a spatial film historiography because it tracks the spatiality of cinema itself, whether as commodity, affective experience, or moving image; it also attends to cinema's constitution in relation to formal, socioeconomic, affective, and geopolitical spaces; and it attempts to adopt a critical self-reflexivity toward its own descriptive language and analytical categories, which spatialize knowledge by being at the front lines of disciplinary border constructions. This book aims to cut across different approaches to cinema with a methodological comprehensiveness to reckon with the medium's spatial identity in materially and socially rooted terms.

Any analysis of space must locate itself somewhere, in an act that hermeneutically foregrounds the fact that all theory and historical interpretation has an implicit or explicit geographical point of origin. *Where Histories Reside* is about the frictions and stories that have been attendant upon shooting different types of locations in India, rendering its territory and people cinematic.[30] In this book, I investigate the politico-economic and visual regimes through which places in India have been spatialized as moving images. I also write about the ways in which those images are in turn respatialized as commodities, artifacts, and objects of study, to designate a sense of place. My argument hinges on following the industrial infrastructures and representational apparatuses particular to film, so that while historical and anthropological scholarship on India's production as a national and visual space constitutes a significant precursor,[31] this book will be more attentive to the particular spatialities of film as image and commodity. The balance between the relative gravities of *film* and *India* to a project about films shot on location in India will be discussed further.

FILMED SPACE VERSUS FILMIC SPACE

My use of the term "filmed space," although colloquially a reference to the filming of places in India, aims for a conceptual precision that differs from the concept of film**ic** space in film theory. Annette Kuhn and Guy Westwell define filmic space

in the following way: "The space created within the film frame as opposed to the space of the real world or of the profilmic event. Filmic space is a wholly distinct type of space, one that can only be created on the cinema screen through the techniques and language of cinema—one of the distinctive attributes of film as a medium being that it creates its own patterns of spatiality (and temporality)."[32]

Distinctions between profilmic or real space and filmic space were crucial to early developments in film theory because of a drive to establish the particularities of film language and the cinematic apparatus, with its formal tools of mise-en-scène, framing, lighting, editing, perspectival manipulation, layering of gazes, and so forth. These specificities, though crucial, diverted attention from the equally rich yield of thinking about entanglements between filmic and profilmic social places and relationships between the spaces of pre-production and production practices, which were taken up more vigorously under the historical turn in film studies. An example of this is Charles Wolfe's analysis of Buster Keaton's silent comedies, set in California. Wolfe breaks down Keaton's shorts into (a) the real locations where they were shot, (b) the fictional story world that unifies these spaces within the logic of the film's narrative, and (c) the cinematic field (of edits, lighting, movement, focus) of screen space. Finding links between these different kinds of spaces, Wolfe shows that Keaton's use of real urban sites along the California coast in *The High Sign* (1921) and *Balloonatic* (1923) contains clues to "how the experience of traversing and inhabiting this terrain found expression in cinematic form,"[33] even as it incorporated visual traces of the land's developmental and design history into its visual and narrative scheme.

The study of cinema and urbanism has contributed greatly to spatial thinking in film history, as in Edward Dimendberg's excavation of the histories of modernity and urbanism in the film noir genre, Giuliana Bruno's spatial mapping of Naples and lost Italian pasts in fragments of Elvira Notari's city films, Mark Shiel's work on early Hollywood, and David James's scholarship on the avant-garde in relation to the city of Los Angeles, to name only a few.[34] James examines how avant-garde films "document the spatialities in which they are set, but also the spatialities in which they come into being," to investigate the "relationship between the way a city figures in a film and the way it figures in the filmmaking."[35] This produces what James calls a "geocinematic hermeneutic," alive to the imprint of material histories in the visualization of cities within films.[36] Geocinematic readings and analyses of interlocking shifts in urban planning, cinematic design, film genres, and film fragments are part of an increasingly prolific and methodologically wide-ranging scholarship on cinematic space in relation to social, architectural, and material spaces. These

include studies on the political economy of runaway productions; cinema as virtual travel and cinema's relationship to travel technologies; location filming; film and architecture; film in global, urban, and rural sites; film theaters, archives, and studio libraries; film labor in urban spaces; film and media in queer spaces; digital media's new spatial networks; emergent media's sociopolitical infrastructures and technological hardware; and more.[37]

Building on this expansive research but also traversing it with some disregard for differences in approach, I argue that in its disciplinary formation, film studies is hampered when it makes methodology itself a sort of spatial fetish.[38] Similar to Marxist ideas of commodity fetishism, fetishized spaces are spaces that hide their production processes to acquire a sheen of inherent value and objective reality. Methodologies become spatial fetishes when techniques of analysis are reified and begin to self-perpetuate (which is a risk borne by any discipline as it gets institutionalized), instead of remaining open to interrogation with every application. To grasp how film toggles between the material, social, aesthetic, and immaterial spaces constituting our world, writing about cinema must seek methods that cut across the techniques and intellectual habits of political economy, production studies, media ethnography, textual analysis, film theory, urban studies, and geopolitical analysis. To upend these divisions, I take my cues from the practices of a film's location scout as much as from any practice in film studies.

A location scout is charged with seeking out actual locations that can be used or adapted for a film shoot. The scout gleans a sense of this location from a film's script. She conceives of an ideal place for the shoot based on a photo bank of images, from her knowledge and experience of actual places, from preexisting images and imaginations, and from practical considerations of budgets and schedules. A 1994 manual for film location scouts in the United States defines "location" in the following way: "A location is a real place. It is a specific structure, an area, or a setting where action and/or dialogue occurs in a script. As differentiated from a 'set,' a location is a place where a production must go in order to have the right background to tell its story. A location mentioned in a script can be very specific such as 'the base of the Statue of Liberty,' or very general such as 'a cozy kitchen,' or something purely imaginary such as 'the planet Zargon.'"[39] Film historians interested in filmed spaces share with location scouts this intense interest in mediating between real and imagined places, but not their desire to make the transition seamless. The exchange between the real and the imagined becomes the focus of their study. For them, the terminology of a filmed space is of interest as much for its definitional ambition (it refers

to everything that transpires when places are filmed and transformed into cinematic space) as for its definitional ambiguity (filmed places are defined by, and become a part of, so *many* different kinds of real and imagined spaces).

