

The Journey of a Project: Traces, Trails, Travails

This volume of textual and photo essays, documentation transcripts, maps and graphics, and annotated reproductions of artworks and documentary film stills, has evolved out of and is the culmination, in a sense, of *Project Cinema City: Research Art and Documentary Practices* – an expansive project that was developed over five years, from 2008 to 2012. The project included exercises in collating, speculating, producing, exhibiting and publishing through interfaces between multiple practices and disciplines. Mainly spanning the twentieth-century as an era of public culture in India, it engaged with the multiple subjectivities related to cinema and the watermarks it has left on the body of the city that produces cinema on an industrial scale, namely Bombay/Mumbai.

Bombay, since the era of early industrialization and expansion of commerce in the late nineteenth-century, has been projected as a prime urban site for accumulation and distribution of fortune through speedy transactions of capital and opportunities. This projection has resulted in opening several tracks through which the inflow of labour and aspiration of all kinds piled up within the narrow land of the peninsula. Such a scale of vertical accumulation of human energy within a tightly packed space over the century has developed a vast repertoire of tales of precarious existence and of intense conflicts of wills. Production of images, in such a space, makes a sort of manifesto for the city as well as renders a justification for its mercurial ways.

Project Cinema City is primarily a set of enquiries into the labour, imagination, desire, access, spaces, locations, iconization, materiality, languages, moving peoples, viewing conventions and hidden processes that inform the cinemas the city makes, and also the cities its cinema produces. The enquiries are based on the hypothesis that cinema in the terrain of cinema city is as much everyday practice as it is a part of a speculative desirescape. Hence this volume presents cinema as a manufacturing enterprise that alters through shifts in materials, technologies, labour inflow, distribution territories, demographic patterns and development policies, and the city as a phenomenon that continuously evolves through the interface between lived reality and the reality perceived in cinema.

This volume anthologizes the processes of the project and audits the works that were created as a part of it, in addition to presenting some textual elaborations on key ideas that formed the base of the project. A good part of the project output was tactile and sensorial – comprising artworks, documentary films, sound installations, archival documentation, video testimonies, etc. Hence it seems necessary, before ‘entering’ this book, to outline the trajectory and the operational criteria of the parent project, which evolved through intense interactions and complex collaborations among more than a hundred artists, filmmakers, architects and town planners, cultural and media practitioners, and social scientists.

Base of the Project

Project Cinema City was hosted by Majlis, an institution that has been working on contemporary urban citizenry and rights discourses since the early 1990s in Bombay/Mumbai. Majlis’s engagement with the relationship between hybrid urban identities and the shifting forms of rights was crucially shaped by events in the wake of the Bombay riots of 1992–93. In course of time, this engagement naturally developed into the wider field of composition of the public, in terms of their agency and legitimacy of their practices. An earlier initiative of Majlis was to create a public access digital archive (an offshoot of that initiative is the web portal *pad.ma*) of unedited footage on the city, collated from diverse sources. This initiative (2002–08), titled *Godaam*, sought to develop a storehouse of city images manufactured and distributed by diverse authorized and unauthorized producers. In the year 2004, Majlis was entrusted with conceiving and mounting the cultural segment of the World Social Forum that took place in Mumbai. This opportunity, which required mobilization of around 3,000 artists and producers of cultural works from all over the world, enabled the organization to evolve a broad platform for exchanges between artists of different genres and registers. Traces of these previous actions, experiences and agendas of Majlis are evident in the ambition and facilities of *Project Cinema City*. A part of the project was also developed in collaboration with the Design Cell of KRVI (Kamla Raheja Vidyanidhi Institute for Architecture and Environmental Studies), Mumbai.

To begin with, the project was imagined as an excavation process to arrive at one or more configurations that constitute cinema city, using devices from practices in architecture, filmmaking, art production, cartography and related social sciences. The area of enquiry changed, altered, expanded and was even rendered void – as the adopted methodology and proposed queries proved inadequate or incongruous – at crucial points during the project period. The fact that spatial configurations in the urban milieu are ever-transient and almost never allow themselves to be archived as a whole also made the project change its tracks every now and then.

A pivotal issue that emerged through the points of shift in the area of enquiry was how much the ‘multiform and fragmentary’ (to borrow a term from Michele De Certeau’s *The Practice of Everyday Life*) urban living pattern and the operations of cinema within that is related to external factors such as demography, technology, the politics of space, etc., and to what extent it is a part of the agency of cinema citizens. And, if there is agency of that kind for all the players in the manufacturing and consumption of cinema, then who among them can be considered as cinema citizens, in terms of the validity of their belonging and the autonomy of their actions?

