

Bollywood versus Hollywood in the Globalization of Media: A History of Indian Films in Indonesia

Makoto KOIKE*

1 Indian Films and Globalization

This paper¹⁾ looks beyond the charm and humour of Indian films and examines their popularity in Indonesia in terms of the general problem of the globalization of media. The emphasis on globalization appears strange, inasmuch as Hollywood films and globalization has been the standard preoccupation, the world wide visibility of Hollywood films being the paradigm of American-dominated cultural imperialism. Yet, the global popularity of Bollywood films (Indian films) is a new topic challenging contemporary researchers and journalists²⁾. Against this background, there is a noticeable declining presence of Indian films in contemporary Indonesia — few new Indian films are nowadays screened. However, Indian films are on television every day and the series of an Indian film, *Kuch Kuch Hota Hai* is so popular that viewers can sing its theme song. From the 1950s to 1980s Indian films were very popular for Indonesian film-goers. The late 1950s was the heyday of Indian films; many film journalists were concerned about the ‘a flood of imported Indian films’ and wrote about the crisis of the national film. Reconstruction of the history of Indian films in Indonesia is essential to understand the complex processes of globalization.

The import of Indian films into Indonesia has targeted native Indonesians (*pribumi* in Indonesian) rather than ethnic Indians. In Indonesia, in contrast to Malaysia and Singapore, the ethnic Indians are less numerous and prominent in socio-economic status. Though reliable statistics of the ethnic composition in contemporary Indonesia are unavailable, the Indians are the third largest immigrant minority after the Chinese and the Arabs. According to colonial statistics (*Indisch verslag* 1941: 17-19), ‘Indians’ (*Voor-Indiërs*) were included in the category

*Faculty of Letters, Momoyama Gakuin University

1) The research from 1999 to 2000 was supported by a special grant (Tokutei Kojin Kenkyuhi) from Momoyama Gakuin University (St. Andrew’s University, Osaka, Japan) and the grand-in-aid for scientific research from the Japanese Ministry of Education, Science and Culture. Also, I am indebted to Tagayasu Naito (Tokai University, Japan) who shared his research data on Indian films. This article was written while I was an affiliated fellow of the International Institute for Asian Studies (IIAS), Leiden, the Netherlands. A draft of the present paper was given at the Brown bag seminar of the Department of Anthropology, University of Nijmegen (the Netherlands) on April 4, 2002, whose participants’ comments and questions were helpful.

2) See my paper “Indian Cinema and Globalization” (Koike 2001), which discusses the relationship between globalization and culture. Today there is an expanding field research on popular Indian films in Asia and Africa. An anthropologist, B. Larkin (1997) focuses on the popularity of Indian films in Nigeria.

‘Other Foreign Orientals’ (*andere vreemde oosterlingen*) and numbered only 30,018 in 1930³⁾.

Since the late 1980s globalization has been vigorously discussed in almost every scholarly discipline and from conflicting perspectives. I use the term globalization to refer to ‘the intensification of global interconnectedness’ which implies ‘a fundamental reordering of time and space’ (Inda and Rosaldo 2002: 5). Many authors discuss globalization in terms of four basic points: (1) a recent phenomena caused by information and communication technologies (ICTs), (2) a one-way flow from the West to the rest, (3) a chief tendency of homogenization, and (4) the polarization of the global and the national. These perspectives on globalization can be applied to the history of Indian films in Indonesia.

First, I reject the common belief that globalization is a recent phenomenon related to the development of computer and other technologies, and instead adopt the view that globalization began with the advent of modernity (Giddens 1990: 63-65), which was imposed by colonialism on most non-Western countries⁴⁾. To understand the popularity of Indian films in terms of globalization, it is essential to go back to the early twentieth century and the colonial situation in the Netherlands East Indies.

Second, while it is clear the world is dominated by Hollywood films, we should take more seriously the role of Indian films in non-Western countries. We have to pay attention to cultural flows not only between the West, the centre of world economy and the periphery, but also between peripheries (Larkin 1997: 408-409, Inda and Rosaldo 2002: 18-23). The Indian film is an excellent case of such flow of cultural products among non-Western countries.