To attend systematically to the multiple spatialities that frame and are generated by the filming of a place, we can weigh the practice of location shooting against the three categories of social space suggested by Henri Lefebvre. Lefebvre scrutinizes institutions, objects, and ideas that we take at face value (instrumentalized spaces), and he reverse-engineers them back to the productive processes through which they acquire their apparent solidity. He does so to destabilize visuality and visibility's exclusive claim to truth. In what Edward Soja refers to as a "trialectics of spatiality,"[40] Lefebvre overlays material, mental, and social worlds in a *fluid* conceptual triad of perceived, conceived, and lived spaces—revealing his antipathy to knowledge itself as a catalogued and disciplinarily bound production of information—to describe their overlapping function in producing what we take as our reality. Lefebvre's trialectics of space serve as an enabling rubric to understand the different scales of cinema's spatiality and sociality for this study. Lefebvre uses a trialectics of perceived, conceived, and lived spaces in order to break away from the binarism of idealist versus materialist frameworks of knowledge and not to institute a new segmentation of space. In that spirit, what follows is less a rigid catalogue for thinking about cinema and space and more an acknowledgment of the intersecting histories that can be narrated when looking at the filming of places.[41]

The first of Lefebvre's triad, *perceived* space, refers to "materialized, socially produced, empirical space" that appears concrete, coherent, and institutional because it represents the ways in which any society "secretes that society's space."[42] This is quite literally the world whose systemic institutions define how we perceive it. For analysts of cinematic space, perceived space may highlight aesthetic traditions, political ideologies, and perspectival and representational conventions that frame images and guide narratives while effacing their own operation. Statist policies and corporate practices that legislate over film as art or commodity may also be understood as elements that make their own interests invisible, while defining the terms of a place's visualization. The second of Lefebvre's triad is *conceived* space, which refers to the design, knowledge, and order through which practitioners actively interpret, translate, and reproduce space. For historians of film, this may point to the codes, designs, and principles followed by film directors and executive producers as well as below-the-line film workers, such as production designers, location managers, line managers, sync sound engineers, location crew, and extras ("junior artists,"

in Indian cinema's parlance), all of whom do the actual work of translating a place into a visual space. It might also refer to the technologies for recording and duplicating the real, as well as professional practices around the adoption of audio-visual technologies. More expansively, the manner in which a place is transformed into conceived space after its filming could include frameworks of knowledge through which such filmed images are assessed by reviewers and critics, by historians and scholars studying cinema and media over time, and by the parameters of state and private archives cataloguing them. All of these create a context within which places circulate as recorded images in varied social spaces.

Lefebvre's last category of *lived* spaces refers to the ways in which spaces are experienced by their inhabitants and users. For film scholars attending to place-images, this draws their attention to the reimagination of places by filmmakers and spectators, and to the memories of places and built environments that linger on-screen well after a place's actual disappearance or destruction. It may also refer to the experience of inhabiting a place after it has been filmed or memorialized in particular ways. In distinction from Lefebvre's tripartite categorization, sociologist Pierre Bourdieu's notion of "habitus" combines elements analytically separated by the former into conceived and lived spaces. Defining "habitus" as "both the generative principle of objectively classified judgments and the system of classification,"[43] Bourdieu encourages us to think of practitioners who create the codes for reproducing social space as inseparable from their own lived embodiment of those codes. For film historians, this means that industry workers who materially depict and create a film's backdrop can also be understood in relation to their culture's social rules (the "production cultures" described by John Caldwell),[44] because they interpret, disrupt, or extend those rules through their own lifestyles, tastes, and professional as well as leisure activities. In this sense, when a film unit goes on location to film, it represents only one order of the event's lived space; that moment could be used to unbind the histories of its resultant images and their itineraries.

In its commitment to historicism, my project differs from media anthropologist Anand Pandian's deep ethnography of contemporary location-based Tamil films. Pandian studies location shoots to describe relationships between the contingent nature of filming and the "experiential texture of the film they yield."[45] Like Pandian, I am compelled by the "imminent potential of the situations in which these images arise."[46] Unlike him, I find that location filming discloses more than an account of the contemporary, the creative, and the experiential. Maintaining the initial encounter and enframing as a point of friction within instances of location shooting, this book is about the afterlife of such im-

FIGURE I.3 An image recognizable as an Indian village. Courtesy of Amit Pasricha.

ages when they transcend their moment of recording, almost instantaneously, to shape and become part of other social, experiential, and institutional spaces of regulation, exhibition, and memorialization in commercial theaters, state documentaries, school curricula, and archives. I study the production of filmed space in relation to these registers lest we take the apparent concreteness of an image and the seeming immutability of its enabling institutions at face value.

INDIA AS FILMED SPACE

Dark, semiclad, rough-kneed children in a Bombay slum; young lovers aboard Darjeeling's small-gauge train; village women with many pots balanced on their heads; ash-encrusted priests in the Ganges; bejeweled women in Jaipur's ornate *havelis* (mansions); Bollywood dancers in cosmopolitan cityscapes. These images of people and places telegraph India to audiences the world over. I organize my study around the filming of places that have represented India, and not around a history of location shooting in India's cinemas, to underscore a problem with how we categorize films in relation to geographical territories. This book's focus on locations and architectures demands an exploration of the cultural logics and disciplinary practices by which we cluster and categorize films when we inscribe them into historical narratives.

To put it differently, all books are haunted by the spirit of books that they could have been. This *could* have been a book about location shooting in India's

mainstream, regional, or alternative cinemas. Such a shadow book could have shown that the Bombay film industry's sound films were predominantly shot in studios, back lots, and rented bungalows until the 1990s, with the exception of art and parallel cinema. *Where Histories Reside* will not be that book. Much as I would like to read it,[47] I am disinclined to write an account of location shooting in India's cinemas (although some of this history makes its way into chapter 5), because it leaves insufficient room to interrogate the institutions, practices, and ideologies that have defined a diverse region as a bounded, territorial, and national entity, to conjure "India" as a unified visual, fiscal, political, and regulatory space.

