Bombay Talkies, Franz Osten and Varying Discourses in the Early Indian Cinema

Bombay Talkies, Franz Osten and Varying Discourses in the Early Indian Cinema

By

Anil Sonawane

Dedicated to

Aniket Jaaware | Urmila Bhirdikar

CONTENTS

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Films

LA	Light of Asia
ATOD	A Throw of Dice
AK	Achhut Kanya
JB	Janmabhoomi

Books

Cinema 1	Cinema 1: The Movement-Image
Cinema 2	Cinema 2: The Time-Image
ICC	Indian Cinematograph Committee
ICCR	Indian Cinematograph Committee Report
ICCE	Indian Cinematograph Committee Evidence
ICYB	Indian Cinematograph Year Book 1938

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

INTRODUCTION

In an interview given to The Indian Cinematograph Committee members on February 25, 1928, Himansu Rai's answer to the question of the lack of capital in India and how he managed the international collaboration, reveals the way he managed to make the three silent films. The conversation between one of the committee members and Himansu Rai goes as follows:

Q. You have already explained that there is lack of Indian capital for the industry, have you recruited your staff here?

A. Yes

Q. You mean the 'acting' staff?

A. Yes.

Q. Have you recruited all your people?

A. We recruit as we go along.

Q. You are experiencing the same difficulty in finding women particularly?

A. Yes.

Q. What about the technical staff, where do they come from, for instance, the Directors?

A. The Director is German, one of the cameramen is an Englishman, another cameraman is a German and there is an Assistant Director who is British.

Q. But then in directing Indian plays don't you think that association of some Indian Directors is necessary?

A. I have taken upon myself that task.

Q. You will be advising off and on?

A. I am advising right through. The scenario has been developed according to my advice, the costumes and the mode of acting all these are done according to my advice.

Q. Then what room is there for the non-Indian experts to direct?

A. The non-Indians direct only the technical part of it.

Q. And what is it?

A. It is a thing which needs about 25 years' experience. Then only can you call a man a director. (*ICCE Vol. iii* 1006-07)

This book is a result of the desire to know more about the contribution of Himansu Rai and Franz Osten's collaborative work to Indian cinema. There was an uncertainty about the availability of material on Himansu Rai, Franz Osten and Bombay Talkies studio. However, National Film Archives of India houses the important archival material regarding early Indian cinema. National Film Archives of India published a monograph on Himansu Rai, *Visions of Splendour: Himansu Rai and Indian Cinema* in 2009. Indranil Bhattacharya has given some facts about Himansu Rai's Indo-German and Indo-British collaborations for silent cinema and the formation of Bombay Talkies. It was a good starting point for this research but this book is mostly informative and not much analysis goes into it. The other important book related to Franz Osten and Himansu Rai that I could locate was Gerhard Koch's *Franz Osten's Indian Silent Films,* published in 1983 by Max Muller Bhavan. Amrit Gangar's book *Franz Osten and the Bombay Talkies: A Journey from Munich to Malad* is published by Max Muller Bhavan in 2001. With these basic books the information on the three silent films *Light of Asia*, *Shiraz* and *A Throw of Dice* and the talkies made for Bombay Talkies studio became available. Gerhard Koch's book contains excerpts of German newspaper articles on the silent films, which was useful to find out how these silent films were received in Germany. Over a period of time new information kept on emerging. In fact, the study of early Indian cinema is filled with the possibility of, if not absent, incomplete objects of study. For example, out of the sixteen talkies directed by Franz Osten between 1935 to 1939, six films; *Mamta* (1936), *Miya Biwi* (1936), *Prem Kahani* (1937), *Savitri* (1937), *Bhabhi* (1938), *Navjeevan* (1939) were not available for viewing in the National Film Archives of India, Pune. From the available film prints some of the reels were missing. For example, from the film *Vachan* (1938), reel eight and reel thirteen are missing. From the film *Jeevan Prabhat* (1937), reel six is missing. From *Jawani ki Hawa* (1935), reel ten and reel fourteen are

missing. Since the digitization of the film journals from the 1930s was taken up, for a certain amount of time, not all the journals in the archives were available for referencing.