Third, it is a cliché that globalization results in global uniformity. Concepts of Americanization includes cultural and economic imperialism, as evidenced in the universality of brands and products such as McDonalds, Coca-cola, Disney Land and Hollywood. My basic hypothesis argues against this view of globalization. I see globalization as instead entailing both homogenization and heterogenization. As discussed earlier, globalization involves more complex global flows of cultural forms. Their clash and struggle with local culture leads to processes of hybridisation or creolization⁵⁾. Through the process of nation-building in Indonesia, hybrid cultural products like films become part of ‘pure’ national culture, the uniqueness of which nationalists find essential.

Finally, it is clear that researchers often emphasize the polarization between globalization and nation-states. Some political scientists consider processes of globalization result in the weakening of nation-states, the escalation of ethnic conflict and the fragmentation of multi-ethnic nation-states. The relationship between globalization and nationalism is a fundamental

3) The total population of the Netherlands East Indies in 1930 was 60,682,880. In addition to 59,138,067 ‘Natives’, there were 1,190,014 ‘Chinese’, 240,162 ‘European’ (including Eurasians and Japanese), and 114,637 ‘Other Foreign Orientals’ including 71,335 ‘Arabs’ (Indisch verslag 1941: 17-19).

4) In discussing the popularity of Indian films in Nigeria, Larkin uses the concept of ‘parallel modernities’ which refers to ‘the coexistence in space and time of multiple economic, religious and cultural flows that are often subsumed within the term “modernity”’ (Larkin 1997: 407). I contend ‘parallel modernities’ have been conditioned by the overall presence of Western ‘modernity’.

5) At the workshop, “Globalisation and Creolisation in World History” held at Erasmus University Rotterdam on March 21 to 22, 2002, the presentations and discussions reinforced my research agenda. My thanks go to the convenors, Alex van Stipriaan L. and Henk Schulte Nordholt, and other participants.

question to be discussed. In the 1950s there were nationalistic discourses against imported American and Asian films. However, we do not have to overemphasize the contrast of the global and national. In the history of imported Indian films of the 1950s and 1960s, we find both opposition and a kind of collaboration between the global and the national. As discussed above, the nation-state itself is an outcome of the prior process of globalization.

I discuss these points concretely by focusing on the history of Indian films from the 1930s to the 1960s in the next three chapters.

2 Indian films in the Netherlands East Indies

After the first public demonstration of the motion picture invented by the brothers Lumière in 1895, it rapidly spread over the world and attracted many peoples from heterogeneous backgrounds. The latest high technology at the time had a vast global impact around the turn of the century. The Netherlands East Indies did not lag behind other countries in the early history of world cinema. In Batavia, the motion picture, then called *gambar idoeop* (animated picture), was seen publicly for the first time in 1900 (Jauhari (ed.) 1992: 3-5). American films were screened in the first decade of the twentieth century. In 1926 the first film, *Loentoeng Kasaroeng* (Mad monkey) based on a Sundanese folk tale was made by two Europeans in Bandung (Said 1982: 5-6), and in 1931 the first talkie, *Boenga Roos dari Tjikembang* (Rose from Cikembang) was produced by The Teng Choen, a Chinese born in Jakarta (Ibid.: 147, Kristanto 1995: 2-3)⁶.

Chinese dominated the film business in the Indies. Commercial films were made by Chinese producers and most cinemas were owned by Chinese (Sen 1994: 14-15). As in the present Indonesian cinema, the popularity of imported films was striking in the Indies. In the 1930s the share of American films was above 60 per cent (*Encyclopaedia van Nederlandsch-Indië* 1939: 122-123). In 1929, a film magazine *Doenia Film* began in Batavia which carried Malay articles mainly about American films. Today some Indonesians criticize the influence of Hollywood, a symbol of globalization under the US hegemony. In the 1920s almost identical criticism was uttered from the viewpoint of colonial policy. Dutch officials were deeply concerned about the negative influence of American and European films. An article in *The Times* (1926) by the British colonial officer Bell attracted their attention⁷.

But to the vast mass of black, brown, and yellow people the inner life of European, and especially that side of it which flourishes in the centres of crime and infamy, was unknown until the American films showed them a travesty of it.....

By the unsophisticated Malay, Javanese, or even the Indian and the Chinese, the scenes of crime and depravity which are thrown on the screen are accepted as faithful representa-

6) In British India the film industry started earlier than in the Indies. The first story film, "Raja Harishchandra", was made by Dadasaheb Phalke in 1913 (Ramachandran (ed.) 1985: 19, 633).