Michel Foucault memorably said, "A whole history remains to be written about *spaces*—which would at the same time be the history of *powers* (both of these terms in the plural)—from the great strategies of geopolitics to the little tactics of the habitat."[48] In this book, I am guided by a writerly commitment that lands somewhere between the procedures, strategies, and "minor instrumentalities" of institutions and discourses governing our social spaces (in a habit that I picked up from Foucault), and the negotiated "tactics" of working and living in those spaces at the local and individual scales (developed by Michel de Certeau).[49] Consequently, arguments about the geopolitics and aesthetics of filmed spaces emerge, in each chapter, in relation to smaller stories about particular production companies, film personalities, film professionals, cities, towns, and architectural structures, which collectively produce a sense of place. British film producer Bruce Woolfe's short geographical films on the Indian cities of Bikaner, Udaipur, and Darjeeling and Nepal's Kathmandu, shot for secondary school classrooms in the United Kingdom during the 1930s, are the focus of chapter 1 ("Disciplinary"). Chapter 2 ("Regulatory") is about the Kumaoni documentarian N. S. Thapa's theatrical and nontheatrical shorts on the Himalayan mountain ranges, made for the Films Division (FD) of India from the 1950s through the 1980s. In chapter 3 ("Sublime"), I discuss renowned French director Jean Renoir's journey to West Bengal to shoot *The River* (1951) on location in India, and in chapter 4 ("Residual"), I turn to North India's precolonial architectural ruins and mansions captured on film by US, British, and Indian photographers and filmmakers from the late nineteenth to the mid-twentieth century. The careers of Bollywood's location managers, junior artists, and below-the-line workers who are at the front line of current changes in location filming practices in the Bombay film industry today are the focus of chapter 5 ("Global").

The broad purview of a metacritical project on "India as filmed space" allows me to consider different kinds of films made by directors from around the

world (specifically British, Indian, and European directors in this book), who used the country's locations and built environments as attractions, backdrops, or inspiration for their films. Filmmakers of different nationalities are of interest because abstract ideas about India have acquired visual coherence through a range of images and narratives about the country. Alongside feature-length fiction, moreover, nontheatrical, documentary, promotional, and short films have played a significant part in visual boundary construction and boundary maintenance. As the history of space has ever been a history of power, these images have served different ends when used by a British versus an Indian film production company. Until recently in India, instructional films, travelogues, newsreels, and documentary films were screened prior to the main feature in Indian theaters because of a governmental mandate making commercial theater licenses contingent on screening a percentage of state-approved films (chapter 2). By state design, this made documentary and nonfiction films a central part of how India's citizens encountered their nation as images on the big screen. In other words, in addition to commercial fiction films, nontheatrical and nonfiction films produced in India and abroad have equivalent purchase on a material history of images documenting or conjuring India as a place.

A few desires drive my grouping of films with a measure of irreverence toward their industrial typology, national origin, and historical period. The first is an imperative to show that a range of histories are embedded in the *processes* through which locations are transformed into moving images. To this end, each chapter tracks the history of a particular aspect of cinema's object status (as image, stock, commodity, archived document, curricular lesson) across a range of institutional, social, and experiential sites. The second is to argue that seeking these histories creates a historiography calibrated to spatial rather than exclusively temporal categories of analysis. The chapters braid together specific cases of location filming with broader questions of theory and geography to propose that our *historical consciousness* and *the protocols of film historiography* alter when history is foundationally driven by a critical focus on units of space in addition to units of time. Specifically, interrogating the spatial production of India through images of its places produces a historiography calibrated to the technological and regulatory processes involved in filming a place, the ontology of cinematic space in those images, the epistemologies framing the visualizations, the institutional and social actors involved in the film productions, and the categories of disciplinary knowledge through which those images are assimilated. So while there remains a repressed arc of periodization that moves this book from the colonial and national to the globalizing eras of Indian society and economy, my project's

framework is conceptual rather than chronological, and attuned to spatial categories of analysis that create their own uptake of history.

This leads me to the third and related desire underlying my chapter divisions, which avoid periodizing Indian film history following the nation's dominant politico-economic orders as a colonized (pre-1947), nationally protectionist (1947–1991), and globalizing territory (1991–). Such a division tends to default into a scholarly bias toward studies of colonial dominance, national identity, and transnational exchange in film studies, even though relations of power, attempts at self-definition, and negotiations across political and fiscal borders have defined each of these periods. India's film history might well be narrated as one of colonial *exchange*,[50] national *dominance*, and global *identity* (or any recombination thereof). Qualifiers like "colonial," "national," and "global" as prefixes for "cinema" or "media" mean too many things (based on the context of intellectual debate or the political proclivities of those using the terms) for them to operate in the absence of detail. My proposal is not to lose the precision of historical analysis. Contrarily, it is to let the specifics of each case study take the lead in probing the efficacy of historical and theoretical categories in order to interrogate the categories of analysis that habituate us into unreflexive modes of thought. It is to keep alive the notion that ideas are, in many instances, the first line of spatial containment.

Each chapter of this book distills a particular construction of India within a regime of representation: India as an object of empirical study in British imperial geography (chapter 1), as an incompletely modern but teachable space in FD documentaries (chapter 2), as a possessor of metaphysical truths in Euro-American films (chapter 3), as a place haunted by specters of feudalism in the architectural structures and sets of post-Independence Hindi-Urdu commercial cinema (chapter 4), and as a postliberalized space of uneven mobile capital in contemporary Bollywood (chapter 5). If these selections seem arbitrary and far from exhaustive, that is because the ambition of scale and total history is replaced here by the need to explore the methodological assumptions of a spatialized film historiography with necessarily heterodox tools, including textual, aesthetic, policy, economic, and ethnographic analysis, to assess the varied (material, social, and immaterial) lives of film as an object. My contention is that a critical spatial film historiography unseats the self-evident unities that accrue around received industrial and critical typologies (such as those of genre or nation), to bring into the fold institutional and social histories that escape entrenched categories of analysis. Filmed locations are territorialized by the

powers of state, dominant industrial practices, habits of visual perception, and the methods of film historiography itself (see the conclusion).