Archiving the Production Process

Initially, the project was called *Cinema City: An Inter-Disciplinary Practice Based Archive Project*. The aim was to create the prototype of an archive that is live in terms of its relationship with contemporary practices. Or, to put differently, to build an archive by facilitating interfaces between disciplines in the course of collating, processing and using archival data. We hoped that the archiving process would be contemporaneized through the edgy energy resulting out of interfaces between the practices of different disciplines. The task was articulated, somewhat clumsily, as an attempt to *find the marks of cinema on the body of the city – heightened, hyper, subtle, invisible, illegible and memorized*.

Apart from research-based activities, the project also developed through interactions at public places. It was presented in different capsules to various sets of audiences (through

intermediary exhibitions, pedagogical courses and public discussions), and the responses fed back into the project. One of the first public presentations was at 'Forum Expanded', Berlinale (Berlin International Film Festival) 2010, on the occasion of the sixtieth anniversary of the festival. The international backdrop of the film festival posed a challenge in so far as the project had to justify its extremely local concerns that were focused more on the production strategies of popular cinema than the criticality of films. After much contemplation it was decided not to attempt to translate any aspect of the project to suit the comprehension of a western audience and to maintain its localized nature, despite the danger of appearing exotic. But the apprehension proved to be misplaced. Berlin's own complex history of urbanization, post-war sub-cultural practices and radical impulses proved the right setting to present the still-tentative schema of *Project Cinema City*. The project was displayed in three different venues each representing a distinct aspect of contemporary Berlin: the foyers of Arsenal Kino, the Institute of Film and Video Art, a subversive site at the heart of the commercial district of Potsdamer Platz; Delphi Filmpalast, a heritage theatre and a traditional Berlinale venue in a dense neighbourhood; and Cine Star's Cubix, a glass-façaded multiplex built in the post-unification years in the former East. The many realities of cinema city Bombay/Mumbai were put on display at these multiple sites of cinema in Berlin. Notations of post-colonial metropolitan hybridity in the era of globalization were placed against the backdrop of post-war western urbanity at the peak of its official campaign for 'cultural integration of the immigrants'. The critical audiences, which the Berlinale has developed over the decades, took to the sites and strategies of producing cinema in Bombay/Mumbai – not with the practised ease of gazing at other, not-so-familiar cultures, but with a curious and expanded interest in cinema and its multiple organizing schemes. Nowhere else did the project belong so wholly to the world of cinema as it did at the Berlinale. This early encounter in turn encouraged *Project Cinema City* to consolidate its focus on the details of production processes and the social patterns evolving out of those, rather than on textual study of films.

Thus, sweatshops of cinema production were documented, studio spaces and iconic locations were mapped, patterns of material inflows into the making of cinema were studied, profiles of neighbourhood theatres were collated, and graphs of migration and demography

related to cinema-based aspirations and occupations were traced. In short, a database concerning the sociology of cinema production in the city was developed by a battery of young researchers and students, and by documentary filmmakers. The research culminated in a series of nine documentary films that covered a range of narratives around the concept of cinema citizenry, and a series of maps dealing with the trajectory of networks between spaces, locations and territories in the cinema city. The strict territorialism, following the logic of industrial capitalism, observed in the pattern of space-use in the city is often split open by the insidious permeation of cinema. The films and maps together outline these special contours of the cinema city.

Different Temporalities

As *Project Cinema City* progressed further it came across zones that refused to be categorized within the set temporality of archiving practices. Certain case studies came up while collating evidence that pointed to a strong presence of apparitions which could not be ignored. A specific form needed to be evolved to accommodate the slippages and detours in the order of occurrences and events.

One of the main destabilizing factors was a chance encounter with Chiranjilal Sharma, a dealer in waste celluloid, who burnt, boiled and cut up discarded film prints to make assorted commodities. His livelihood thrived on transforming the utility of the base material he used, celluloid in this case, and that was in direct opposition to the archival agenda of our project. Sharma's secular practice of expanding the utility of the *thing* into myriad possibilities by continuous conversion, and our impulse to confine the *thing* by freezing its material utility in an archival space, were too oppositional to ignore. It also brought to the fore the issue of thingness in cultural production and artefacts, and that led to the question: if cinema experiences form the reservoir of the collective memory we were trying to map, should discarded film reels be regarded as material that is vulnerable to public intervention or as socialized artefacts / fixed documents? In short, is Chiranjilal Sharma a cinema citizen – or is he an immigrant with no attachment to the local culture and its past, and thus capable of any sly tactic for survival in the present?

