

IPTA and Indian Cinema During the 1940s and the Early 1950s

SAGNIK CHAKRAVARTTY

Culture as a tool for reaching out to the masses was felt for the first time by the Communist Party of India when Comrade P. C. Joshi was its General Secretary. Many common artists from professional and other fields were drawn closer to the people. There was a concerted effort by the Party to develop a cultural front for the political awakening of the people. Against the backdrop of the Second World War, anti-fascist movement, Quit India Movement, the passing of the Pakistan Resolution by the Muslim League, the Bengal Famine of 1943, the rumblings from Telengana, the need for a cultural movement among writers, theatre activists, singers, painters was felt by the Communist Party. The Party's goal was to arouse, to educate, to elevate the masses and to negate the alien influences on and among them, so that they could mobilise into mass organizations.¹

Against this background, the Bombay unit of the Indian People's Theatre Association was born, particularly in the atmosphere of an impending danger of a fascist takeover and the unwillingness of the British Government to share power with the national movement to organise national defence.²

The name Indian People's Theatre Association had been suggested on the basis of Romain Rolland's famous book *People's Theatre* either by scientist Dr Homi Bhabha or by Anil De Silva, a Ceylonese journalist who became the first Secretary of the IPTA's Bangalore unit in 1941. It was he who helped to form the Bombay Branch of IPTA in 1942 and subsequently the All-India organisation was formed in May 1943.³ In the first bulletin of IPTA, we find that the sponsors of the Bombay unit included all shades of political opinion—Congressmen, Communists, moderates, liberals, labour and Kisan leaders. Tickets for performances were issued free on the basis of quotas to different trade unions of Bombay. The Bulletin further informs that the Bombay Report asserted that the people's theatre was committed to the people in their struggle against the ruling and exploiting classes. It is clear from this Report that this people's theatre was started by a few intellectuals who were not artists themselves, but who felt the urgent need of such a movement at that crucial period of Indian history. Significantly, the first performances of IPTA were before working-class audiences and the playwrights came also from the same class. According to Sudhi Pradhan, it was a new experiment in the cultural history of India.

The IPTA along with the Progressive Writer's Association (PWA), earlier formed in 1936, provided the first model of organised cultural activism in India and remained an inspiration for future cultural activists. Combining an emphasis on realism with the need to revitalize the

traditional arts, the PWA and IPTA produced a revolutionary art perspective. The address of Premchand at the first PWA Conference as well as Cabral's address on Culture and National Liberation reminded us of Lu Xun and Mao Zedong. The main thrust was that art or literature which does not portray the deepest human emotions and aspirations of this epoch cannot have any life or significance for the people. Thus A. K. Hangal has rightly mentioned that IPTA was more of a movement than an organisation of performing arts. He even traced the international perspective and mentioned about the international association of writers in defence of culture against fascism which was formed in France and was led by eminent writers of those days like Andre Malraux, Maxim Gorky and others.⁴ IPTA as a non-profit voluntary organization whose aims were to raise artists' voice against the injustices of the country's present rulers. Songs, poems, ballets and plays were all directed toward this goal and every artist of any significance became part of IPTA. "The association drew," as Zohra Segal wrote, "talent like honey does bees and every branch of art was represented by the most honoured in the land."⁵ Thus one reason for its success was that it could draw the most talented people of the time. Among the stage actors and actresses were Prithviraj Kapoor (twice nominated IPTA's President), Balraj and Damayanti Sahni, Chetan and Uma Anand, Uzra and Hamid Butt, Dina Gandhi (later Pathak), Habib Tanvir, Krishan Dhavan, Safdar Mir, Hima Kasarkodi, Romesh Thapar, Sarju Pandeyu, Shaukat Kaifi. Among the dancers were Shanti and Gul Bardhan, Narendra Sharma, Shanta Gandhi, Debendra Shankar, Sachin Shankar. Musicians included Salil Chowdhury, Sachin Deb Burman, Bhupen Hazarika, Jotindranath Maitra, Ravi Shankar. In Bengal, the stage artists included Bijon Bhattacharya, Shombhu Mitra, Tripti Bhaduri, Sova Sen, and later Utpal Dutt, Ritwik Ghatak.

