London as a hub of Indian\(^1\) film and television networks

Shehina Fazal*

Abstract

The paper seeks to articulate the presence of media from India - both as multinational players as well as media for the Indian diaspora communities living in the city. It attempts to analyse the implications of these global media networks in London's audio-visual economy, often referred to by policy makers as a positive influence on the city’s cultural and creative industries. The context of the paper is the significance of Indian television and film in London and the interrelated elements of how these local developments connect with the expansion of the media actors globally. Media and cultural clusters in urban systems are often the local entry points of the global media corporations.

Introduction

London has a number of South Asian diaspora communities living in the city, following the post-war migration in the middle of the 20\(^{th}\) century. South Asian cultural activities have been occurring on a regular basis in the city, with film festivals screening films from the Indian subcontinent: India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka; The Festival of India was held in London in 2007 to ensure that the country is firmly imprinted in the city as it has ‘A booming modern economy tied to a vibrant culture - India’s future matters to us all’ (Time Out-India Now booklet 2007). Furthermore, India is the second largest country investing in London, following USA; UK follows USA as a destination for overseas investments by Indian companies. (High Commission for India, London) The ‘Bollywood’ brand has entered the mainstream. There was an exhibition of Indian film posters in the Victoria and Albert museum in 2002. The Selfridges departmental store on Oxford Street in the heart of London’s shopping centre had a Bollywood season featuring products from India that were sold at inflated prices. Nitin Sawhney and A R Rahman have made major contributions to the arena of world music. The London theatre scene had the successful musical Bombay Dreams whose music was written by A R Rahman, the plot written by Meera Syal and produced by Andrew Lloyd-Webber. Awareness of the Bollywood brand has also been increased by regular Bollywood seasons on Channel 4 and more recently the controversy on Celebrity Big Brother when

\(^1\) Policy makers in the UK use the terms South Asian and Asian to label the creative and cultural industries in London that connect with the Indian subcontinent. The same labels are also used to describe people of Indian origin living in the UK.
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the Bollywood star Shilpa Shetty (now a mega-star) was a participant on the reality television show broadcast in January 2007 (Fazal, 2007). A report by Greater London Economics in 2003 states that the preceding year was a watershed for Asian culture and entertainment in London, with the release of several commercially successful films including Bend it Like Beckham (Gurinder Chadha, 2002), the musical Bombay Dreams and the Selfridges ‘Bollywood’ promotion. (Greater London Economics, 2003, p. v) In June 2007 the Yorkshire Tourist Board hosted the International Indian Film Academy Awards (IIFA), which brought many extra visitors to the region. London hosted IIFA in 2000 which increased the box office receipts for Hindi films exhibited in the city by 35 per cent.

My interest in this area began in Spring 2007 when I came across filming of a scene on a cold winter’s morning in Borough market (near London Bridge) where an actor was dancing to a Hindi film tune with Southwark Cathedral as the backdrop and a small audience who applauded some of his daring moves. This scene prompted many questions including why is London being used as a location for a Bollywood film particularly on a cold, dull and grey morning in February? This paper seeks to articulate the presence of media from India - both as multinational players as well as media for the Indian diaspora communities living in the city. It attempts to analyse the implications of these global media networks in London’s audio-visual economy, often referred to by policy makers as a positive influence on the city’s cultural and creative industries.

London as a Global and an Olympic city

London is one of the key global cities of the world where, according to the London Development Agency (LDA), it provides business and financial services to 33 per cent of European headquarters of the Global Fortune 500 companies and where 30 per cent of the worlds’ currency exchanges take place in the city, more than New York and Tokyo combined. The city’s financial success was celebrated until the financial crisis of 2008. London is also the host city for the summer Olympic Games in 2012. The mega-city is an economic powerhouse where most of the residents work in the service sectors. However, the city’s position as an economic giant hides the poverty levels particularly among ethnic minority communities in the inner city areas. (Greater London Authority, 2002) Additionally, there is also a severe shortage of ‘affordable accommodation’ for the ‘key workers’ in the city (Global Cities, Tate Modern Exhibition, 20 June to 27 August 2007). London is also the one of the largest cities among the so-called ‘developed countries’ where its total land area comprises of nearly 1600 square kilometres with the largest population in a city in the European Union.

London is often hailed as a model of successful multiculturalism in that the diversity of its population and the resultant diverse cultural spaces are available to its residents and visitors in a variety of arenas of life: restaurants, shops, cultural activities such as theatre, films and of course television among others. Such activities are used to portray the image of the city as diverse and multicultural thereby branding its ‘globalised culture’ in the global market place. London has 12 per cent of UK’s population and the 2001 census data shows that just under 30 per cent of the population of the city is considered to be from ‘Minority Ethnic Groups’ (Table 1) with 10.23 percent of the ‘Minority Ethnic Groups’ originating from the Indian subcontinent: India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka.
Table 1: Percentage distribution of ‘ethnic’ groups in London

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>71.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Chinese</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Other</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Minority Ethnic groups</td>
<td>28.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2001 Census, Office for National Statistics

These communities together with others contribute to the intellectual capital of London, which in the ‘knowledge economy’ is ‘one of the most important sources of value’. It provides knowledge, creativity and the ability to innovate. (PricewaterhouseCoopers 2005, p. 38) The intellectual capital (which encompasses social and cultural capital) is perceived to be an important asset to cities particularly in the knowledge economy frame where the population with its skills as well as knowledge makes the metropolis an attractive location on the global investment stage.