"Scenics," actualities, and newsreels abounded in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to convey a sense of India as a place to international and domestic audiences.[51] Most of India's natural and built environments were first filmed to be part of nonnarrative shorts, and a cursory look at British, American, Indian, and French films shot on location in India during these early years brings up reams of nonfiction films, some now catalogued, annotated, and digitally accessible.[52] A random sample includes *Scenes on the River Jhelum* (1903, Charles Urban Trading Company, Britain), *Scenes in Ceylon* (1909, Hepworth Manufacturing Company, Britain), *Ruins of Delhi* (1910, Pathé Frères, Britain), *Le Travail des Elephants aux Indes* (1911, Pathé Frères, France), *Punjab Village: The Empire Series* (1925, British Instructional Films, GB), *People and Products of India* (1931, Empire Marketing Board, Britain), and newsreels from the prolific Fox Movietone News, such as *Turbulent Scenes of Bombay Riots* (1930, USA/Britain), *Bombay Boycott Parade* (1930, USA/Britain), and so on.

At first viewing, the overwhelming quantity of locational detail derails any effort at constructing a coherent analysis of location filming. A historiography calibrated to the plenitude of place across shorts, documentaries, and feature films offers a confusing welter of material for study. Like Jorge Luis Borges's character Ireneo Funes, who sees all objects in their immediate and extreme particularity and so loses the ability to generalize or make meaning,[53] a historian watching interminable reels of actuality and fiction films for the minutiae of geography, fauna, monuments, river banks, streets, crowds, villages, and cities will find herself at a loss for categories that do justice to the excessive visual data. Here again is the "distracted and overcathected" spectator that Gorfinkel and Rhodes speak of: someone too attentive to the things in a film's background to heed to their unification through narrative and ocular regimes.[54] However, this distraction and obsession provides a good model for a historian to whom, in Charles Wolfe's words, "cinema offers . . . the experience of moving in and out of different emplacements."[55] The disappearance of the unities of a film's genre-related or national categorizations leads to a dispersal in the historian's way of organizing and understanding films. Her sense of historicism now derives from a self-reflexivity gained by shifting grounds between the comparative visual perspectives and epistemic dispensations of the typological range of films she is watching, each of which frames the meanings of a place or location differently.

Five epistemic dispensations are named in this book: specifically, the disciplinary, the regulatory, the sublime,[56] the residual, and the global orders. Each dispensation organizes India as a place and a cinematic image in distinct configurations, to foster particular kinds of visual and institutional encounters with the land.[57] The five chapters of this book may therefore be read separately, but should be understood as disrupting each other's dominant spatial logic for organizing place. The effect of reading them should be one of reading a cumulative yet polymorphous narrative about the production of India as a location, rather than as a story composed of separate and disconnected episodes in film history.

Part I, "Rationalized Spaces," describes the rationalization of India as a colonial space in the tradition of British empiricism, and the renegotiation of that vision in newly independent India. At the turn of the twentieth century, a tradition of British empiricism privileging experience over pure reason exercised an intellectual influence on the study of geography in British classrooms.[58] Direct observation of a region gained traction as the essential first step toward mapping a territory and acquiring spatial knowledge. This logic of empiricism confronted particular challenges when it came to the curriculum on British colonies. Colonial lands were geographically distant and inaccessible to direct observation and experience. Moreover, the appropriate management of colonial territories was a topic of heated political debate by the 1930s. As I discuss in chapter 1, visual media about Indian towns and cities such as the *Indian Town Studies* series produced by Gaumont-British Instructional in the 1930s entered British geography classrooms as the best substitute for firsthand encounters with distant and combat-ridden places. Two decades later, these commercially produced but state-encouraged British shorts provided an institutional and aesthetic template for instructional films, travelogues, and military films made by FD, the Indian Ministry of Information and Broadcasting's film unit. The new state's emerging visual vocabulary combined the colonial legacy of empiricism with an apparently chaotic mix of supraregional nationalism, technological developmentalism, secularism, and spiritualism. Through N. S. Thapa's documentaries about India's northern mountain ranges, I consider the historical factors enabling a conjunction of nationalism, empiricism, secular rationalism, and myth in FD landscape shorts in chapter 2.

Antithetical to the rationalized discourses of the state were the fabulist and orientalist images of India, discussed in part II, "Affective Spaces." Cinematic images of India's villages and medieval palaces, holy men and ornate women, toil-

ing peasants and lolling cows have been screened internationally at least since Gaumont and Company's single-reel attractions of the early 1900s. A cocktail of exotic images popularizing visions of the subcontinent's crowds, color, poverty, and mystery continues to entertain global audiences, most recently in Beyoncé's Bollywood diva/Mother Mary incarnation in the Coldplay music video *Hymn for the Weekend*.[59] Jean Renoir's film *The River* (1950), which was shot on location in West Bengal soon after India's independence, was hailed as a departure from orientalist depictions of the country. However, the film's combination of actuality footage with sublime themes of death and regeneration alienated some Indian critics and filmmakers who felt that the film reduced India to a moral canvas for white protagonists. This controversy makes the film a rich nodal text for exploring the artistic, social, and industrial frictions and collaborations provoked by a significant foreign location shoot in India. Against the grain of Renoir's visualization of India, but still using landscape to reflect on a sense of estrangement, Ritwik Ghatak's *Titas Ekti Nadir Naam* (*A River Called Titas*, 1973) and Roberto Rossellini's *India Matri Bhoomi* (1959) use Indian rivers to stage contentious dialogues with the trope of India as a sublime space. Looking at competing interpretations of India's waterscapes, I discuss how *The River*'s use of India as a location reverberates within the history of world cinema in chapter 3.