The contest between past and present played itself out in a different way in the case of the cinema of Malegaon. As a sub-theme of *Project Cinema City*, it was planned to also document non-metropolitan cinema industries and settlements. The cinema of Manipur, a border state in the North-East of India with a highly conflicting relationship with the mainland, was chosen as one such site; the other was the cinema of Malegaon, an industrial town situated 250 kilometres away from the home of 'Bollywood'. Though clubbed in one category for the sake of convenience, they are completely different entities. The marginalization of Manipuri cinema is symptomatic of the broader political reality, and thus related to federal state formation and issues of sovereignty. With a strong tradition of pre-cinema narratives, the film culture in Manipur is almost as old as that of the world. Manipuri cinema's opposition to Bombay cinema, and also to the Bangla cinema of Calcutta, is frontal, physical and speaks the language of confronting hegemonic cultures.

Malegaon cinema, on the other hand, functions within a unique frame of a copy without an original – a present without a past. The town produces films in cheap VCD format and circulates them through local video parlours and entertainment kiosks. They are original films in the guise of copies – with titles like *Malegaon ka Sholay*, *Malegaon ka Superman*, *Khandes ki Barat* and so on, they are a flamboyant declaration of being imitations of films made by industries with far greater outreach. *Superman* in the Malegaon version is a rickety man in the garb of the 'original' of Hollywood. The local stand-up comedian comments on various socio-civic issues of Malegaon in the voice of Bombay's stars. The small town is infested with local versions of popular Bombay heroes, villains and singers. Yet the making of these films involve substantial transgressions in terms of the production process and narrative structure of the 'originals' to which they attach themselves. This strategy of attaching their works with the 'super powers' is what makes the cinema of Malegaon a distinct phenomenon. It defies all the available categories of an offshoot – copy, spoof, parody, pirated, adaptation, impersonation – in terms of its intention, narrative and process; yet it refuses to be anointed with an independent identity.

In some sense, the players of Malegaon cinema decline claims of cinema citizenship and opt instead for the status of immigrants: a footloose identity that relieves them of the burden of

legacy and/or timeline. By producing films that are titled *Malegaon ka...* this or that, they firmly erase the footprints of their own works and, in turn, insist on their existence in the periphery. In this milieu of resistance to 'originality', Malegaon became a difficult subject for our project to document and archive. The adamant anti-history, anti-evidence stance of its film industry made a serious dent in our method of archiving through chronicles. Though there is an essay on Malegaon cinema in this book, in a broader sense, we would have to admit that the project failed to formalize its engagement with Malegaon cinema.

In the context of the challenge posed by jagged and ragged chronologies, we initiated a compilation of the timeline of the twentieth-century city. The assumption was that the crisis in the method of chronicling could only be addressed by increasing and expanding the attributes of the chronicle itself. The compilation, which was later published as a book – *dates.sites: Project Cinema City Bombay/Mumbai* (text by Madhusree Dutta, designed by Shilpa Gupta and Madhusree Dutta, New Delhi: Tulika Books, 2012) – is a figurative and associative timeline of the city and its public life in the twentieth-century. Multi-layered text-fragments comprising policies, events, dissents, movements, memoirs, rumours, beliefs and fictions were grafted together around dates. Disparate information about dates that are site-based, sites that are connected to dates, the joints where the two clash, the margins where both get blurred, broadly illegible temporalities that challenge the tangibility of both dates and sites, were gathered from formal and informal, acknowledged and discarded sources. These were then laid out in a contrived pattern to keep open the scope for multiple and dialogic readings that, in turn, invited further interpolation and speculation from readers. This timeline, then, was used as a loose grid for the project.

At this stage we changed the title to *Cinema City: Research Art and Archive Project*. The idea was to amalgamate the act of research and the act of making art into a process of archiving. We hoped the archive would evolve through a process of tracing the collective and multiple ways of *using* research to *make* art, as well as through research *emerging* out of art-making.