7) The extract from the article was incorporated in the author's *Foreign Colonial Administration in the Far East* (Bell 1928: 120-121). The Dutch translation of the quote was cited in the description of "filmbedrijf" in *Encyclopaedia van Nederlandsch-Indië* (1939: 123) along with similar view by a French scholar (1939: 123). Also, one writer in the Dutch film magazine of *Filmland* (December 1926) quoted the article of *The Times* (Sen 1994: 14).

tion of the ordinary life of the white in his own country (Bell 1928: 121).

They were afraid that when naïve natives were exposed to the scenes of criminality, violence, and sensual love scenes they would negatively stereotype the Dutch men and women.

In the 1930s, Indian films were less popular than in the 1950s and 1960s. Films imported from the British India had a very small share (only 1.1% in 1932) in the Indies film market (*Encyclopaedia van Nederlandsch-Indië* 1939: 123). Where were Indian films first screened when American and European films dominated most cinemas in the Indies? In 1935 an Indian film business was established in Surabaya, the major colonial city in East Java by two Muslim brothers, Haji Sulaiman Latief and Abdullah. Together with their friend, H. Khambatty founded two companies, Latief Film Distributors and Feroz Film Exchange and started to import films from India and Egypt⁸⁾. The brothers were Muslim Indians from Cutch in western India, one of the main native lands of Indian migrants across South East Asia. They had a cinema, Feroz Cinema⁹⁾ in the east of the Arabian quarter¹⁰⁾. Egyptian and Indian films were shown in their cinema, whose architecture reflected Indian and Arabian style. One of the first Indian films screened in Surabaya was *Anarkali* (directed by Rama Shankar Choudhury, 1928), which depicted a romance in which Prince of Mughal falls in love with the common Anarkali (Rajadhyaksha and Willemen 1999: 329). Like Indian films, Egyptian films were also popular, especially those with songs sung by the legendary Egyptian singer, Abdul Wahab.

In the colonial period, Surabaya was a globalize theatre city where inhabitants from multi-ethnic backgrounds enjoyed multiple kinds of entertainment from diverse regions. There were in Surabaya approximately 374,000 people (294,000 'Natives', 44,000 'Chinese', 30,000 'Europeans', and 6,000 'Other Foreign Orientals' including Arabs and Indians in 1938) (Het Centraal Kantoor voor de Statistiek 1941: 2). As early as in the 1880s there were circuses with Japanese acrobatic troupes and European magic shows, Wild West shows and the *Komedie Stamboel* for mixed inhabitants (cf. Matthew 2001: 325-327). We have to consider the popularity of the Indian and Egyptian films in the context of this diversified urban culture brought about by the initial phase of globalization.

3 The widespread popularity of Indian Films in the 1950s

Since the independence of Indonesia in 1945, film was expected to play an important role in the formation of national culture. Under Sukarno the Indonesian cinema was overtly intertwined with outspoken nationalism. Usmar Ismail, admired as 'the father of Indonesian cinema', established PERFINI, Perusahaan Film Nasional (National Film Company) in 1950, and produced *Darah dan Doa* (Blood and prayer) (its English title was *The Long March*) (1950) and

8) The early history of Indian film in Surabaya draws heavily on A. Rahim Latief's unpublished paper (1991) and an interview with the author (6 September 2000). He is a son of Haji Sulaiman Latief and himself an importer and distributor of films.

9) This cinema was once called Alhambra Theatre (Latief 1991: 1).

10) There were nineteen cinemas in Surabaya in 1938 (Het Centraal Kantoor voor de Statistiek 1941: 19). Two cinemas, the City and the Flora were located near the *Alun-alun*, the central square (Anon. 1941). In the same year Batavia had nineteen cinemas, Bandung nine and Semarang five (Het Centraal Kantoor voor de Statistiek 1941: 19).

Table 1 The share of censored films by their land of origin (%) (1950-1961)

	Total	Indonesia	Malaya	India	China	Japan	USA	Europe	Others
1950	3723	12.6	0.2	1.5	3.0	...	56.2	24.4	2.1
1951	4026	11.5	0.6	1.7	7.9	...	59.2	15.6	3.5
1952	4430	13.4	1.4	1.3	7.1	...	58.0	14.6	4.3
1953	3243	4.7	2.3	1.7	6.3	...	65.7	14.9	4.4
1954	2708	6.6	1.7	5.5	3.9	...	51.4	22.8	8.0
1955	2864	6.1	1.1	10.9	4.1	...	52.4	19.7	5.7
1956	3263	8.2	0.8	5.5	4.1	...	57.7	16.9	6.9
1957	2323	6.5	1.4	5.3	6.2	0.6	54.4	15.2	10.5
1958	2118	6.2	2.3	6.1	7.6	1.7	55.0	17.3	3.8
1959	2470	7.8	2.1	4.9	9.4	4.1	44.2	21.6	6.1
1960	2243	10.2	1.7	5.3	4.8	5.6	45.6	20.5	6.4
1961	2170	8.8	1.6	4.1	4.8	5.7	47.3	20.1	7.9

Source : *Statistical Pocket Book of Indonesia* 1957, 1962.