At hard edges to the Western lens on India as a sublime space, but also in response to it, is the anguished internal conversation that India's commercial cinema conducts with its own civilization, explored in chapter 4.[60] Ruins of cities and built environments in post-Independence Hindi-Urdu films such as *Sahib Bibi aur Ghulam* (Abrar Alvi, 1962) and *Lal Pathhar* (Sushil Majumdar, 1971) make muted references to the devastation of North Indian cities in the wake of India's traumatic entry into modernity through colonialism and Partition. Ambivalence surrounding the loss of an imagined feudal past becomes part of Bombay cinema's nostalgic mise-en-scène, particularly in its *haveli* films, which is my term for films that use an iconic type of precolonial mansion (the haveli) as a significant visual trope. Alongside European films that imbue India's landscapes with a sense of sublime spiritual transcendence are these commercial Hindi-Urdu films that are obsessed with the uncanniness of precolonial Indian ruins.[61] The films' narratives and cinematography saturate architectural relics with a sense of haunting nostalgia and melodramatic trauma, to write an affective history of the nation. European art cinema's sublime India and Indian commercial cinema's ruinscapes bring with them a representational and symbolic scheme that is not fully compatible with the sober (but no less ideological)

demands of empiricism extended by the disciplinary and governmental rationalizations of India's territories in statist British colonial and Indian FD films.

Earnest negotiations with the past through landscapes and ruinscapes were rendered anachronistic by the late 1990s, when the Indian state inaugurated paradigmatic shifts in the nation's economic policies. The past was put into a radically different spatial relationship with the present when, starting in 1991, the Indian state liberalized its quasisocialist economy to dilate the sphere of commodification to every aspect of Indian society. Predictable and unpredictable transformations in response to privatization, as they unfold in present-day India, can be seen across numerous socioeconomic registers, from changing patterns of territorial, financial, and media ownership to increasing availability and demand for consumer goods and the reorganization of familial and generational relations. The discussion of "commodified space" in chapter 5 deals with India's globalization and rising right-wing populism between 2000 and 2013, to explore the mutually entangled processes of India's economic reterritorialization, the Indian middle class's social reorganization, modifications in the nation's labor forces, and shifts in Indian cinema's aesthetic styles. I tell these interlacing stories by attending to the rise of new below-the-line professionals in Bollywood who are changing the look and craft of Hindi cinema's backgrounds and filmed locations. I conduct media ethnographies to write a history of the contemporary, when a potentially volatile mix of people from India's varying social classes and regions join the skilled and unskilled work demanded by location filming in Bombay and Bollywood today. As I show, India's transitional economy is reshaping the social and professional relationships within the film industry's workspaces while also impacting the microspaces of the film workers' aspirations and desires.

In this book, archival, biographical, and institutional analysis of films from India's colonial and early national periods are presented alongside textual, cultural, and aesthetic readings of commercial Indian and European art films from the mid-twentieth century. In distinction to these approaches, the history of contemporary Bollywood demands ethnographies of the present. There is historical relevance to each of these approaches, and a pleasure distinctive to each. But the push toward methodological heterodoxy is essential because ecumenical analytic tools bring sensitivity to the many artifactual facets unique to cinema as an artistic form, sociocultural medium, statist institution, commercial enterprise, and professional practice. No singular mode is sufficient to uncover the variegated registers of space constituting, produced by, and implicated in cinema. Following the injunction to think more carefully and historically but

also more capaciously about cinema and space, I suggest a few lines of possibility for spatial thinking in film studies. These are broad invitations—based on lessons learned from my more focused research into films on or about Indian locations—to go beyond the apparent chasms between the realities of social space and the formal particularities or ideological constructions of filmic space. Filmed spaces are a part and a product of cinematic, social, industrial, imagined, and political spaces. The study of filmed spaces can expose how cinematic and real spaces carry each other's imprints if, to use E. M. Forster's familiar injunction, we "only connect!"[62]

- CONNECT CINEMATIC SPACE WITH THE SOCIO-SPATIALITY OF MEDIA: The two handles of the phrase "filmed" and *"space"* make it oscillate between recorded screen spaces and profilmic spaces to draw out histories generated in the encounters between film and place. One end of the dyadic phrase opens out to the recorded image incorporated into formal filmic spaces. The other end hints at different kinds of social spaces, such as the world of ephemeral encounters during filming; the statist and capitalistic frameworks of image production; the theatrical or nontheatrical venues where images are distributed, exhibited, consumed, and archived as a range of spatial objects (film stock, video, or digital data); and the social sites where images linger as memories of places since altered.

- CONNECT MATERIAL WITH IMMATERIAL SPACE: Filmed space is substantial and insubstantial, material and abstract, in the Benjaminian sense of representing the "temporal core of history . . . where evolution halts for a moment, where the *dynamis* of what is happening coagulates into *stasis*."[63] This temporary freezing of time can serve as a functional definition of what happens when a place is filmed, crystallizing its fluid time into an enframed unit of space as an image, object, and commodity. These images and objects are subsequently remade in multiple sites of distribution, exhibition, politicization, commodification, memorialization, and experience, each with their own temporality. In this sense, perhaps places transforming into images experience the same fate as a person who is about to be photographed, in Roland Barthes's poetic account.[64] Despite lacking the singular subjectivity of a person, a place that is about to be filmed and that subsequently has a life as a cinematic image is material *and* spectral. It exists simultaneously within the time-bound present of the now and within a differentially temporalized and posed world of an image, remade in preparation of its imminent recording, and perpetually remade in its reuse as an image.

• CONNECT FILMED SPACE WITH A SPATIAL FILM HISTORIOGRA-
PHY: A history written from multiple sites necessarily interrogates what
such a perceptual shift does to the disciplinary practice of film historiog-
raphy. Using filmed space as a historical unit of analysis rearranges how
we think about film history as a spatiotemporal and disciplinary practice,
because such writing prioritizes a different optic: *not* chronology or a
film's form, style, production, genre, technology, and authorship; *nor* the
global against the national or local scales of production and capitaliza-
tion. Rather, it simply begins with the question, What transpires when a
place is filmed, and why? Seeking the rationale unravels the factors defini-
tive of and contingent upon that moment. Abandoning familiar orga-
nizational frameworks produces not a randomization of film and media
history but a history narrated as a constellation of particular regulatory,
economic, political, affective, and personal forces that define encoun-
ters between a camera and its locational environment within any given
context. Such a historiography is less a rejection of other optics than an
incorporation of them through a focus on (a past of) determining factors,
(a present of) enabling encounters, and (a future of) artifacts produced,
preserved, or forgotten when something is filmed.