Its success was also because it could tap the sources of popular expression and gave them the kind of respect and recognition that they needed. It was the recognition of their existence, their identity and bringing a total response to their cultural expression that made IPTA such an important movement and precisely for this Nemi Chandra Jain has said, "It became a national force."⁶ IPTA in Bombay had used the folklore of Marathi theatre, taking Tamasha and Powada as forms of expression and the Bengali artists employed Jatra, their provincial folk theatre as their medium. During the golden years of IPTA (1942-1952), it was customary to use all forms of folk expressions to enhance rural concerns in theatre. Conscious efforts were made at rooting theatre in the lives of the people, using their own modes of expression in music, dance, puppets and mime.⁷ The direct aim was to draw the rural audiences. In fact the street theatre movement evolved to dramatise the injustices of capitalist and caste exploitation. The Tamasha was often used to mobilize public opinion when nationalist sentiments were riding high. Playwrights like D. N. Gowankar, Madgulkar, P. L. Deshpande, Vasant Sabnis, Vasant Bapat combined topical subjects and the traditional forms like Tamasha and Powada in order to reach to the masses. One of Gowankar's Tamasha was about how a grain hoarder of a starving village was cornered by the villagers. In Kerala, traditional forms like Kathakali and Ottamthullal were taken out of their temple surroundings and staged before larger audiences with new themes, portraying the struggles of the masses.

In Andhra Pradesh, Burrakatha and Harikatha were often used to educate the public about the significance of contemporary events and to invoke solidarity and patriotism among the people. Bijon Bhattacharya set the play *Nabanna* in the background of the 1943 Famine. It became a landmark in the history of Bengali theatre.

Similarly, Uday Shankar redefined the idiom of modern Indian dance. He wanted dance as a means of communication reaching out to one and all. Later he experimented a fusion of two media—Dance and Cinema, the product was *Kalpana* in 1947.

The impact of IPTA movement was enormous. It was not just confined to Calcutta and Bombay. It could flourish all over the country with a large number of regional variations. As a result, a large number of theatrical forms from various regions have acquired some kind of recognition. While at the creative level, the search for this commonness continues, organised intervention of the mass media for some kind of unity created some kind of standardization. As Nemi Chandra Jain analysed the reason for the petering out of the movement in the following words:

Gradually standardization came in. Uniform programmes and uniform forms of expression started prevailing with the result that it became destructive of creative cultural expression rather than helping its growth.⁸

Politicization of mass media tended to create this kind of standard response, a standard pattern. It was difficult for the people who have been working in the creative field to resist this. On the other hand, Sudhi Pradhan justified this politicization when he writes,

In a country where nearly 70 per cent of the people are illiterate and the popular mass media like the cinema and the professional dramatic stage owned by professional individuals and the radio was under the foreign rulers, politicization of the broad masses through the performing arts is quite understandable. The problem arose, when subsequently, the declared objective of creating people's art clashed with the party's short term objective of mass mobilization on issues of temporary nature. The party did not differentiate between the two jobs. A trained political activist can handle agit-prop material within a short notice but artists would take comparatively longer to assimilate and render it artistically.⁹

The organisation and the staging of the dance-dramas—*The Spirit of India*, *India Immortal* and the epoch making Bengali drama *Nabanna* (New Harvest) established the position of the IPTA or the model to be followed by successive generations of artists. But the cultural leadership of the IPTA could not go beyond the tactical line of the CPI of building Congress-League unity. Lack of understanding of the significance of the rapidly changing situation, after the fall of the Axis Powers, followed by the unprecedented anti-imperialist mass upsurge created a stalemate, which affected the IPTA also. The artists with some professional training working in the drama and ballet squad could not adjust themselves to the changing situation.

As a result, the logic of party intervention in the workings of IPTA was raised by some of the activists.

The political situation also changed. The party took a left sectarian line in 1948. Later, after the Telengana debacle and defeat of the sectarian policy, CPI's policy changed, having faith in the progressive policy of the Congress Government in the development of culture. When the Government of India established three Akademis (Lalit Kala, Sahitya and Sangeet Natak) to promote cultural activities in the country, merited artists who were once in the IPTA were picked up for positions there and for awards. As a result, IPTA began to lose its previous character. Various splinter groups claiming their origin in the IPTA began to be formed to produce dramas in cities and towns. Very soon these groups established their contacts with the Government academies, professional theatre, and the screen with the help of professional people attached to these establishments.

