

'Aayi Sali Pyar Kar na' (Girl is not loving me) But why? Exploration of 'Love' through Khandeshi Cinema.

I must say, love is more than emotions and more than shape, it is sense of belonging. Reviewing of literature and cinema, where patriarchy dominates and 'cultural' considerations becomes more powerful, same with love also. It is said that cinema and literature is mirror of the society. In this 'constructive world' the fantasies and fictions are more influenced and vice-versa. Fantasies is primarily been men domain both in the sphere of cultural production and in everyday life. These domains make, 'love' as villain. We have 'Love Jihad', 'Honor Killing' and what not. It is reflected in the cinemas also and sometime these fantasies and fictions tries to say, 'love is so difficult to do or make', though having the fact that cinema and its functionality created a such desire for a partner which can be found in certain groups of a society. Khandesh region is also part of a society. Khandesh also have cinema enterprise. It will be vast issue if I talked about Indian Cinema by and large regarding love. 'Romantic love' is supposed to be stand for break social barriers unlike caste, class, gender and religion. Hindi cinema is seen as a completely utopian force which fails to show what is exactly happening in the society. As Rachel Dwyer says Hindi Cinema brings together Heterosexual couples that are it. My paper attempting Khandeshi cinema and their romantic representation of love on screen and off screen which burns as wholesome, eternal, spiritual and authentic such as livelihood and survival. The Khandeshi Cinema's filmmakers, heroes, villains, patrons and heroines are come into sight with sensible point of view like 'boss, love is okay, need to survive beyond that', on screen and off screen. Paper based on ethnography method and textual analysis of 2-3 films along with song and interviews which seek to argue that Khandeshi cinema embeds romantic love in a progressive politics of resistance, while straddling issues at the intersection of caste and gender.

In a common meeting Raosaheb Kasbe was told us about 'how the imitation works?' where he gave the example of Walter Begehot's, saying that, "we should not assume the imitation is very playful and conscious. Imitation is obscure location in humans mind. Imitations placed in beliefs

of human kinds". However, imitations have background of social, economical, political and psychological reasons. These phenomenologies have their conscious and subconsciousness (unconsciousness). There is endless and invisible connection in between this conscious-subconsciousness and above phenomenologies. Slowly all these things are captured by the dominant powers. Such is about 'love' which is a creation of unique situation of the society including social, political, economical and psychological, physical and productive natures. When production comes love become material and physical where it has enormously spread psychological imitation to the others, on the others.

Infections of 'imitation' are viral in each and every era. Very consumed ideas of society are developed when the morality and philosophies carrying through the imitation. The right lining idea and brahmanical notions carried as it is in new forms. It can be good examples for imitation that 'God Krishna' stands for the 'love, emotions and feelings' and idea behind something stand for something else is none other than imitation. This imitation reflected in the society as well as in literature and cinema. While having the fact that the cinema also developed the brahmanical ideas which is so material initially already make peoples as victim of their falseness. Now you can see the peoples, societies are imitating the screen.

'To begin with a definition, love is an emotion that motivates an individual to establish and maintain an exclusive and mutual emotional relationship--based on gender with another person. As long as love is in force, the relationship remains permanent, to death and beyond. But often love decays.' (Gordel, 2004)

When Indian cinema started their themes were mythological and religious. Movies like 'Pundlik' (1912) by Dadasaheb Torne were ignored and judged as low creation. (low culture). From onwards globalised era movie actually around middle class-urban peoples. All narratives of the cinema were dominates the idea of urban middle class society. However urban area became sites of experiences of modernity, cinema energy occupied with these sites to produce new and complex and composites representations. In many ways, cinema makes the hidden archive of the 'Indian' modern'. Love is popular theme of this cinema. 'Indian moderns' none other than

but those people who love their societies in traditional way for their convenience. These peoples are not only consumerists of the traditional nuances but also followers of the religion, patriotism and materialized capitalists sentiments.

Love at first sight is powerful topic of represented love on the screen. In Hindi Cinema there is one side of sacrificed individual desires to make ultimate couples and it is the guiding motto of the so called Indian society in other hand. Cinema like *Raja Hindustani*, *Hum Apake Hai Kaun*, *Hum Saath Saath Hai*, *Pyar Deewana Hota Hai*, *Pardesh*, *Vivah* etc is examples of sacrificed individual desires. Above films stands for so called 'romantic love' also.

Later on sacrificed individual desire assemble as ideal 'Indian' partner. Indian commercial cinema is gathered public imaginations and it is highly appealable for how the desirability of a partner can be?