A closer look at the recent works on the historiography of early Indian cinema reveals their concern with the unavailability of films and print material like film journals. The most refererenced book for any historical work on cinema in India, is probably *Encyclopedia of Indian Cinema* (1994), edited by Ashish Rajadhyaksha and Paul Willemen. Suresh Chabria's book *Light of Asia: Indian Silent Cinema* (1994) is also considered to be a pioneering work in the field of cinema history. In the foreword to the second edition of his book, Surech Chabria notes that after the first publication of his book,

> In the years that followed many scholars working on their dissertations in the National Film Archive of India (NFAI)'s library in Pune remarked that Light of Asia-along with Ashish Rajadhyaksha and Paul Willemen's Encyclopedia of Indian Cinema…provided a starting point for a new phase in the writing of the history of Indian cinema. (foreword)

But the point of unavailability of the material remains a concern. Neepa Majumdar, for example, states:

> In analysing early Indian cinema, one senses overwhelmingly an absent object of study. While this situation is endemic to early cinema studies in many countries, it raises important questions regarding historiographic method. Those of us who work on early Indian cinema, both silent and early sound, tend to envy our colleagues working in other national spaces who can draw on what seems to us like a wealth of surviving materials. At the same time, we are compelled to be more speculative in our assertions, given that the complexity of grounded realities anchored in material cultures becomes skewed by the accidental resurfacing of this or that piece of material or textual 'evidence.' In areas of research where primary materials are no longer available in their obvious sites (such as films and film magazines), the accidental takes on a new importance in historiographical method-not only the accidentally surviving film text, but also the accidental find of the researcher. (*Wanted Cultured Ladies Only!* 2)

Thus, arguments regarding the discourse around cinema in the 1920s and the 1930s tend to be speculative. Debashree Mukherjee's essays on the early talkie cinema and Kaushik Bhaumik's unpublished post-doctoral thesis *The Emergence of the Bombay Film Industry, 1913-1936* adopt the same approach mentioned above. However, both Debashree Mukherjee and Kaushik Bhaumik's contribution to the academic discourse of early

Indian cinema is important. The historical details and analysis in their writing bring out some important aspects of early Indian film culture.

For this study, the material collected from film magazines and other sources never seemed complete and uniform. Mere reading about the silent films and the talkies produced by Bombay Talkies studio, from whatever available material, was not enough to get a substantial idea about the operations of these films in the early Indian cinema history. This realisation resulted in adopting the relational mode of thought, to be able to state something concrete about these films.

The *Indian Cinematograph Committee Report* (henceforth ICCR) and the *Indian Cinematograph Committee Evidence* (henceforth ICCE) volumes were studied to find out how *Light of Asia*, *Shiraz* and *Throw of Dice* were received and talked about in these documents. These documents contain some information on *Light of Asia* and a mere mention of *Shiraz*. Nonetheless reading these documents laid open the field of early Indian silent cinema. The written statements and the oral evidences confirmed that there was a definite divide amongst the audience of early Indian cinema. The views recorded in these documents are of people from educated strata of India in the 1920s. Their answers and views are guided by the questionnaire provided by the ICC. So, the view of the early Indian film culture appears to be one sided. The audience was divided on the basis of literacy (accumulation of cultural capital) which in result allows the interviewees to claim that the lower class, illiterate audience preferred to watch genres like mythology, Western adventure, Western comedy and crime thrillers. The socials were not preferred by the lower-class audience who are addressed as 'mill hand' and 'illiterate' by the interviewees. The cinema halls too are divided according to the audience they cater to. Most of the exhibitors catered to the Europeans and the elite Indians living in upmarket areas like Churchgate in Bombay. These theatres mostly exhibited imported films. Films produced in India were exhibited, for example, in Bombay, only in areas like Dadar and Parel, which were mostly inhabited by mill workers. Some interviewees did not acknowledge Himansu Rai's collaborative efforts objecting to the involvement of the foreign technicians. In the same way, reading film journals published in the 1930s brought to light the advertising strategies used by Bombay Talkies studio and other studios like Prabhat and New Theatres. It was also observed that film critics like K.A. Abbas and Baburao Patel played an important role in forming the taste of the audience. Their articles in the film journals indicate how both the critics emphasised the need to produce more films dealing with social issues. The audience wrote letters to the

editors recording their observations on the films and activities surrounding films. The audience was interested in the personal lives of the actors involved with the films. One also comes across various participants talking about and using the word 'modernity' in several capacities. Modernity for film critics and the readers of the film journals chiefly meant new ideas. Most of the issues of social reform are considered modern. This discourse had to be accounted for and the first possibility explored in this direction was using Habermas' idea of the public sphere.