And here one can trace the relationship between IPTA and cinema, a relationship which has been very intense and a cerebral process. Cinema in the early forties was dominated by the theatre. The acting was stage-oriented, the dialogue was theatrical, and even the disposition of actors within the frame was theatrical.

IPTA had a link with this cinema, particularly with its ethos of reaching out to the people with people's themes. Ritwik Ghatak's first film *Nagarik* made in 1953, though not released, bears the full imprint of his Marxist faith and his IPTA involvement. Ritwik Ghatak changed his medium from literature to theatre and later to film because he felt literature works slowly into the minds of the people. IPTA revolutionized his way of thinking. He found that this was a much more potent medium than fiction and much more immediate. So he closely associated himself with IPTA. But later he shifted to cinema because he felt, "The cinema can mould minds of millions at a single time in a complete way. I came to cinema because of that."¹⁰

The cinema lived in partly enforced isolation in British India. The search for identity which brought a new life to literature and other arts in India had not begun in the cinema. During this time cine clubs began to be established drawing inspiration from Soviet cinema. The film-making community was culturally underdeveloped and there was a special lack of creativity that could have cut across cultural barriers. However the IPTA movement had an impact on cinema-making also. One can trace a line along which realism was developing in cinema through Bimal Ray's *Udayar Pathe* (1944), Nema Ghosh's *Chhinnamul* (1951) (on the refugee problem), Hemen Gupta's *42* (1951), Ritwik Ghatak's *Nagarik* (1952), Salil Sen's *Natun Yehudi* (1953), Satyen Bose's *Rickshawalla* (1955) etc. The critical realism of films like *Chhinnamul* or *Nagarik* was discarded in favour of lyrical realism. After Satyajit Ray's *Pather Panchali* (1955), the makers of these earlier films themselves discarded their former principles. Ritwik, for instance, had to redefine realism entirely for himself when he took to films again.

The national and international success of the new cinema of the 1950s fostered the rise of a wave. But it had to face formidable resistance from the industry and the major part of the public. The new wave started in an atmosphere of internationalism which was a by-product of anti-

fascist movements. So far Calcutta was concerned, the founding of the Calcutta Film Society in 1947 by Satyajit Ray, Chidananda Das Gupta, Harisadhan Das Gupta etc., Jean Renoir's visit in 1949 to film *The River*, and the International Film Festival of India of 1952 were major landmarks of Calcutta's discovery of world cinema. Film societies now took the task of creating an audience for new cinema. The 'realist' trend in Indian films gained impetus from the 1952 International Film Festival held in this country, just when the early sporadic attempts at realism seemed to be petering out "under the impact of Hollywood's forget-your-worries escape formula"¹¹ Huge crowds were drawn by films from the Soviet Union, People's Republic of China, Italy, Japan etc. at the festival. This proved that the Indian film-goers tired of Hollywood, were eager to see on the screen common-people struggling in an hostile world for a better life and decency. Accordingly, there followed a stream of realist Indian films. Though some of them were their prototypes, they represent a new healthy trend. The significance lies in the fact that it emerged in the post-war period of increasing economic and political pressures and the gathering momentum of the people's movement towards a better life.

It is very essential to study the meaning of realism to understand the 'realist' trend in Indian films of 1940s and early '50s. For this purpose, the following quotation from *Essays in European Realism* by George Lukacs¹², the Hungarian critic is relevant,

Realism means recognition of the fact that artistic creation is not based on some abstract average, as naturalism believes, or on an individual principle which solves itself and disappears in the void—a vehement expression that which is unique and occurs but once. The essence and basic criterion of the literary concept of realism is the type—or that specific synthesis which, both in the matter of characters and situations, organically fuses the general and the individual. The type becomes type not because of its averageness, nor solely because of its individual character, however deepened that may be; it becomes the type because in it join and merge all the decisive moments—the humanly and socially essential moments—of a historical period. It presents moments at their peak point of development, in the full realisation of their immanent possibilities, in an extreme portrayal of extremes, crystallising either the high points or outermost limits of the total man and the total period.

It is clear from the above passage that realism is at the root of social and human relations and behaviour in the basic interconnections of reality and life and the consequent conflicts in life between the old and the new between decay and growth, occurring simultaneously within a society in a given historical period. Realism thus portrays the complete man and event, i.e., the total reality, by depicting what is characteristic in reality. Concurrently it indicates the direction in which reality moves, revealing the interaction of forces that impel forward. Realism thus heightens our understanding of reality.