“Europe” includes UK, the Netherlands, USSR, Italy, France and Germany and “Others” includes Canada, Egypt and the Philippines.

Lewat Djam Malam (After Curfew) (1954). Both of these masterpieces depicted the revolutionary war against the Dutch. The nationalist politicians and journalists were always anxious about the Indonesian cinema and protested against a large number of imported films. Indonesian films in the 1950s and 1960s were less popular than imported American and Asian films. Table 1 shows that American films had a far bigger market share than others. While American films were screened in the most expensive cinemas in urban centres, Indonesian films always competed with films imported from Malaya, the Philippines and India in the second and third ranking cinemas catering for the less wealthy people.

In the early 1950s the Indonesian film industry expanded rapidly (8 films in 1949, 40 in 1951, and 65 in 1955) (Kristanto 1995: 12-45)¹¹⁾ At the same time Indonesian cinema was under threat from Malay films. Films imported from Malaya were very popular among the Indonesian audience at the period. P. Ramlee, who was a director, actor, singer and composer, became a well known film star in both Malaya and Indonesia. Because there was no linguistic obstacle, his Malay films without Indonesian subtitles were enjoyed by audience, many of whom could not read Indonesian. *Juwita* (The Beauty) (directed by S. Ramanathan¹²⁾, 1952) starring P. Ramlee and Kasma Booty was a hit in Indonesia. It is striking that these Malay films used many scenes of dance and song like mainstream Indian films. It was one of the main reasons why the Malay films were so popular among the Indonesian audience. Their stories, most of which are

11) I count the titles of films in the Film Catalogue by Kristanto (1995). The numbers indicated by Sen (1994) were smaller than in my count.

12) Ramanathan was a Tamil born in 1919 in Kuala Lumpur. *Juwita* was a globalized film made by Chinese producers, the Shaw Brothers and a Indian director, Ramanathan, and played by Malay actors.

romances and adventures, were simple and easily understood.

The popular magazine of *Aneka*¹³⁾ repeatedly focused on the threat of Malay films in 1952. An article titled “*Film Malaya di Indonesia dan Masyarakat dipinggir Djalan* (Malay films in Indonesia and communities in the periphery)” (*Aneka* 3-23, 1952) claimed the government should ban the import of Malay films to protect Indonesian film industry. Also, an article, “*Film Indonesia dalam Bahaya* (Indonesian film under threat)” (*Aneka* 3-26, 1952) argued Indonesia films should be promoted by being screened in the first-class cinemas.

The popularity of Malay films declined in the mid 1950s as Indian films replaced them. The number of imported Indian films increased rapidly from 7 in 1952, to 74 in 1954, and 184 in 1955 (Sen 1994: 27). Table 1 shows the number of censored films. The percentage of Indian films, which rose in 1954 and 1955, continued to be approximately 5% in the late 1950s. Because importers submitted only part of their stock films to the censors, the table fails to make evident the changing ratio of imported films. The cheapest cinemas were dominated by Indian films. Although the absolute number of Indonesian films exceeded the Indian imports, the later achieved a greater audience share than Indonesian films. Among the 450 million total viewers from 1952 to 1960, viewers of Indonesian films were merely 45 million (10%) while those of American and British films were 270 million (60%) and those of Indian, Malay and Japanese films 135 million (30%) (Jauhari (ed.) 1992: 71).