Habermas' ideas of the public sphere, though interesting, appeared to be inadequate to deal with the culturally polyvalent communities around film activities. These community formations did not indicate any lead to the formation of a political public sphere. Plus, film journalism in the 1930s appeared to be dominated by the huge economics involved in the process of filmmaking. However, Pierre Bourdieu's ideas 'field', 'habitus' and 'symbolic capital' provided the framework needed to discuss the film activities and discourse surrounding it in the 1920s and 1930s.

The technical analysis of the films was another important aspect to be taken into account. Since the first two decades of Indian cinema were formative years, it was assumed that the technical analysis would reveal some important stylistic conventions used in these films. Therefore, Gilles Deleuze's two cinema books *Cinema 1: The Movement-Image* and *Cinema 2: The Time-Image* provided the framework to analyse the arrangement of the visual images in these films. I have used images from these films to explain the camera angles, organisation of the frames, shots and editing techniques. These are still-frames from shot sequences that I have referred to to make the complicated scheme of analysis simple. I am not sure though that the analysis has come out as lucid as was expected.

The selection of films, *Achhut Kanya*, *Janmabhoomi*, *Izzat* and *Durga* were based on the themes they deal with and the gradual shift of Bombay Talkies Ltd. in terms of the technicalities of organization of shots.

The writing of this book is a mix of what others had to say about the object of the study and what I have to say, my views and commentaries on it. As the object of the study is not singular (Bombay Talkies Ltd. films, thinking about various instances and examples of modernity, discourse around cinema in the 1920s and 1930s) and some part of it operates as primary as well as secondary texts, the secondary material on the films and my views on them get intertwined. The link between these objects of study and their analyses could better be expressed in this manner. Ideas from various

thinkers have been used; ideas that were useful for the analyses of films and film journals. For example, Walter Benjamin's idea of 'technique' from his essay, "Author as Producer" (1934), helps to situate the Bombay Talkies Ltd..'s films in the context of early Indian cinema. Here, by the word 'technique,' Benjamin means compound of content and form that traditionally had been working as a dichotomy. Benjamin states that the political tendency of a work is revealed by its literary tendency. An author can produce a work with literary tendency either in progress or regression of literary technique. Here, the word technique refers to the cinematic techniques related to visual and aural images. Benjamin presented this paper as an address at the Institute for the study of Fascism. Later, in the essay, Benjamin claims that technical progress for an author as a producer is the foundation of his political progress. And this progress can be achieved by transcending the specialization in the process of production. Himanshu Rai, Franz Osten and Niranjan Pal, with their silent films and talkies, can be seen as trying to transcend their respective specialisations. Film-making is a process that demands the transcendence of skills. The studio system, in India, in the 1930s brings out this peculiar situation. In the case of Bombay Talkies studio, it becomes more evident with the German technicians and Indian artists working together towards making successful films.

The writing of this book is organized in the following manner.

The first chapter, "Some issues in the Early Indian Cinema", introduces the field of early Indian cinema through the discussion of British India government documents related to film activity in the 1920s. Evans' report on *Cinema Publicity in India*, *ICCR* and *ICCE* are discussed to get an account of the production, circulation and consumption practices of silent cinema. This chapter also discusses the changes caused by the arrival of talkies. This chapter is used to discuss how other production houses contributed to the cultural field of early Indian cinema.

The second chapter, "Bombay Talkies and the Indo-German Collaboration", discusses the history of how Himansu Rai and Franz Osten happened to get involved in the international collaboration for making three silent films. I have also discussed how Bombay Talkies was formed and how film activities related to it were discussed in the film journals in the 1930s. This chapter also takes into consideration Jurgen Habermas' idea of the 'public sphere', and how Indian thinkers like Dipesh Chakrabarty and Rajiv Bhargava have dealt with the public sphere and modernity in India. Pierre Bourdieu's relational mode of analysis is explained and used to

discuss the positions taken by Himansu Rai and Bombay Talkies in the cultural field of early Indian cinema.

The third chaper, "The Three Silent films and the Movement-Image", deals with the analysis of the silent films using Gilles Deleuze' ideas, 'Movement-Image' and 'Time-Image'. This chapter begins with a discussion of Deleuze's anti-structuralist approach towards the analysis of the films. The issue of film as a language is dealt with, explaining the objections that Deleuze had with Christian Metz's structuralist approach to the issue of film as a language. Concepts of frame, set, shot and montage are discussed in detail. The concepts of set, shot, perception-image, affection-image and action-image are discussed along with the analysis of the films.