Similarly in Hindi films, Bimal Ray was able to sweep aside the cobwebs of the old tradition and introduce a realism and subtlety that was wholly suited to the Cinema. Satyajit Ray mentions him as undoubtedly a pioneer.¹³ His *Do Bigha Zamin*, the story of a toiling Rickshawwalla reverberates in the minds of those who saw it. It remains undoubtedly one of

the landmarks of Indian cinema.

Film also was a component aspect of the IPTA movement. Theatre and films were parallel streams each influencing the other. In 1946, *Dharti ka Lal* could draw Balraj Sahni, Shombhu Mitra, Ravi Shankar, Krishan Chandra at a common place.¹⁴ Similarly IPTA also supported V. Shantaram's film titled *Dr Kotnis ki Amar Kahani*. Often it has been mentioned that *Pather Panchali* depicts social realism, but this trend was already there a decade earlier in the 1940s. Charu Roy's film *Bengalee* that was produced in 1939 is noteworthy in this context.

Satyajit Ray praised this film for its flawless portrayal of middle class life while avoiding Hollywood's influence. A number of films can be named since the forties which happened to be the precursor of *Pather Panchali*. Satyajit Ray himself effusively acclaimed *Kalpana* made in 1948, a film which he had seen more than once. According to him, the film's neorealistic fantasy "is embedded within a framing story of a writer telling a story to a film producer who eventually declines to make the movie."¹⁵ Now the realistic stream was reflected in Devaki Basu's *Chandidas*. At the same time, there came in the forties films like *Achhut Kanya* where the class angle was highlighted alongside universal humanism. Conflict between worker-employer, zamindar/jotdar-peasants, socialist idealism and old values came to the fore. Gradually the marginalized people of the society were mirrored on cinema. In 1941, a film like *Naya Sansar* by Khwaja Ahmed Abbas initiated this new trend of cinema. K. A. Abbas was directly linked to IPTA, being one of its founder members. Other films like *Udayar Pathe* 1944, *Dharti Ka Lal* 1946, *Neecha Nagar* 1950, *Tathapi* 1950, *Chhinnamul* 1950, *Nagarik* 1952, *Do Bigha Zamin* 1953, *Nanne Munna* 1954 had utilised several components which were later seen in *Pather Panchali*. Realistic narration, social consciousness, capturing the objective emotions of the individual—all these are found in these films alongside several other components in a scattered way. Abbas' *Dharti ka Lal* was made on the lines of Bijon Bhattacharya's *Nabanna* and *Jabanbandi* and Krishan Chander's *Annadata*. The realism seen in this film was subsequently reflected in Nema Ghosh's *Chhinnamul* and Bimal Roy's *Do Bigha Zamin*.

How were the IPTA activists drawn into film making? There were influential people like N. M. Joshi, the veteran trade-unionist having considerable influence in New Delhi's corridors of power, who helped these new directors to produce films. The beneficiaries were Uday Shankar to make a dance film different from a mere film of songs and dances, Chetan Anand to produce *Neecha Nagar*, IPTA to make a film *Dharti ka Lal* on Bengal famine tragedy which eventually was directed by Abbas himself.

An important film personality of IPTA movement was Balraj Sahni who later on became a celebrated actor in the Hindi movie world. He in his memoirs narrated his own personal experiences and also his association with IPTA and PWA. These movements influenced the film-makers so much that films of that period became far more realistic such as *Mazdoor* (1945), a film by Nitin Bose. Balraj writes,

Those who have seen this film would agree with me that till today in India whatever realistic films have been made, *Mazdoor* comes in the number one slot. I have never seen the class struggle/conflict being presented minutely in any other film.¹⁶

In fact this film had to be withdrawn under the pressure of vested interests on the third or fourth day after its release. This new theatre movement produced many socially committed films like Bimal Roy's *Humrahi*, where the capitalistic system was sarcastically portrayed. Here, according to Roop Narain, he shows the conflict of the period—conflict between labour and capital. And yet he is unable to get out of the conventional rich-girl-meets-poor-boy formula. He looks at the conflict and the people engaged in it from the lace contained window of his rich heroine.¹⁷