Some Indian films viewed in the first-class cinemas were very appealing to Indonesians from diverse backgrounds. *Aan* (directed by Mehboob Khan, 1952) was the first Indian film which had wide acclaim in Indonesia¹⁴⁾. It was followed by *Dil-e-Nadaan* (directed by Abdul Rashid Kardar, 1955) which ran for 55 days at Astria Cinema in Jakarta and overtook the box office record of an American rock'n roll film *Rock around the Clock* (Latief 1991: 3). This film also did well in Pontianak (Kusuma 1955). Another hit Indian film in the late 1950s, *Sujata* (directed by Bimal Roy, 1959) was even screened in Menteng, Jakarta's most expensive cinema, and broke the box office record of a famous American film *The Bridge over the River Kwai* (Latief 1991: 4). *Sujata* is a 'classic reformist melodrama' with a 'untouchable' heroine (Rajadhyaksha and Willemsen 1999: 361). Along with this 'reformist' film, films made by the famous Indian director, Raj Kapoor¹⁵⁾, like *Awara* (The Vagabond) (1951), *Boot Polish* (1954) and *Shree* 420 (Swindler) (1955) were box office successes. Raj Kapoor and the actress Nargis became top film stars for Indonesian film-goers. Their popularity soon spread to the Middle East and the Soviet Union (Bhatt 1985: 132, Katz 1994: 172)¹⁶⁾.

These films which portrayed social problems like corruption and poverty are exceptional among a large number of imported Indian films, most of which are various feature films rang-

13) *Aneka* (Variety) began in 1950 as an Indonesian bimonthly magazine featuring sports and cinema, but reduced its coverage to sports in October 1960.

14) *Aan* was the first multi-colour film produced in India (Rajadhyaksha and Willemsen 1999: 324-325)

15) 'Raj Kapoor has created a special niche for himself in commercial Hindi Cinema as the showman with a social conscience.' (Bhatt 1985: 127)

16) '(in 1954) Raj Kapoor's "Awara" swept through Iran, Iraq, Syria, Egypt, Turkey, and the Soviet Union like an uncontrollable brush fire. Raj Kapoor and Nargis became virtual folk heroes; the film's songs were translated into a dozen different languages and were sung on the streets of cities and small towns thousands of miles away from India.' (Bhatt 1985: 132)

ing from mythological stories to urban romance stories. These simplistic melodramas sprinkled with dance and songs were key factors to the popularity of Indian films, including Raj Kapoor's classics. These dominant characteristics of Indian feature films are evident as well today. Because Indian films were screened with Indonesian subtitles, it was difficult for illiterate audiences to follow their stories. Generally, however, they could follow their conventional plots with the conflict between the hero and villain, good and evil, and rich and poor. In an article on Indian film, the author wrote '*Film India sangat digemari dan laku sebagai pisang goreng, sedang Film Indonesia kurang mendapat perhatian!*' (Indian Films are very popular as fried banana while Indonesian films attract less attention!) (Kusuma 1955: 8). This phrase compares mass appeal of Indian films to the most loved Indonesian sweet.

Along with plot, film songs are a crucial factor in mainstream Indian cinema (cf. Chandavarkar 1985: 244-245). Songs used in the hit films were very popular in Indonesia and on the air in some radio stations in Jakarta (*Aneka* 6-30, 1955). They influenced Indonesian popular music and contributed to the birth of *dangdut*, a music genre with wide appeal across Indonesia¹⁷. It is a hybrid of Malay music, Indian film song and American rock. In the early 1960s an Indonesian remake of the hit Indian film song, *Boneka dari India* (a doll from India) was performed by Ellya Agus to the accompaniment of Orkes Kelana Ria and became highly popular. This song is considered as one prototype of the contemporary *dangdut* music.

4 The Campaign against Imported Films: the Global and the National

The huge popularity of Indian films provoked a nationalistic, often enthusiastic, response. In the journal of *Aneka* (6-19, 1955) appeared the first article¹⁸ that demanded the government should restrict the import of Indian films. In the same year, *Aneka* published "*Demi Perkembangan Usaha Film Nasional, Stop Film India* (Stop Indian films for the development of the national film)" (*Aneka* 6-30, 1955). The author insisted Indian films made the importers wealthier as well as damaged Indonesians' educational experience. PPFi, Persatuan Produser Film Indonesia (Indonesian Film Producers' Union), established under the leadership of Usmar Ismail and Djamaluddin Malik¹⁹, proposed restricting Indian films in 1956 (Sen 1994: 30-31). The government accepted the PPFi's proposal to impose an annual quota of 30 films from India the following year.