In majority of movie is shows how 'modernity' and individual desire are wrong and not good to the society. In *Raja Hindustani* Karishma Kapoor (Aarti) wears a modern-westernised dress; she got targeted from 'gundas' of 'Palanpur'. Here, the modernity shows as against the national culture, but at the same time her stepmother Archana Puran Singh who is again modern individual shows as villain against the modern. Karishma Kapoor's two friends 'Kammo' and Gulab Singh played by Navneet Nishan, Veeru Krishnan respectively. In the plot this two characters were not as societal norms like Navneet who is woman but behave like a 'Macho' man, Veeru Krishnan shows as transgender. Johnny Lever who plays the role of 'Balvant Singh' constantly makes fun of them. At the end Navneet's character become ideal women and tries and Karishma Kapoor also forgets her individual desire and modernity and becomes ideal wife of Amir Khan with saree and all. This movie is not only confused patrons but trying to shows if someone becomes modern that will be against to the society also.

Popular belief regarding partner is so 'heteronormative' which is comes from the idea of constructive. Society constantly prepared them about 'desire' off screen and on screen. Indian

Cinema is full of couple production guiding motto. The circle of the 'desirability' is already dominant by the class and caste consciousness. Desire of partner introduced as very prominent thing to human being. Person prepared as getting partner is very overwhelming and only target and it is found in each and every caste, creed, religion and social category of the society. The surface of the desirability is depend upon physical appearances and sometime unwilling fantasies. Sentiments and understandings of desire of a 'partner' not practical's. These sentiments go into the heart of modern understanding of 'Love'. Like if some stranger privileged person the desire of modern understanding nonetheless but well said 'constructive' only and the same situation is on the screen and off the screen also. For example, '*Naseeb Apna Apna*' (1986) 'family entertainment movie' by Tatineni Rama Rao starring by Rishi Kapoor (Kishan), Farha (Radha), Amrish Puri (Bhima), Radhika Sarathkumar (Chando), Satyen Kappu (Ramlal) etc. Satyen Kappu and Amrish Puri were childhood friends, now their children in the age of marriage but Satyen Kappu's daughter is 'ugly' in social norms, so no one wants to marriage her. Kappu and Puri met each other at Varanasi and they fixed their children's marriage. Meanwhile, Rishi Kapoor is in the some other level he fantasized slim-fair-intellectual-conservative Indian woman as partner. Being a scared from his father Kishan married to Chando. Later on she comes to the city and whole drama happened. When Kishan described his desire regarding partner it takes 11 minutes footage. 'In reality people's desires of a partner also match' says one of my friend. Radha took Chando to the 'beauty parlor' make her what Kishan desire. At the end everything go happy happy.

Still there are images like 'Love as in villain' situation. In *Sholay* (1975) by Ramesh Sippy, Amitabh Bachchan's and Jaya Bhaduri's love is supposed to be villain in this movie. Jaya is widowed woman and to 'make or do love' with her is not tolerable in the society because we have social practices like 'Sati'. Another example is '*Jait Re Jait*' (1977) by Jabbar Patel famously known for admitting the 'Thakar Tribe'. Plot of the movie is Nagya (Mohan Agashe) who is honey gatherer. Prominent figure and he is the one who does all religious rituals of the village and Chandi (Smita Patil) who throw by her husband or her husband was useless so she left. She proposes him saying '*Bhut Lagalay Mala*' (Ghost snatched my body) and he refused her, says

'Narkat Jaain Jar Dusaryachya Baai Kade Wakdya Najarene Baghitale Tar' (Will go to the hell if I saw others wife). To get him as husband she promised herself to paid all the money which she have to give for separation. They lived together for sometime but somehow the rumour arrives. It says, 'there is something wrong with this village' and everyone curse couple. At the end Chandi dies and Nagya started to do his old work. For me dying Chandi is nonetheless but punishment of doing or making love. Indians beliefs and actions regarding love is traditional way where socialisation is men domain religious and influential. Ramesh Sippy ends the movie to killed Amitabh and left Jaya alone (Widowed) which is what larger context of Brahmanical consciousness, men domain convenience and to punish Chandi is also comes at the same men domain.

Louis Schwartz acknowledges Foucault quotes that, 'modern state transform as feudal sovereign power to end life into a power to control life'. The Hindi Cinema not for entertainment only rather it is controlling on lives *Raja Hindustani, Sholay, Jait Re Jait* are the examples for it. Let's not discuss cinema comes into the modernity. While having fact that camera unable to provide objectives of truth on the screen. When Marathi cinema traces its limited to the Pune-Mumbai, no one talks about Khandesh, even though the 'officials' also let alone, then you cannot expect about livelihood and lifestyle. It's not exaggeration to described Khandeshi Cinema is known for its factual cinematic appearances, it is bringing the dead part of the society on the screen. Even then the societal norms depiction of love can be seen in the films as well. In *'Yeh Hai Malegaon Ka Superman'* (2009) movie by Nasir Sheikh, the hero is thin, worker and has aspirations to the social mobilization. He fallen in love with 'Trupti', in between he disappointed with lot of things, Superman wanted to leave the place but 'love' doesn't allow him to go, made love trap and supports him to vanished 'bad habits' of the society. These metaphors of love which stands for the rationality actually exist in the society. I must say commercial cinema never shows this type of metaphors of love, they only interested in to shows the farcical love stories.