Theatres were transformed into cinemas and audiences forgot their exclusive loyalty to drama. Giants like Prithviraj Kapoor poured his film earnings into theatre.¹⁸ Thus these two parallel streams, theatre and cinema, had the same perspective, experimenting, technically exploring and sometimes overlapping. At a later stage, we find Dina Pathak, Utpal Dutt, Naseeruddin Shah, A. K. Hangal, Mrinal Sen and many others creating a space both in theatre and film world. In fact, A.K. Hangal writes in his autobiography:

Ever since I had become a student of communist ideology, my view of the world was changing. This touched my theatre activity too. I was convinced that the medium of theatre should be used for the spiritual and political awakening of the people—theatre for a cause. There was one organisation that was actively doing such work, and it was in India, the Indian People's Theatre Association (IPTA). And in 1947, it was holding its annual national conference in Ahmedabad in December. I picked up my blanket, packed a small bag and boarded a steamer bound for Ahmedabad. The trip turned out to be a rewarding experience. I was inspired by what I saw in Ahmedabad, the issue-oriented plays, the revolutionary and patriotic songs. I made friends with the Indian delegates like K. A. Abbas, Balraj Sahni, Dr Raja Rao and Dina Pathak.¹⁹

He further writes,

Before proceeding further, let me answer some questions I am often asked. The first is, how did I adapt to the change from committed theatre to commercial cinema, and also, what is a character actor's place in the hardcore world of glamour? To the first question, the answer is that an actor is an actor, whether on stage or in commercial cinema. The point is whether he is indulging in buffoonery while enacting his characters, for the sake of the demands of rising commercialism. Let me tell you that I have always avoided playing to the gallery. I believed in realistic acting, and abided by that, both on the stage and in films, as far as possible. To the second question, I was dragged into films by directors whose wavelength was more or less the same as mine. These directors were also "committed" and therefore, took good care of me, which paid me well in the long run.²⁰

Similarly, film-maker Mrinal Sen who was also associated with IPTA, expressed his expe-

riences in an interview with Deepankar Mukhopadhyay.²¹ He came into contact with the IPTA crowd through his study-circle platform. He used to witness all their productions but merely as a spectator. He even attended their drama-reading sessions. In fact, he realized it was the theatre of the revolutionary people. In fact, the young dramatist was no other, but Ritwik Ghatak. Mrinal Sen remarked, “I was deeply impressed that art could do so much for the people, that it could create a certain climate.”²² These associations later helped Mrinal to become a director, a film-maker of some of the burning issues of the time. In fact IPTA was a movement which inspired many young people and brought out their talents on surface.

It is not just the question of the choice or the likings of the audience. Financial constraint pushes the theatre personalities into the film world. Hardly can one find theatre actors earning bread and butter through their performances and that’s why, many of them switched over to the film world to earn their living. Love for theatre brought them back to the drama world as a pastime or a recreation and then again they entered into the world of cinema for financial reason. Even Zohra Segal in her memoirs wrote,

Gradually, the impact of IPTA declined, perhaps because a number of its artists became popular in Indian films and were no longer inclined to slave away without monetary compensation.²³

Thus they oscillated between the two mediums. Larger audience, more media coverage, popularity and fame could be other factors. But all said or done, the new wave cinema is an extension of the trend initiated by the people’s theatre movement.

Singers like Salil Chowdhury, S. D. Burman, Bhupen Hazarika, or even Hemanta Mukherjee experimented with tunes of the IPTA era and made them popular in the cinema world. Bhupen recalls his old days in IPTA in an interview where he sang happily a famous song—*Ab dariya machal ke aayaa*—of the IPTA days, penned by Shailendra and music composed by Salil Chowdhury. He says, “We sang it for unity then and I sing it for unity today.”²⁴