The main target of nationalist producers was Indian rather than American films. Sen explained why they did not argue against American film imports despite the fact they were more numerous than Indian films (See Table 1). 'The PPFi argued that American films drew audiences mainly from the educated urban elite who did not want to see Indonesian films anyway, whereas Indian films, which appealed to the lower classes, took prospective viewers away from Indonesian productions.' (Sen 1994: 30) However, anti-American movement was also striking from 1956 to 1965. These opposing campaigns reflected the ideological opposition between left-

17) '*dangdut* comprises over a third of the domestic market for musical recordings. Many television hours, whole feature films and radio stations have been dedicated to *dangdut*.' (Sen and Hill 2000: 174).

18) The author labelled the expansion of imported Indian films as 'Bandjir film India (The flood of Indian films)'. This metaphor had been often used by the journalists against Indian films.

19) Jamaluddin Malik was a key pioneer of Indonesian cinema, along with Usmar Ismail. He set up the film company Persari which produced many films in the 1950s.

wing film-workers organization, SARBUFIS and the producers' organization, PPF²⁰⁾ (Sen 1994: 29-31). These conflicts in the film industry are understood in the context of keen political tension in Indonesian politics which climaxed in 1965 the coup led by Colonel Untung²¹⁾ happened.

Contrary to the producers movement, SARBUFIS's main target was American films and argued for import of films from India and other non-aligned Third World countries (*negara-negara A. A.*). At a symposium on film held in 1957²²⁾, the secretary of SARBUFIS, Tann Sing Hwat argued for Indian film import, claiming India was 'a comrade in the revolution of the Indonesian nation' (*kawan seperjuangan bangsa Indonesia*) while he protested against imported American films which dominated 60 per cent of the Indonesian film market (Persatuan Pers Film Indonesia 1957: 75, 78). In the early 1960s anti-American sentiment heated up and was widely supported by many sectors in the film industry although it was initiated by SARBUFIS. In 1964 PARFIAS²³⁾ (Council of Action for the Boycott of Imperialist American Films) was formed, demanding a total ban on American films. As the name suggests, the boycott of American films was used as a key symbol of the critique of American cultural imperialism. Its main target was AMPAI (American Motion Pictures Association in Indonesia) which controlled the import of American films. Within months of its formation, the government accepted the proposal and instructed AMPAI to cease operations. However, the anti-American policy was overturned soon after Suharto came to power, and American films dominated the Indonesian market again (Sen 1994: 32-36, 49).

The global flow of cultural products across the national borders, whether from America or India, triggers nationalistic reactions. Movements against import of films are one typical reaction. However, the polarization between the global and the national does not always apply to the complex relationship between the import of foreign films and the national film makers. The collaboration as well as opposition between the global and the national is revealed if we observe the ambivalent attitude towards Indian films taken by two nationalist producers, Usmar Ismail and Jamaluddin Malik. Whereas PERFINI (Perusahaan Film Nasional) established by Usmar Ismail produced Indonesian films, at the same time it imported Indian films

20) SARBUFIS, Sarekat Buruh dan Senidrama (Indonesian Film and Stage Workers' Union) was a member of SOBSI, Sentral Organisasi Buruh Seluruh Indonesia (All-Indonesia Federation of Labour Organizations) linked to the PKI, Partai Komunis Indonesia (Indonesian Communist Party). SARBUFIS had a close relationship with LEKRA, Lembaga Kebudayaan Rakyat (Institute of People's Culture) that also was linked to the PKI. The leaders of PPF, Usmar Ismail and Jamaluddin Malik were also core members of LESBUMI, Lembaga Senibudaya Muslimin Indonesia (Indonesian Institute of Islamic Culture). It was founded in 1962 by the Muslim party, NU (Nahdatul Ulama) (Sen 1994: 29-31).

21) The attempted coup was immediately crushed by General Suharto, resulting in the fall of Sukarno, destruction of the PKI and associated organizations, and the rise of Suharto's New Order.

22) The symposium Film Artists and Political Parties (Artisfilm dan Partai Politik) was organized by the Indonesian Movie Press Association (PERPEFI, Persatuan Pers Film Indonesia). Producers' organization, PPF was one of the financial contributors despite the fact that its political opponent, SARBUFIS was a main participant.