• CONNECT THE FLUIDITY OF CINEMATIC TIME WITH THE
INSTRUMENTALITY OF SOCIAL SPACE: Postmodern geographers
have complained that the habit of treating "the production of space as
rooted in the same problematic as the making of history" has subordi-
nated spatial questions to temporal ones, resulting in the projection of
"geography on to the physical background of society."[65] Ironically, filming
a real location or built environment is a process by which any place is
literally converted into a visual background and usually subordinated to
a film's narrative or thematic elements.[66] Retrieving a film's background as
a point of focus and analyzing it as a distinctive aesthetic and produced
entity performs a few strategic inversions. It disarticulates the different
stages of a film's pre-production process prior to its manufacture as a
unified textual and visual experience; it focuses on the ontological mo-
ment of the camera's capture of the profilmic; it studies the ordering of
the world within the film's narrative and aesthetic schema; and it tracks
the embodied and spatial experiences generated by that captured artifact
of place in the afterlives of films as social objects. The concept of filmed
space is thus founded on the assumption that all spaces are instrumen-

tal, in the sense that they are shaped by state and institutional power, aesthetic and narrative regimes, market forces, and social hierarchies.

• CONNECT THE INSTRUMENTALITY OF SOCIAL SPACE WITH THE PARTICULARITIES OF ITS EMBODIMENT: If economic and sociopolitical determinations influence how we draw our boundaries, how we manufacture our identities, and how we cast our fantasies, then moving images also exercise their own determinate power on us and *through* us. We each bring our own idiosyncrasies, particularities, bodies, and experiences to them. As regulated object, consumed commodity, and subjective as well as collective experience, filmed spaces are sites of power and politics, but equally of encounter, imagination, and dissidence.

THINKING SPATIALLY ABOUT CINEMA

Film was not constituted as a uniform object under the purview of the Indian state. Rather, it was dispersed into many different categories within the taxonomic framework of India's Constitution. Constitutions are fundamental principles that officially transform a territory into a nation by establishing certain precedents for its people and their lives, laws, labor, and products. The constitution of any state partitions national space politically and economically through "its own particular administrative classification,"[67] to provide a framework of operation that designates fundamental shared values regarding the extent and limits of a state's power and its people's rights, adopted and occasionally adapted within the land. According to the Indian Constitution, legislative issues are divided into separate lists to determine whether the union's parliament (equivalent to the federal authority in the United States but with more power) or an individual state can legislate over it. All issues fall under three lists: the union list (those under the jurisdiction of the central parliament), the state list (under state legislatures), and concurrent list (shared by the center and the states). From 1947 until 1998, the constitution remained obfuscatory on how to apportion legislative powers over cinema. Cinema fell into different jurisdictions based on its categorization as an object of censorship (which brought it under the union list), a luxury product (which was on the state list), entertainment (on the state list), flammable commodity (union list when film was part of the petroleum industry, and state list with the introduction of safety films when it moved out of the flammable category), theater and dramatic performance (under the state list), and so forth.[68]

In other words, the manner in which film was defined and organized—how it was bounded and placed in relation to other products and aspects of social life[69]—could affect the domain of its jurisdiction. Additional confusion came from the fact that the union list was supposed to cover all industries "expedient in the public interest," but the Indian government's low estimation of the commercial entertainment industry made it an uneasy fit within that category. Film was, by default, on the state list for most concerns, although the "sanctioning of cinematograph film for exhibition" was assigned to the union list, which gave the center authority over censorship.[70] Fuzziness around sorting film as an object allowed the center to exert moral authority over cinema with its power of sanction, although individual states retained most of the constitutional rights over film with their power to license theaters and tax entertainment. At stake was the spatial distribution of state power over the cinematographic industry across the scale of a nation, from its local, provincial, regional, and central levels, which depended on how the national territory was defined in relation to film *and* how film itself was categorized.

Spatial thinking makes us review a liberal state's regulation of media as a territorialization of its power over time, defining the extent and the limits of its intervention. The state's management of film as a commodity has been one of many factors in the historical territorialization of state power (as explored in chapter 2). In India's case, the vagueness of the Indian Constitution over sorting films across different lists continued for five decades after Indian independence, despite recommendations to the contrary from three significant official reviews of Indian cinema: namely, by the 1927–28 Indian Cinematograph Committee (*Rangachariar Committee*), the Film Enquiry Committee of 1951 (*Patil Committee*), and the Working Group on National Film Policy of 1980. Each of these inquiries recommended that film be transferred to the concurrent list, in significant measure to protect the commercial film industry from the innumerable regional and national regulatory authorities overseeing theater licensing and taxes.[71] In 1998, the constitution's categorization of film finally changed when the then minister of information and broadcasting, Sushma Swaraj, made a parliamentary proposal to place film on the concurrent list. The film industry was brought under the center's legislative powers in order to give it official industry status, with the ability to attract finance capital, insurance, and other benefits of industry that it had demanded for decades. The Indian state's inauguration of media globalization and the consequent international popularization and monetization of "Bollywood" was part of this restructuring of national space as a privatizing market.

Referring to the maze of regulations that commercial film producers, distributors, and exhibitors had to battle merely to survive in the era of economic protectionism, the *Patil Committee Report* of 1951 quotes a verse from the Urdu/Persian poet Mirza Ghalib's lyrical love poem titled "*Aah ko chahiye ik umr asar hone tak*," translatable as "It takes a lifetime of longing for a sigh to make a difference."[72] The commercial film industry's desire for an open market was realized when, after decades of the industry's longing, the erotics of profit overtook rituals of public responsibility in the relationship between film business and the Indian state. As I show in "Rationalized Spaces" and "Commodified Spaces," statist measures to regulate or liberalize cinema had an impact on the production practices governing representations of national topography, just as much as they found expression in the aesthetics of film and media images.