Similarly, Salil Chowdhury’s name is associated with famous hits like Bimal Ray’s *Do Bigha Zamin*, *Biraj Bahu*, *Madhumati* of the 1950s and other films of later times. In fact, Salil grew up as a political artist in the tumultuous Bengal of the 1940s and emerged as the most popular musician, poet and singer to be valourised by the youth of those times. It was this political past of Salil’s and his exposure through the IPTA to both the indigenous and folk songs of the peasantry and the radical strains in Western classical musicians like Beethoven and later Russian composers, that enabled him to break new ground in Bengali music, and later in Bombay’s filmworld. This diversity of styles, which was Salil’s forte, came out beautifully in another composition—*Palki Choley*—which was based on a poem written at the turn of this century by Satyendranath Dutta, describing a journey by a group of palanquin bearers, weaving their way through villages and a variety of rural scenes. Mobility, the ever-changing scenes in a political journey, the musical snippets collected from his encounters with folk poets, or from his encounters to Indian and Western classical music, appeared to

have shaped his musical style in a syncretistic mould.²⁵

This whole discourse will remain incomplete unless the gender dimension is focussed. IPTA movement for the first time brought educated middle class women into acting. Karuna Banerjee, who did her post-graduation in English literature from Calcutta University, later became the heroine of *Pather Panchali*, is one such example. She wrote, "Somewhere inside me, there was an inclination towards acting in a drama ... When the Indian People's Theatre Association opened a branch in our neighbourhood, I rushed to enrol myself as a member."²⁶ Large number of women from middle class background who were earlier confined to the domain of the house came out in this new wave at the call of the new theatre movement. And many of them later joined films and became renowned actresses like Durga Khote. She had entered theatre through performances in IPTA plays and subsequently she became one of the most powerful actresses of the Hindi film-world.

Films became a powerful medium, more powerful because these had tremendous impact in the mind through visual presentation. Most of these activists could realise that cinema can emerge as a vital weapon with an element of social attack against the persisting influence of backwardness such as the monster of communalism, caste and other factors of disintegration. Many of them realized that cinema reflects the healthy aspirations of national life which can act as a lever for social change. Precisely, that is why, cinema became a far more engulfing medium which can influence the society at large. The new cinema or art cinema which shapes the mind and provokes the thinking process, which stirs the emotions and which keeps the audience ponder for days and nights is indeed a very, very powerful mode of social protest. That is why, the tradition of IPTA still continues and blossoms and experiments into different art forms, breaking the shackles of party intervention and reach out to a large section of viewers through the media of cinema and television with the emergence of new technology. IPTA was the trend-setter of the new wave cinema that has left its distinct impress on the Indian film scene today.

NOTES

1. Sahni, Balraj: *Meri Filmi Atmakatha* (in Hindi), Rajpal and Sons, Delhi, 1974, p.102. He narrates the role of P. C. Joshi in making IPTA a movement. There was something in his personality which could draw people from all parts of the country.
2. Pradhan, Sudhi: 'Future Prospects of a People's Theatre', in Banerjee, Subrata (ed.), *Culture and Communication*, Patriot Publishers, Delhi, 1985. p.34.
3. 'People's Art in the 20th Century—Theory and Practice' (*Nukkad Janam Samvad*: July 1999–September 2000) : Jana Natya Manch, New Delhi—Excerpts from Sudhi Pradhan (ed.) Marxist Cultural Movement, published in the above.
4. Hangal, A. K.: *Life and Times of A. K. Hangal*, Sterling, Delhi, 1999, p. 76.
5. Segal, Zohra: 'Theatre and Activism in the 1940s', *IIC Quarterly*, Monsoon, 1997 p.31 ; This article is excerpted from *Stages: The Art and Adventures of Zohra Segal*, by Joan L. Erdman with