23) PARFIAS (Panitia Aksi Pemboikotan Film Imperialis Amerika Serikat) was made up of 16 organizations including both the ones linked to the PKI and those such as Cinema Owners' Organization (OPS Bioskop) and the Union of National Importers and Distributors (PIDFIN) which were not related to the PKI (Sen 1994: 33).

including *Sujata* and *Awara* which were box-office hits (Latief 1991: 4). Jamaluddin Malik also imported Indian films. While they proposed restricting Indian films, Usmar Ismail and Jamaluddin Malik profited in importing Indian films, thus offsetting frequent losses from producing national films (Sen 1994: 31). Jamaluddin Malik's involvement with Indian films was not restricted to the film import. He invited a director and staff from India and copied an Indian film in 1956. This film, *Djandjiku* (My promise) is considered an 'Indian film' despite its Indonesian actors and was a box office hit by Indonesian standards (Said 1982: 11, 42, Kristanto 1995: 46). Regarding his hybrid film, he said, 'If audiences want Indian films, we make them until they get bored (Kalau penonton mau yang India, kita kasih India, biar sampai mereka bosan)' (Said 1982: 42)

5 Conclusion

What does our early history of Indonesia cinema focusing on imported Indian films from the 1930s to 1960s reveal about the complicated nature of globalization? There are four prominent points:

First, the rapid spread of cinema as a cultural form of expression and entertainment documents the process of early globalization which paralleled the growth of modernity and colonization in the non-Western world. The technology of film was invented in 1895 in France and rapidly spread to British India and the Netherlands East Indies. Cinema had developed as a hybrid and creole cultural industry in the Indies, as in other colonies. Europeans produced a film based on a local Sundanese folktale, and 'natives' watched Hollywood films in cinemas owned by Chinese business men.

Second, distribution of Indian film is a early global flow of cultural products between non-Western countries. In the 1930s the Indies imported films not only from the West but also from China, Egypt and British India though their share was significantly smaller than that of American and European films. Four decades after the invention of film in Paris, the import of Indian films began in the Indies.

Third, while early globalization led to Westernization, it also contributed to the formation of national culture whose unique character nationalist Indonesians upheld. In the 1950s both the government and intellectuals paid special attention to film, which had long been a highly global and hybrid popular culture. In the age of nationalism, film was understood as an indispensable element of a national culture the new-born nation-state was wise to encourage. Pioneers of Indonesian cinema like Usmar Ismail sought to 'nationalize' film in terms of production and expression. Though influenced mainly by American film and somewhat by Indian film, they produced films in pursuit of their own national culture.

Fourth, I consider the relationship between the global and the national. The national films were nearly pushed out by the 'nation-wide' popularity of imported films in the late 1950s. Naturally, among the people working in the film industry there was concern that the Indonesian film industry was threatened by a flood of imports. Indian films was a target of nationalist film producers led by Usmar Ismail and Djamaruddin Malik who were deeply involved in the import of Indian films. There existed an ambivalent collaboration between the growth of the global flow of film and vocal nationalists against the import of film.

Finally, let me mention briefly current popular culture. Most of hit TV dramas (*sinetron*) are produced by two ethnic Indian producers, Raam Punjabi and Gope Samtani who imported films in the 1960s. But, when associations controlled by the Suharto government dominated the import and distribution of foreign films, they were forced to cease their normal business. They then began to produce Indonesian mainstream films, some of which were the box-office successes. When private TV channels began to broadcast in the early 1990s, the film industry suffered and they started the production of TV *sinetron* for the new private channels. The *sinetron* serials produced by Raam Punjabi have won the broad national popularity and he is labelled 'the king of *sinetron* (*raja sinetron*)'. The perspective of globalization I favour in this paper is particularly relevant to any discussion of the *sinetron*. Its nation-wide popularity is closely related to the global and hybrid character of the production.