Tracking the government's wrangling with the film industry nevertheless make too much of institutional power. What potentially slips past such an account is the *fantasy* of consumerism, which predated India's economic deregulation and underwrote both the film industry's lobbying for lower taxations and on-screen images of free-market consumption.[73] In other words, the success, visibility, and power of institutional spatializations of territory should not throw us off the scent of desired, repressed, and partially articulated spatial imaginaries. Whereas consumerism and privatization were not officially endorsed by the Indian state until the 1990s, spectacles of consumerism, romance, and travel had a much longer presence in Indian cinema, and were expressed in significant measure through representations of landscape. In these cases, histories gleaned by following the regulation and commercialization of film as an economic commodity are insufficient in revealing the affective meanings generated by filmic space. In "Affective Space," I study these alternative cartographic imaginations of land, architecture, and geography on-screen, as they manifested themselves in imaginations that exceeded the ambit of statist visions.

Despite these differences, all location and place-based films discussed in this book explicitly or viscerally contain elements of a travelogue,[74] which is an archetypical cinematic form conveying the sense of an encounter with or inhabitation of new lands. Unfamiliar places are introduced to viewers to educate or entertain them when British students learn about Indian geography through film (discussed in chapter 1) or when Indian viewers learn about their own country's geography in documentaries (chapter 2). European audiences travel virtually to India in films shot there and distributed internationally (chapter 3). In other instances, places and architectures conjure dystopian or wish-fulfilling alternatives to social realities, as in reincarnation films set in havelis, or in consumerist

FIGURE I.4 A visual spectacle from *Throw of Dice*.

spectacles of global travel (chapters 4 and 5). Arguably, in a colonized land, there is a profound sense of encountering one's homeland against and through the colonizer's image in early cinematic visualizations of topography. Self-representation can feel like a form of revisitation when it occurs in the context of first renditions by an imperial power and its proprietorial ownership by an imperial state.[75] Divergent treatments of film's backgrounds present these contesting impulses of self-representation. When actor and producer Himansu Rai worked with Bruce Woolfe's British Instructional to shoot the palaces of Jaipur and Mysore for an international audience in *Throw of Dice* (*Prapancha Pash*, Franz Osten, 1929), he creatively adapted an outsider's perspective on Indian landscapes by making regional architecture, flora, and fauna into a cosmopolitan spectacle. Dadasaheb Phalke, on the other hand, transformed Prabhat Studio's grounds into a mythological setting in *Raja Harishchandra* (1913), incorporating outdoor locations into tableaus of stories already familiar to domestic Indian audiences.[76]

A touristic sensibility migrates as well into the bureaucratic imagination of FD, which produced documentaries that took the spectator/citizen on a cinematic journey of the nation's regions. People and territories marginal to the

new Indian state—such as the Gorkhas and Lepchas of North India, or the terrains of India's northeastern states—become objects of a national touristic gaze under the visual regime of FD landscape documentaries. Contrarily, in India's commercial Hindi-Urdu films, on occasion those very places and people positioned by the state as minoritarian, marginal, or exotic become a haunting trace of the environmental uncanny. If appeals to India's syncretic past make FD documentaries instruct all Indian citizens on the national credo of "unity in diversity" by synthesizing India's varied topographical and ethnographic types into an imaginary whole, it pushes a strand of commercial Hindi-Urdu films (such as its Muslim socials) to explore repressed traumas in North India's cities and architectures. Markedly different from either of these visual regimes are today's corporatized Indian media images that shrink-wrap and brand post-modern spectacles of Indian geography. Their self-conscious style either assumes a media-savvy, global, and consumerist audience, or defies Westernized cosmopolitanism with a stylized and self-conscious provincialism. This aspect is described in the chapter on "Commodified Spaces," where space itself becomes a commodified and consumed thing.[77] Each cinematic iteration—whether produced as rationalized, affective, or commodified space—generates a particular relationship between territory and its perception. Each suggests a different mode through which India has been organized and visually spatialized on film.

RIVAL HISTORIES AND GEOGRAPHIES

In *Culture and Imperialism*, Edward Said's analysis of the "rival geographies" of place in art and literature captures the extent to which metaphoric struggles over representing places accompanied material contest over territories.[78] In film and media more so than in literature, given media's commercial need to solicit markets as capital-intensive commodities, geopolitically marginal territories became popular backdrops and news items when rapidly mechanizing technologies of vision coincided with expanding Western politico-economic interests around the world. Photographs and films of places such as Lucknow in 1857, Kashmir in 1948, Palestine in 1967, Mai Lai in 1968, or Fallujah in 2004 became globally familiar at the same time that a spectacular and violent suppression of their sovereignty implanted a local sense of alienation and unhousing for the inhabitants of those locations. One of the challenges confronting historians writing about filmed locations is the manner in which political events at the international or national scale unleash the sense of a place's multiple significance for different populations. A splintered and subjective sense of time comes to be

embedded in the same images of place. Another challenge is to consider how historians may reduce the effect of what Susan Sontag has called "proximity without risk"[79] endemic to the mass circulation of any photographic image, which is the experience of feeling that we know a place and a people because we have seen them represented frequently on media, without questioning the basis of our knowledge or endangering the comfort of our assumptions.