The timeline was distributed among visual artists, filmmakers, architects, designers, and they were requested to 'respond' to it from the specific position of their practice, lineage and proclivity by imaging a date calendar for a specific year in the twentieth-century. Sixty date

calendars, eclectically conceived and created in 2010–11 yet credited to the previous century, were thus produced as digital prints. These calendars became documents of contemporary thinking and varied perceptions relating to the previous century, and could completely bypass the issue of evidential authenticity which is so central to archiving practices and history writing. The calendars were an art project based on archived material (the timeline of twentieth-century Bombay/Mumbai and found images related to it), but also an archiving process by itself (as the artists organized the data according to their own perceptions of the past, as well as brought in additional material in response to requirements that arose from it); in a way, the exercise was also one of disbanding the archive by positioning the calendars as primary material available for newer works/readings. This is how the process became a circular and continuous method of both archiving and opening up what was already archived – by, in a sense, working on the potentials of the past.

At this point the cartographic works too shifted focus: they moved from a mapping of physical terrains to accommodating the multiple subjectivities associated with spatial operations. The maps and graphics created in this phase of the project dealt with locations that had been shaped and disseminated through narratives in popular films and other forms of public culture. The works activated these locations not by documenting space-use but by compiling their heterogeneous association with public life. In a later phase, this proposed heterogeneity of the relationship between urban lived-in spaces and the perception of those spaces as rendered in popular culture was further expanded through the works of senior artists whom we specially invited to participate in the project.

In 2011, *Project Cinema City* was invited to be showcased at the golden jubilee celebration of the Film and Television Institute of India (FTII) in Pune. The project's presentation at this event comprised an exhibition, screenings of the documentary films and a panel discussion on 'The Cinematic Imagination and the City'. The exhibition was mounted on the studio floors of FTII, a heritage site built in 1933 by the pioneering Prabhat Film Company. The high ceilings, wooden floors and industrial shed-like structure of the old shooting studio, along with film students as the primary audience, posed a different challenge than that faced at the Berlinale the previous year. With the change of venue, the same exhibits that ran a danger of appearing

exotic in Berlin faced a risk of looking mundane in Pune. So the task was to accumulate/contrive the mundane into structures that resemble spectacles, and thus, switch the familiar into fantastical. Two formal decisions became crucial at this point – the first was to reconfigure the scale of the works to match the studio structure; the second was to introduce surprising juxtapositions to counter the familiarity with corporeal aspects of the works. This was when a part of the project finally attained the ‘status’ of public art, in terms of its scalar ambition and ability to rearrange the mundane as spectacle.

Sociology of Memories

But the project could not yet claim stability. A new challenge appeared in the form of abstractions of public imagination and the memories constructed out of that.

The search for traces of cinema in neighbourhoods took us to Samrat – the 1500-seater cinema hall built in the 1970s following the outbreak of multi-starrer blockbusters, in the erstwhile pastoral land of Goregaon West. Oral testimonies have it that the inhabitants of the locality at first thought it was being built as a night shelter for buffaloes from the surrounding *tabelas* (stables). They had never seen a plinth of that size before. The construction of the cinema hall was their first brush with urban infrastructural development. But this developmental intervention did not create any palpable tension as the land-use pattern even in 1970s’ Bombay allowed for a kind of mutual functionality between inhabitants, buffaloes and the cinema. And, in the absence of social tension, neither Samrat Cinema nor the *tabelas* entered the official history of either the city or its cinema.

Around the same time, while documenting women’s experiences of viewing cinema, we came across Sushila, a self-professed film buff and domestic worker who had lived all her life in suburban Bombay. She testified: ‘Last year I went to town ... saw the sea, the train lines, buildings, roads ... they are exactly like in cinema. ... I felt like I have seen them all.’ Sushila’s access to cinema was far greater than her access to landmarks of the city she lives in. That made cinema her primary source for reflexes and created a relationship of ‘proximity without presence’ (to borrow a phrase from W. Fleisch, *Proximity and Power: Shakespearean and Cinematic Spaces*, 1987) with the city. The contest between the memories and realities of the

neighbours of Samrat Cinema, between non-spectators belonging to a pre-cinema life system and Sushila, the committed spectator, challenged our notion of substantiality in the course of archiving. Both testimonies (I refuse to categorize them as anecdotes) corroborate a kind of urban displacement; yet they also articulate a certain identification and spatial relationship with the cultural logic of the city. So, for the project, the imagination and the imaginary became as urgent as the tangible aspects of archiving.