Bibliography

- Anon., 1935, *Alphabetisch lexicographische naamlijst der wegen, straten, pleinen, kampongs, scholen, kerken, passers en openbare gebouwen in de gemeente Soerabaia 1935*, Soerabaia: H. van Ingen.
- Anon., 1941, *Telefoongids Soerabaja*, Weltevreden: Kolff.
- Bell, Hesketh, 1928, *Foreign Colonial Administration in the Far East*, London: Edward Arnold.
- Bhatt, Punita, 1985, The Cinema of Raj Kapoor, in Ramachandran, T. M. (ed.), 1985.
- Biro Pusat Statistik, 1957, *Statistical Pocket Book of Indonesia 1957*, Jakarta: Biro Pusat Statistik.
- Biro Pusat Statistik, 1962, *Statistical Pocket Book of Indonesia 1962*, Jakarta: Biro Pusat Statistik.
- Het Centraal Kantoor voor de Statistiek, 1941, *Enkele statistische gegevens over 4 stads-gemeenten op Java*, Batavia: Het Centraal Kantoor voor de Statistiek.
- Chandavarkar, Bhaskar, 1985, Indian Film Song, in Ramachandran, T. M. (ed.), 1985.
- Cohen, Matthew Isaac, 2001, On the Origin of the Komedi Stamboel: Popular Culture, Colonial Society, and the Parsi Theatre Movement, *Bijd.* 157-2: 313-357.
- 1939, *Encyclopaedia van Nederlandsch-Indië: Supplement (tweede druk)*, 's-Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Faber, G. H. von, 1934, *Nieuw Soerabaia: De geschiedenis van Indië's voornaamste koopstad in de eerste kwarteeuw sedert hare instelling 1906-1931*, Soerabaia: H. van Ingen.
- Gidens, A., 1990, *The Consequences of Modernity*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Inda, Jonathan Xavier & Rosaldo, Renato (eds.), *The Anthropology of Media: A Reader*, Malden: Blackwell.
- Indisch verslag 1941: II Statistisch jaaroverzicht van Nederlandsch-Indië over het jaar 1940*, Batavia: Landsdrukkerij.
- Jauhari, Haris (ed.), 1992, *Layar Perak: 90 Tahun Bioskop di Indonesia*, Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Katz, Ephraim, 1994, *The Film Encyclopedia (2nd Ed.)*, New York: Harper Perennial.
- Koike, Makoto, 2001, Indian Cinema and Globalization (in Japanese), *Momoyama Gakuin Daigaku Sogokenkyujo Kiyō* 27-1.
- Kusuma, R. A., 1955, Film India Pegang Peranan, *Kentjana* 3-9: 8-9.
- Kristanto, JB, 1995, *Katalog Film Indonesia 1926-1995*, Jakarta: Grafisari Mukti.
- Latief, Rahim, 1991, The History of Indian Films in Indonesia, Unpublished Paper.
- Larkin, Brian, 1997, Indian Films and Nigerian Lovers: Media and the Creation of Parallel Modernities, *Africa* 67-3: 406-440.
- Persatuan Pers Film Indonesia, 1957, *Artisfilm dan Partai Politik: Hasil Symposion Film Pertama dari Persatuan Pers Film Indonesia (PERPEFI)*, Djakarta: Persatuan Pers Film Indonesia.
- Rajadhyaksha, Ashish and Willemsen, Paul, 1999, *Encyclopaedia of Indian Cinema: New Revised Edition*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Ramachandran, T. M. (ed.), 1985, *70 Years of Indian Cinema (1913-1983)*, Bombay: CINEMA India-International Publication.
- Said, Salim, 1982, *Profil Dunia Film Indonesia*, Jakarta: Grafitipers.

- Sen, Krishna, 1985, Hidden from History: Aspects of Indonesian Cinema 1955-65, *Review of Indonesian and Malaysian Affairs* 19-2: 1-55.
- Sen, Krishna, 1994, *Indonesian Cinema: Framing the New Order*, London: Zed Books.
- Sen, Krishna and Hill, David T., 2000, *Media, Culture and Politics in Indonesia*, Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Usmar Ismail, H., 1983, *Usmar Ismail Mengupas Film*, Jakarta: Sinar Harapan.

Journal

Aneka

Bollywood versus Hollywood in the Globalization of Media: A History of Indian Films in Indonesia

Makoto KOIKE

The goal of this paper is to explain the popularity of Indian films in Indonesia in terms of globalization of media. Focusing on a history of Indian films from the 1930s to the 1960s, I point to four connected issues. First, the rapid spread of film is a typical example of the process of early globalization which operated in tandem with modernity and colonization in the non-Western world. Second, the distribution of Indian film represents a key early flow of cultural products between the non-Western countries. Third, the early flow of such cultural products had a dynamic impact on the development of Indonesian national culture. Though cinema had been a highly global and hybrid popular culture, pioneers of Indonesian cinema sought to 'nationalize' films both in terms of production and expression. Fourth, there was an ambivalent collaboration between the global flow of film and the nationalists against the import of film. The national films were very nearly pushed out by the 'nation-wide' popularity of imported films in the late 1950s. Though nationalist producers Usmar Ismail and Djamaruddin Malik proposed restricting imported Indian films, they were themselves deeply involved in the import of films.