This book aims precisely to disturb the complacency of such perspectives and assumptions. References to the Himalayan "hill station"[80] Darjeeling appear here in relation to the Gaumont-British Instructional short *A Foot-hill Town: Darjeeling* (1937). Darjeeling also makes an appearance in K. L. Khandpur's FD documentary *Darjeeling* (1954) and in the classic of parallel cinema *Kanchenjungha* (1962), directed by Satyajit Ray. It features in a different form in the commercial moneymaker *Aradhana* (1969), directed by Shakti Samanta (chapters 1, 2, and 5). The hill station Darjeeling is part of a montage of alternative images in this book. Soviet filmmaker Sergei Eisenstein suggested that architectural ensembles reflect montage computations to a moving spectator, but for a stationary one, the creator needs to juxtapose "in one unique point the elements of that which is dispersed in reality, unseizable to a single gaze."[81] For Eisenstein, cinematic montage was thus a "means to 'link' in one point— the screen—various elements (fragments) of a phenomenon filmed in diverse dimensions, from diverse points of view and sides."[82] In my more linear chapters, case studies draw together different visual perspectives on particular cities, towns, and architectural structures in India. My effort is to undercut the singularity of each cinematic gaze, and indeed to show how each text produces its cinematic space through the management of other potential relations between time and place, memory and history, society and subject. Against the singularities of statist, commercial, or populist mappings of India as territory, this book offers an alternative cartography (discussed further in the conclusion). At the same time, this book's comparative histories and modes of visualizing places are not intended to create an impasse of representational relativism. Nor is it my intention that we halt at historicizing each particular spatial imagination. Rather, my argument is that spatial film historiographies—undertaken, in this instance, through a study of films shot in India—allow the discipline of film and media studies to tackle two challenges: first, the challenge posed by Henri Lefebvre and geographers in his wake to all historians; and second, the challenge posed by subaltern historians to Western historiography.

With my analysis of filmed places through the historicization of representational and social spaces, I concur with Marxist geographers Henri Lefebvre,

Edward Soja, Doreen Massey, and David Harvey, who argue that we need to redress a disproportionate focus on temporality and historical consciousness in European social thought, to show that space is not a passive canvas for human action but an active product and shaper of human life and social relations. This book's concluding chapter expands on the ways in which this project adds to an already rich range of scholarship on cinema and space. On the other side, in debate with Western Marxist geographers, subaltern historians have asked for an account of the persistence of *other* spatial logics—the feudal, the fantastical, the tribal, the ethnolinguistic, the caste-based, the communal, the superstitious, the mythic, the nonlinear—that are partially but never wholly comprehensible within vocabularies of modernity, capitalism, and hypercapitalism, as they persist to produce differentially capitalistic and differentially modern (off-modern, in Svetlana Boym's terms)[83] places around the world. Without refuting the centrality of capitalism to the history of modernity, subaltern historians challenge the primacy given to capitalism's territorial reorganization of the world at the expense of alternative spatial mappings that linger to assist, reformulate, or disrupt the order of economic globalization in microspaces. They dispute the enshrinement of one (Western) modality of capitalism and modernity as normative.

Accepting the second challenge in sustained ways throughout this book, I contend that spatial film historiographies are well equipped to respond to the subaltern critique of Western historiography to convey what Spivak refers to as "the uneven diachrony of global contemporaneity."[84] As others have noted, in any given slice of time, time itself is experienced differently across and within locations.[85] Framing the films and histories of nations such as India as non-Western or anomalous evades the substance of this critique. The sharp point of the argument is that fundamental categories that explain the world, such as history (in this case, of cinema's past) and philosophy (in this case, of cinema's ontology) are indexed to events and texts that belong to what Dipesh Chakrabarty calls a "hyperreal Europe."[86] Others are explained by their qualifying particularity. In film theory, this discrepancy is entrenched in the citational practice of using films, events, and experiences of twentieth-century Western Europe and the United States to explain abstract ideas about cinematic form, although no singular type of place, race, gender, or sexuality can claim ontological normativity.[87] A study that focuses on the filming of locations is necessarily cognizant of the source, object, and intent of cinematic knowledge production. It offers a refutation of the possibility of innocent epistemologies.

To realize the scope of spatial film criticism, we need to consider space as an ontologically central but politically and historically contingent force in

cinema. This book acknowledges the earlier and important turn to screen space in 1970s *Screen* theory, but shifts focus away from an exclusive emphasis on the implied subject within the filmic text to consider the tensile relations between onscreen and social, disciplinary, capitalist, affective, and geopolitical spaces. Escaping the territorial trap of different ideational approaches in film studies calls for writing across three registers: across cinema's ability to manipulate time and space to account for the medium's ontological referentiality and plasticity;[88] across the methodologies of film theory, political economy, and cultural studies to account for film as a formal, material, and social object; and across differentiated geopolitical contexts to account for cinema's emergence in the mutually implicated histories of global modernity. While questions of temporality rather than spatiality have been of primary concern to subaltern historians, the revelation that modernity must be understood in relation to disparate historical subjects and contexts has an immediate (if unstated) spatial dimension. To borrow digital humanities scholar Todd Presner's words from another discussion, "What this means for the temporal field is that multiple, nonsimultaneous histories are considered as if they were simultaneous; for the spatial field, it means that multiple, noncontiguous geographies are linked together as if they were contiguous."[89]

Colonial histories and geographies, often effaced from dominant accounts of Western modernity, were temporally contiguous and, more important, causally central to the production of modern industrial Europe. Colonization and slavery were the material practices that made the world contiguous and contagious under the sign of modernity and must remain a historical reference point for spatially decentered writing in the era of neoimperialism and globalization. Seeing the world in this way, with what may be considered a radical spatial equivalence despite reified political asymmetries, makes us ask why knowledge appears placeless in some forms and situated in others; theoretical when produced in relation to some geographical locations, and empirical in relation to others.[90]

This perspective allows me to raise but also sidestep the question of whether this book is about cinema or about Indian cinema. I do not feel compelled to answer that question, because I am proposing that thinking about filmed spaces through a sustained interrogation of locations in film is an opportunity to feel the rub of epistemic and territorial categorizations in all of film history and film theory. What such a study makes clear is that the history of filming a location, in India or indeed in any place in the world, is necessarily a history of the competing assumptions, knowledges, experiences, and practices that underwrite the production of a territory as a visual environment. Apparently co-

herent spatial perspectives or grids for organizing space give visual and political definition to that place, much as the place and its people exert a determinate influence on an image's visuality and politics. The following historical account of the disciplinary spaces of geography, regulatory spaces of the state, affective spaces of human encounter, residual spaces of memory, and commodifying spaces of capital collectively present space as a template for understanding Indian locations on film. They also orchestrate five arguments and methods for the practice of a spatial film historiography.