With this new complication of testimonies as evidence and the invasion of imagination within that, it became important to alter the scheme once again. This time we changed the title of the project to *Cinema City: Research Art and Documentary Practices*. The choice of the word documentary was not made due to any ideological determinism but to avail the fluidity of operations within its practices. We hoped that the impulse of inquisition in documentary would help preserve the collated material as found resources, countering the fixity of fact and evidence. Found resources are precarious yet supple, and thus conducive to reorganization at any given time. Besides, only the underdefined tag of documentary practice provided the spectrum to flatly place the collated, the produced, the researched, the muted, the recycled, the unresolved, the uncategorized, the speculated and the fantasized on the same table.

Under the new title, an agenda was evolved to place unprocessed, raw data in the public domain, and to initiate a participatory exercise of documentary-making by arranging and rearranging these into open-ended propositions. This agenda was addressed by making the found and collated material accessible through devices of interactive artworks. In order to achieve interactivity, the project had to dig into various forms of rhetoric that would create a stage for spectators/audience to perform *commonly* and *publicly*. Individuals as spectators/audience had to be eased into the anonymity of a public with a shared nostalgia and a sense of playfulness for the interactivity to be achieved at a significant scale. Hence, several mass-used devices and sites – bioscope, telephone booth, photo studio, reading room table, digital archive console, museum shop – were (re)constructed as artworks, and the research data were fed into them. The spectator was invited to handle and organize the data in the guise of a game, and to do so in a public place while others watched on.

The spectators' actions – peeping, eavesdropping, projecting self-image on to a fantasy landscape, browsing at the reading room, window-shopping at the museum, surfing via search engines – mimicked a shared culture; and yet the embedded data demanded personalized navigation by each individual in order for it to be processed into comprehensible knowledge. The devices were designed such that the outcomes remained unpredictable and transitory. The aimed interactivity thus turned into a game between the individual (spectator/audience), the public (rhetorical devices and shared nostalgia) and the popular (playful participation) – and, in the process, fleeting archives got repeatedly built and then dismantled under the public eye. The possibility of these ephemeral configurations reaching a threatening scale to destabilize the prevalent social and intellectual order was only mildly implied in the games. A terrestrial network of miscellanies across the cinema city holds together the ambiguous, if not latently oppositional, relationships between patterns of land-use (in the Adarsh Nagar colony of cinema sweatshops that had become extinct without leaving any trace, and the location of the Dharavi slum that threw up tantalizing imaginations of urbanity); between forms of public access (in the high-energy technologies of reproduction that have been socialized as consumers' goods, and the distinct viewing practices of cinema that consolidate class and gender-based citizenship); and between functioning mechanisms (in several cinema-plus practices that function within the everydayness of the city, and the extraordinary-ness of cinema production that turns all habitable and inhabitable spaces into templates of mythologies). And the miscellaneous could be collated and displayed only if the labels in the catalogue were kept re-writeable, depending on the significance of past and present, and also the material and the imagination in each reading. By anchoring the project in documentary practices and fashioning it for public interaction we were able, to some extent, to address that. For example, the location of neighbourhood theatres could then become simultaneously a timeline of urban development, a charter of migrant culture, a chronicle of the formation of an urban public, a site to revisit the genre of now-extinct female stunt movies, a map of gender-based access to entertainment, a proclamation of the death of certain analogous cultures and livelihoods, a speculation about a post-celluloid public culture, and a spatial and architectural exploration of urban public places. Accordingly, the data could be presented in independent and

interdependent forms of texts, documentary films, artworks and performances, maps and drawings, as well as uncut material.

The Public-ness of Technology

Other occasions of exhibiting in university corridors and cultural institutions, screening at public theatres and on television channels, conducting pedagogical courses for undergraduate and postgraduate students, and numerous public discussions too fed into the backroom preparations of the project. Of these, one segment is especially worth mentioning here as an example of the urgency created by material and technological transiency. In 2010, as a part of the disseminating agenda of the project, we rented a single screen theatre to run a festival of city films: Edward Theatre, founded in the 1880s as a drama house, which had survived many phases of urban development and changes of era in public entertainment. At that time the heritage theatre could only project 35-mm mono sound film reels. Despite a reasonably good response we were forced to close the weekly screenings after a few months as access to celluloid film reels turned out to be very difficult. The conventional film archives were reluctant to put out their precious prints for public viewing. A way out could have been to project some kind of digital version of the films, but the theatre was not equipped for that.