As cinema enterprise the recognition of this industry is neglected as Khandesh region. By the textbook or other medium like electronic and print media, the perceptions regarding owning is always in hands of the upper class-caste lobby. According to Bharat Saindane who is filmmaker and choreographer "this lobbies always tries to encourage and give space to their beloved or their contacts, we also started this lobbies, might be this is wrong but we have to do this". The produced material in Khandesh, there is spaces for 'Love'. Movies like '*Dhudkya 420*', '*Bayko 420*', '*Teen Tighadya*' by B Kumar Jadugar (Patil) and '*Lagin Manha Dondyan*' by Subhash Kumbhar are female centric. Vanmala Bagul, Trupti Vyavahare and Pushpa Thakur are protagonists of these movies. All the plot of above movies is around the 'Love' and its positive effects on society. In '*Dhudkya 420*' protagonists is migrant laborer lives in Gujarat, he is against the rituals. Dhudkya fight with the feudal person Daulat who is greedy and exploits peoples. In between he fell in love with his daughter 'Hiri'. He thinks to teach him a lesson 'Hiri' can support him. She is also so much social conscious, she gives all the support to teach lesson to 'Daulat'. To abolish her father greediness 'there is someone' and Hiri called it Love'. In '*Lagin Manha Dondyan*' by B. Kumar Patil protagonist is dwarf and his love 'Shalu' who is mentally disabled girl. Everyone against their love but 'Dhondya' the protagonists fight and successfully make or do their love. In this movie the love is symbol to break the boundaries of a marriages. It is controversial movie in Khandesh. Dhondya (Paresh Bhat) in movie and real is 'Bahujan' and tries to convey the message that 'there is something wrong with this society need to be change'. These romantic representations of 'Dhondya', 'Dhudkya', 'Shalu' 'Hiri' on screen and off screen which burns as wholesome, eternal, spiritual and authentic such as livelihood and survival. Being a migrant laborer Dhudkya has to survive. Dondhya being a dwarf his eternal identity makes him to fight for livelihood.

All the varied idea of love in cinema is can be called as falls consciousness. As I said above the imitation of idea in cinema is platform where patriarchy dominates and 'cultural' considerations becomes more powerful. The men domain Hindi or Indian cinema never shows the real situation of the love and what are its depictions. '*Sholay*', '*Naseeb Apna Apna*', '*Jait Re Jait*', '*Raja Hindustani*' and what not, so many movies are the imaginary fantasies of the men domain

lobbies which nonetheless but Brahmanical and capitalist materialized sentiments. However, 'Lagin Manha Dondhyan', 'Dhudkya 420', 'Teen Tighdya Kaam Bighadya', 'Bayko 420' are tries to attempts the romantic love which is progressive in nature and tries to resist the men domain lobbies. Khandeshi Cinema's resistance is their lifestyle politics. One of the actresses Priyanka Kamble shares her experiences about how she fought with men domain industry. She says, "This system is very bad but we have to cross to this system and working. If they offer me a work which is in the industry and have to pay for that then I reject. I'm happy to doing in only Khandeshi Film Industry. My family is always happy to do work in the Khandesh Film Industry and also when I fulfilling their wishes it's also the good thing for me and them also." The Khandeshi Cinema is not completely transformed but the scenarios and the situation is change as nature of flow change.

When video song called 'Tumhi Karat Prem Sa, Amhi Karat Lafda' (your love is love, our love is lust) by Eshwar Mali comes, it has potential of entertainment and the realistic pain that consumed by the Khandeshi peoples. When society builds by the class and caste criterion methods it changes the equations also. Desires and objectives of Love change and their perception also changes with the above criteria. (Shiva, 2015) To conclude, I maintain that Khandeshi Cinema tries to attempt the wholesome, spiritual and practical love is trying to in the Khandeshi cinema.

Bibliography

Gordal, T. (2004). Love and desire in the cinema. *Society for cienma and media studies* .

Mishra, V. (2003). All You Want is Money, All You Need is Love: Sex and Romance in Modern India by Rachel Dwyer. *Asian Journal of Social Science* , 147-150.

Thorat, S. (2015). Khandeshi Cinema - Ek Nava Drishitkon. *Abhivyakti Media For Development* , 94-98.