- Zohra Segal, *Kali for Women*, New Delhi, 1997.
6. Jain, Nemi Chandra: 'Communication and Theatre', in Banerjee, Subrata (ed.) *Culture and Communication*, op. cit. p.30.
 7. Srampickal, Jacob, *Voice to the Voiceless - The Power of People's Theatre in India*, Manohar, Delhi, 1994, p.78.
 8. Jain, Nemi Chandra, in Banerjee, Subrata (ed.) op. cit. p.30.
 9. Pradhan, Sudhi, in Banerjee, Subrata (ed.) op. cit. p. 41
 10. Ritwik Ghatak's interview in 1973, reprinted in *Chitrabikshan*, January - April 1976, p 65, as reproduced in *Ritwik Ghatak's Stories*, translated by Rani Ray (from Bengali), Sristi Publishers, Delhi, 2000 - p. xi (in Lieu of an Introduction)
 11. Narain, Roop, 'The Question of Realism in Indian Films', *New Age*, Vol. III No.6 June 1954. p.79.
 12. Ibid., p.77
 13. Bhattacharya Rinki, *Bimal Roy—A Man of Silence*, Indus, Delhi, 1994, p.12.
 14. Bandopadhyay Parthapratim: *Bharatiyo Chhola-chitrer Ruprekha* (in Bengali), Banishilpa, Calcutta, 1997, p. 71.
 15. Ibid., p.72.
 16. Sahni, Balraj, *Meri Filmi Atmakatha*, op. cit. p.92.
 17. Narain, Roop, in *New Age*, June 1954, op. cit. p.85.
 18. Excerpts from the narration by Naseeruddin Shah in the documentary, *Indian Theatre*, produced by Films Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India.
 19. Hangal, A. K., op. cit. p.41
 20. Ibid., p. 97
 21. Mukhopadhyay, Deepankar, *The Maverick Maestro—Mrinal Sen*, Indus, Delhi, 1995, p.11.
 22. Hood, John W., *Chasing the Truth—The Films of Mrinal Sen*, Seagull, Calcutta, 1993, p.12. Excerpts from an interview with the author, John W. Hood, in September 1989, are reproduced in this book.
 23. Segal, Zohra, op. cit. p.32
 24. Dutt, Nirupama, 'Rhythm in Water', *Hindustan Times*, 1 October, 2000, p.17.
 25. Banerjee, Sumanta, 'Remembering Salil Chowdhury', *Mainstream*, September 16th, 1995, p.6.
 26. Banerjee, Karuna, *An Actress in Her Time, A Celluloid Chapter Persona*, Thema, Jamshedpur, 1999. p. 21.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

1. A. K. Hangal: *Life and Times of A. K. Hangal*, Sterling, Delhi, 1999.
2. Balraj Sahni: *Meri Filmi Atmakatha* (in Hindi), Rajpal and Sons, Delhi, 1974.

3. Zohra Segal: 'Theatre and Activism in the 1940s', published in *IIC Quarterly*, Monsoon, 1997. Excerpted from *Stages: The Art and Adventures of Zohra Segal* by John L. Erdman with Zohra Segal, Kali for Women, New Delhi, 1997.
4. Karuna Banerjee: *An Actress in Her Time—A Celluloid Chapter Persona*, Thema Distributor, Jamshedpur, 1999.
5. Ritwik Ghatak's Interview in 1973, reprinted in Chitrabikshan, January-April, 1976, p.65. This is referred to in *Ritwik Ghatak's Stories*, translated by Rani Ray, Srishti Publishers, Delhi, 2000, p.xi. In Lieu of an Introduction.
6. Mrinal Sen's conversation with Deepankar Mukhopadhyay. Glimpses of it are present in Deepankar Mukhopadhyay: *The Maverick—Maestro-Mrinal Sen*, Indus, Delhi, 1995.
7. Mrinal Sen's interview with John W. Hood, September, 1989. This is referred to in John W. Hood's *Chasing The Truth—The Films of Mrinal Sen*, Seagull, Calcutta, 1993.
8. Bhupen Hazarika's interview with Nirupama Dutt, published as an article, 'Rhythm in Water' *Hindustan Times*, 1 October, 2000. Here he mentions of his association with IPTA.
9. Roop Narain, 'The Question of Realism in Indian Films', *New Age*, Vol. III No. 6, June, 1954.

Secondary Sources

1. Subrata Bannerjee (ed.): *Culture and Communication*, Patriot Publishers, Delhi, 1985.
2. Sudhi Pradhan (ed.): *Marxist Cultural Movement in India*. Some portions of this work are seen in *Nukkad Janam Samvad*, 'People's Art in the 20th Century—Theory and Practice', July 1999–September 2000, Jana Natya Manch, New Delhi.
3. Rinki Bhattacharya: *Bimal Roy—A Man of Silence*, Indus, 1994.
4. Parthapratiim Bandopadhyay: *Bharotiyo Choloচিত্রের Ruprekha* (in Bengali), Banishilpa, Calcutta, 1997.
5. Documentary film: *Indian Theatre*, Films Division, Government of India.
6. Sumanta Bannerjee: 'Remembering Salil Chowdhury', *Mainstream*, 16 September, 1995.
7. Jacob Srampickal: *Voice to the Voiceless—The Power of People's Theatre in India*, Manohar, New Delhi, 1994.