The fourth chapter, "The Talkies: A New Dimension of Visual Image", discusses how the emergence of sound changed certain aspects of filmmaking and the organization of the visual image. Along with discussing the contribution of sound, the films are analyzed using the concept of montage put forth by Deleuze in his cinema books. This chapter uses concepts 'out-of-field', 'voice-off', and 'voice-in' to discuss *Achhut Kanya*, *Janmabhoomi*, *Izzat* and *Durga*. The phenomenon of song sequence is discussed, suggesting that early Indian cinema appears to be different from Western cinema if one looks at the use of song sequence in the early talkie Indian cinema.

The fifth chapter, "Conclusion", reiterates the findings of the book.

CHAPTER 1

SOME ISSUES IN EARLY INDIAN FILM CULTURE

1.1 Evans' report and the early years of Indian cinema

In 1921 on 3rd March, W. Evans submitted a report titled *Cinema Publicity in India* to Sir William Vincent, a government official in India. Evans begins the report by pointing out two requirements for the publicity of cinema in India, in the absence of which, the propagandists would misuse cinema, which Evans terms as a "most powerful weapon" (1). Evans states the requirements as:

> A.   The extension of the industry which implies its release from the present improved facilities for bringing home the cinemas to the masses of the Indian population.
>
> B.   Regulation of the programmes – a process which comprises on the one hand the negative aspect of barring out unsuitable, undesirable and useless films; and on the other, the positive aspect of supplying films of public interest, pleasure and utility. (1)

While dealing with section 'A' Evans states that the number of cinemas is small for India's huge population. Evans mentions some numbers in his report. According to Evan's report in 1921, there were one hundred and seventy theatres in India (2). Both the sections A and B yield interesting facts about cinema in India. I would like to quote this report in some detail here. Evans puts forth three reasons for his observation of theatres being insufficient in India, as follows:

> First, practically, all the exhibitors are catering for the small European population who pay high prices for admission. The existing cinemas are generally out of date, and of small seating capacity. This considerably affects the nature of the audience for it has always been found that a theatre with 2500 seating capacity is more attractive to the masses than one which all will accommodate say 800, the more average size in India.

> Secondly, no programmes are available specially catering for Indian taste. The majority of films exhibited are quite unsuitable to the religious and racial taste of India; and it should be noticed that where Indian produced films dealing with Indian subject(s) are exhibited the theatres are not merely overcrowded but the producer of the film asks and receives 75 per cent of the total takings, leaving only 25 per cent, to the theatre proprietor. From this fact, some idea of the prospects before Indian-manufactured films may be gathered. (1-2)

While adding the third reason Evans appears a bit skeptical towards the monopoly formed by Messers. Madan as he owned 60 theatres out of 170 that existed in India. The implications of this for Evans are serious. According to Evans, Madan had a monopoly in the newly developing Indian film industry. Evans terms this situation as "serious tendencies" (2). An interesting fact that comes out of this report; the circulation of film was completely dependent on the purchase of the films. Evans observes that "Instead of a universal renting system, under which the renter obtains films from the producer and lets them out at competitive rates in the open market to exhibitors, there exists in Indian film business a system of purchase" (2). Madans being good in business were the only theatre owners who could afford the buying prices of the foreign film producers. Any new entrant in the business, thus, had to buy all the films or not get them at all. The solution suggested for this problem by Evans is complete control of the government of India over the film business. He urges the Indian government to control the importation of films from foreign countries and films produced in India as well. According to Evans, this would result in providing "…small and new exhibitor an equal chance with larger existing companies" (3). Evans observes that a British organization with world connections should be given this responsibility which would be helped by available Indian firms for local distribution of films. An organization suitable for this concern, according to Evans, could be either a government owned company or a private firm guaranteed by government (4). For growth in the number of theatres, Evans suggests, the government should give concessions for the construction of theatres to any person or company that abides by the government conditions. And, one of the conditions Evans mentions is, "In return for this, concessionaires might be asked to give in the course of the day, fee exhibitions of Government films in schools, institutes etc" (4). While talking about the censorship issues in India Evans' suggestions bring out some interesting insights regarding British government's policy of controlling the content of the films. Evans observes:

> At present when a film has passed the censors of Bombay, it is treated as suitable for exhibition in most parts of India. I am of the view that a film which can be exhibited with impunity in Bombay, might produce a most undesirable effect in, let us say, Bengal. I therefore feel inclined to urge that the censorship of films should be different and that the local Indian Boards should be left to pronounce upon the suitability of given films for exhibition in their particular area…It may be remarked in parentheses that the present Indian film market is so small that no one is likely to object to a general censorship for imported films being located in London. The great majority of films for India are today purchased in London. (6)

Evans' concern with strict supervision of the imported films and films produced in India is emphasized when he reasons that the existence of undesirable films is enormous and censorship would curb the circulation and consumption of these films. He recommends encouragement of the production of films of native literature and history by Indian firms. But mere control over production, circulation and consumption of films, Evans believes, will not suffice "to convert the cinematograph into a means of nativeal education; for I have already pointed out that the real need at present is for films produced in India dealing with Indian subject" (7). Evans believes in controlling the production of films in India as:

> Roughly one-third of India is comprised by Indian states; and throughout this area at the present moment it must be stated on the authority of several experts in the film trade that the Indian states provide among the most profitable markets for indecent films. At present these films are smuggled in clandestinely from France and South America and are believed to fetch a very high price. As soon as film production in India becomes better organized there is every reason to fear that this illicit trade in indecent films may increase considerably…The Indian climate not only possesses great advantage from the point of the film producer but in addition the cheapness and celerity with which crowds can be collected for filming purposes constitute an extra-ordinary valuable asset from the point of view of the film producer. It does not seem unduly fantastic to suppose that as soon as film production in India becomes better organised, we may see conjunction with the production of harmless drama films, may also put upon the market films of a highly undesirable type. (12)

Evans here refers to the American films that portrayed European women in a bad light. The common thread in all of Evans' observations, suggestions and arguments is the mass appeal of cinema. And, it was this mass appeal that helped cinema as an institution establish in a very short period.

Michael Chanan's book *The Dream That Kicks* begins with the paradox that film history contains. Chanan states:

> In spite of the extensive documentation which exists concerning the early days of film there is a sense in which the origins of film are obscure. Film has taught us to see the world anew, but it seems that the one thing it could not properly picture was its own birth. What we see in the earliest films is the beginning of a new way of seeing. What we don't seem to see is how that way of seeing was first seen. (5)

In the case of Indian cinema history, the beginning is always attributed to Louis and Auguste Lumiere's unveiling of "…*cinematographe* in the basement of the Grand Café in Paris on December 28, 1895" (Barnouw and Krishnaswamy, *Indian Film* 2). It is further speculated by Barnouw and Krishnaswamy that the possibility of short-lived novelty of the cinematograph might have propelled the French brothers to bring the machine to India. One more important factor that is mentioned in this book is the "activity of rival entrepreneurs" (2). The first advertisement of film in India appears in the newspaper *The Times of India* published on 7th July 1896. It describes the cinematograph as "The marvel of the century. The wonder of the world. Living photographic pictures. In life-sized reproductions" (4). The films screened were, *Entry of Cinematographe*, *Arrival of a Train*, *The Sea Bath*, *A Demolition*, *Leaving the Factroy* and *Ladies and Soldier on Wheels*. Bombay residents had to be very curious to watch the moving picture as the *Times of India* on 27th July announced "Bombay residents who have flocked recently in spite of bad weather to see the Kinematograph, the patentee has obtained a fresh lease of the Novelty Theatre for a few more nights" (qtd. In Barnow and Krishnaswamy 3). The Lumiere brothers' stint was followed by "'Hughes Moto-Photoscope'…Professor Anderson and Mlle Blanche and their 'Andersonoscopograph'" (5). There seem to be quick developments taking place regarding activities surrounding the cinematograph. Ashish Rajadhyaksha and Paul Willemen, in the *Encyclopedia of Indian Cinema*, list some important events in the history of Indian cinema. According to Rajadhyaksha and Willemen, Hiralal Sen started making films in 1898. The year was important because Amritlal Bose screened "a package of 'actualities' and 'fakes' at the Star Theatre, Calcutta" (17). Harishchandra Sakharam Bhatavadekar, inspired by the films screened in Bombay, recorded a wrestling match and screened it. His later experiments with recording movements are believed to be "monkey circus", "arrival of R. P. Paranjpye" and "coronation of Edward VII" (*Indian Film* 6). In the following years the number of theatres grew, as did the import of the

films. The credit for the development of the Indian film industry and the beginning of it is given to Dadasaheb Govind Phalke. It is not just articles and books on the history of Indian cinema that would mention Phalke's name but he himself has claimed this. In an interview recorded in the *Indian Cinematograph Committee Evidence Volume iii*, Phalake states:

> *Q*. I suppose you began the film industry in this country?
>
> *A*. Yes, I began the film industry in India in the year 1912.
>
> *Q*. What was the company you started?
>
> *A*. It was simply called 'Phalke's films'.
>
> *Q*. How many years you worked at it?
>
> *A*. I worked at it for nearly 6 years and then we formed a company called the Hindustan Film Company. (869)

But even before Phalke made his first film *Raja Harishchandra* in 1913, India was definitely considered as a market for the films to be distributed. Kristin Thompson, in her book *Exporting Entertainment*, while talking about distribution strategies of American films, states:

> But some small or underdeveloped markets could not afford many new prints. In India in 1910, for example, there were few permanent theatres – one in Calcutta, one in Rangoon and four in Bombay; other locales were served by about seventy touring cinemas. Pathé was the only distributor with direct sales there and it would not rent, only sell. The main theatres would buy Pathé films direct and sell them used at half-price to the travelling shows; some new topical and used prints were obtained via the post from London. (33)

Thompson's description of India as a small market for films asserts the fact that Britain and America both looked at India as a possible place for selling their product. Madhava Prasad's observation on this new technology's effect on colonized India has to be considered here. Prasad describes the confrontation of this new technology as:

> Film technology, developed in the capitalist centre, arrived in India during colonial rule and captivated audiences here as it had done elsewhere. It was as part of a movement to promote indigenous enterprise that the idea of an 'Indian cinema' was conceived. If Phalke is considered the pioneer of Indian cinema, it is not only because he made the 'first' Indian film, but because he conceived of film-making as a nationalist, specifically 'swadeshi' enterprise, and produced Indian images to occupy the screens.

> Film technology, thus, did not arrive in a vacuum. There was a cultural, political, social field from within which some people, encountering a new technology of representation, devised ways of putting it to uses that accorded with the field. The technology did not bring with it, readymade, a set of cultural possibilities which would be automatically realized through the mere act of employing it. At the same time, the technology is not neutral, simply sliding into the role assigned to it by the cultural-political field it enters. It has its own unsettling, re-organizing effects on the field. (2)

Phalke, though, can be considered as a pioneer, as Prasad suggests, who explored the possibilities of converting film-making into an industry: we need not think of these events as a logical outcome of some cause. India was already a possible ground for film-making to become an industry. Harishchandra Bhatavadekar was also a part of the same condition. Phalke is credited to create indigenous images using the western technology because he could think and preserve his thoughts through writing "While the life of Christ was rolling fast before my eyes I was mentally visualising the Gods…could we the sons of India, ever be able to see Indian images on the screen?" (qtd. In Rajadhyaksha, *The Phalke Era* 49). In the early 1910s there was no significant rise in the cinema halls in India. The number of cinema halls grew gradually and America was looking for markets to sell films made by their film makers. Various companies competed to tap into this market. American companies, for example, initially found it difficult to penetrate the Indian market that was dominated by Pathé. Thompson notes:

> We have seen that prior to 1913 India could only support a few permanent theatres, supplied mainly by a Pathé office and by used prints obtained from London. This situation changed little over the next two years. By 1912 Bombay had gone from four theatres to five; Pathé was still the biggest supplier. Other brands that showed occasionally were Itala, Cines, Urban, Gaumont, Edison, and Vitagraph – mostly in used prints. More theatre construction took place in 1913. Calcutta gained three and there was at least one in Madras; their patrons were mostly Europeans. But the USA made no inroads into Pathé's control; an occasional Edison film came in from London or New York. (43)

However, during the years 1915 and 1916 American exports increased in numbers. The reason for this was the decline of industries in other nations (*Exporting Entertainment* 71). Universal, for example, had opened branches in India in 1916, in March 1918 sales rights, in India, were obtained by Goldwyn (*Exporting Entertainment* 73). All these details explicate why Evans' report was necessary for the British government.