Yet two years later, at the last leg of the project, when we attempted to screen an original 35-mm print at Bharatmata – another old, single screen theatre in a working-class neighbourhood – we faced a completely opposite obstacle. By then all theatres, fancy and dilapidated alike, had been converted to digital projection, governed by a central server controlled by the distribution company. The 35-mm projectors in those theatres had fallen into disuse, and it was impossible to break into the closely guarded digital projection system in order to screen a film that was not routed through the distributor's server. The disappearance of materiality in film projection, interestingly, had made the theatres non-conductive to stray acts of intervention and out-of-turn screenings. While in the case of the former the site was available and the material was scarce, in the latter case it was the site that turned inaccessible though the availability of material (digital copies) increased manifold. Here is a severe contest between reproducibility and access, and between access and availability. Interviews with

women spectators across class, caste, age and geographical location revealed that with each turn/leap in the evolution of entertainment technology, women's access to public space and public amenities had shrunk. Technologies that increased consumer accessibility in a general sense have also domesticated popular culture and entertainment. For example, the phenomenal expansion of television has brought to an end special matinee shows for women in neighbourhood cinema halls.

Anthologizing the Project

In the course of the last five years but especially following a series of exhibitions held at the National Gallery of Modern Art in multiple cities in 2012, other cinema-producing cities have viewed and responded to the project with a mix of enthusiasm and suspicion. Suspicion has arisen on the ground that by making Bombay/Mumbai the pivotal cinema city, the project was only reaffirming the hegemonic role of Bombay cinema in the region. On other occasions, the replicability of the project in other locations has surfaced as a strong possibility, with enthusiastic plans to replant it in Calcutta/Kolkata, Madras/Chennai, Tehran, Seoul, Shanghai. But when it came to the level of logistical details, it became clear that such a project needs to be initiated within the specificities of each location and that it cannot be transplanted, manifesto-like, from one location to the other. In the final count, *Project Cinema City* is not a standard configuration but an integral part of the location-specific permutations and combinations that Arjun Appadurai (in *Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy*, 1996) defines as ethnoscaples, mediascaples, technoscaples, financescaples and ideoscaples. Hence the location will need to be prioritized over the production and the production process over the products, for a project of this register to work.

The present book is schemed to detail the allusive journey of the project – while refusing itself the comfort of drawing closures of any kind – from ideation to research to production to dissemination and back, through the winding path between the contemporary and the past. Most of the contributors to this book are practitioners of various disciplines of narrative-making and action strategists, and their texts are primarily based on experience and notes from the field. The main aim of this volume is to convey the richness of documentation made through

the collaborative project – a richness that, hopefully, will also convey to the reader the scale and diversity, and the crisis and creativity of the relationship between cinema and city in Bombay. In its free mixing of images, graphics, field notes, information and commentary, the book, quite like the parent project, maintains a work-in-progress status. This temperamentality, we would like to believe, mirrors the vacillating characteristics of the medium of mass imaginations: cinema.

The book is divided into three sections. The first, *Mapping Imaginations: Terrains, Locations*, deals with the spatiality, materiality and habitability of the cinema city. The basic argument put forth by the essays included here is that cinema is essentially a spatial system that functions through an entanglement of forms of production and representation of/in cinema. This section addresses the spatial system of cinema as it is incorporated within the broader genres of urbanity, modernity, vocationality and desirability of the city.

The second section, *Performing Labour: Bodies, Network*, is about the act of producing and the labour that produces – skill, work, character, aspiration, dissent, transgression, duplication, ancillaries – and the myriad ways in which they populate the cinema city. With the death of manufacturing industries in Bombay, the service and entertainment sectors have become the mainstay of aspiration-induced migration to the city. This section deals with the organized and unorganized accumulation of labour, performing bodies, and aspirational talent at the altar of cinema.

The third section, titled *Viewing Limits: Narratives, Technologies*, deals with the multiple niches and varied strategies through which cinema is arranged and rearranged in the everyday life of the city and its citizens. Every alteration in genre, narrative, technology, economy, infrastructure, etc., influences the way cinema multiplies its effect on the lived realities of the city and its citizens. While some of these effects are physically related to the cinema, others are remote and merely provisional.

Madhusree Dutta