Saskia Sassen in her analysis of global cities says that the urban centres like London were at the heart of industrial production and have now become hubs of finance and service industries. Additionally, Sassen (2002) notes that economic globalization should extend from the ‘duality of national-global where the global gains power and advantages at the expense of the national’ (p.161). She goes on to say that the conceptualization of the global has been based predominantly on ‘the internationalization of capital and then only the upper circuits of capital, notably finance’ (p.161). The proposition here is that we should move away from the nation-global duality to one where cities become sites of analysis which would ‘allow us to reconceptualise processes of economic globalization as concrete economic complexes situated in specific places’ (p.161). Sassen gives reasons for promoting the idea of a ‘place’ in the analysis of the global economy:

Because it allows us to see the multiplicity of economies and work cultures in which the global information economy is embedded. It also allows us to recover the concrete, localized processes through which globalization exists and to argue that much of the multiculturalism in large cities is as much part of globalization as is international finance. (p.161)

Pointing to the global grid of cities such as New York, Los Angeles, Paris, London and Tokyo, Sassen (2002) says that in the economic globalization process these cities have also become places where inward migration has resulted in ‘transnationalization of labour’. The resultant spaces in these cities are the ‘new economic and political potentialities’ and where future formulations of ‘transnational identities and communities’ takes place (Sassen 2002, p.169). These spaces consist of capital as well as people that include the affluent, professional workers as well as poor, migrant workers. In many cases such spaces have become sites of postcolonial communication. And within the postcolonial communication frame there are now new actors in cities who are claiming spaces. These new players are the international corporations who ‘have been
increasingly entitled through the deregulation of the national economies, and the increasing number of international business people’ who are changing the urban landscape. The space claims made by these new players are rarely questioned. As Sassen (2002) states:

Globalization is a process that generates contradictory spaces, characterized by contestation, internal differentiation, continuous border crossings. The global city is emblematic of this condition. Global cities concentrate a disproportionate share of global corporate power and are one of the key sites for its valorization. But they also concentrate a disproportionate share of the disadvantaged and are one of their key sites for their devalorization. (p.170)

Likewise, Elizabeth Currid (2006) puts forward the proposition from her work on New York as a global creative hub, where cultural production among the ‘creative class’ is equally important in the global economic process. Stressing on the ‘vibrancy’ and ‘diversity’ expressed by the occupations in the creative sector, Currid states that they contribute directly and indirectly to other sections of the creative sectors such as marketing and advertising, and of course, tourism. The city of New York ‘has always been a hotbed of creative and intellectual breakthroughs, driven by creativity and talent’ (Currid, 2006, p. 333). It is therefore, not surprising to note that in October 2008 the New York City (NYC) mayor Michael Bloomberg invited ‘Bollywood’ film directors and producers to use the city as a location as well as a base following the success of films such as Kal Ho Naa Ho/Tomorrow May or May Not Be (Nikhil Advani, 2003) and Kabhi Alvida Naa Kehna/Never Say Goodbye (Karan Johar, 2006) where NYC was a key location. Using cities as locations for films boosts tourism and enhances income to services located in these centres. Martin-Jones (2006) analysing the film Pyaar, Ishq aur Mohabbat (Rajiv Rai, 2001) which was filmed in Scotland explains that the film while using “Scotland’s recognisable tourist locations” thereby portraying Scotland as a tourist destination, the film also makes use of other locations in the country to represent the ‘NRI (Non-Resident Indian) identity as part of the global Indian middle class’.

In a similar vein Krätke (2003) elucidates the role of the cultural industries where they influence organisational changes as well as labour relations, work patterns and marketing of new products that increasingly have smaller cycles. Such changes have already been observed in Information Technology, and Kratke (2003) claims that the cultural industries can become:
a prototype of future organised forms of social labour in that it produces new urban industries that go far beyond the confines of the old urban industries (such as printing and publishing trade). The consequence of this is the formation, especially in large cities and metropolises, or urban clusters of cultural production, which account for a considerable share of the regional economy, and reveal strong intraregional and supraregional networks of inter-firm transactions. (p.606)

Such changes have impacted on notions of cultural spaces in cities. Amin (1997) discusses the idea of the ‘multiplex city’ where there is fragmentation and claims the author ‘is in part the product of globalization’. The world cities do not have a ‘unitary identity’ or notions of ‘homogenous spaces’. The fragmentation is verified in the loss of close geographical links. As Amin (1997) writes of cities and globalization:

Areas exist where neighbours do not know each other and tend to relate through telematics and automobiles with friends and relatives across the city and further afield. Adjacent firms in many business parks have no linkages but remain tied into distant circuits of corporate exchange. And cultural exchange in most residential areas in now perhaps more technically mediated than through face-to-face interactions via television, the Internet and other global communications systems. (p.131)

The concept of connected urban spaces is a vital one and should not be readily dismissed. Appadurai (1990) proposes that the ‘disjunctures’ that exist between economy, culture and politics need to be examined within five aspects of global flows: ‘ethnoscapes, mediascapes, financescapes, technoscapes and ideoscapes’. The ‘mediascapes’ and ‘ideoscapes’ portray a mixture of the ‘world of commodities’ and the ‘world of “news” and politics’ that have become enmeshed and therefore, make it somewhat difficult for the audiences to distinguish between reality and fiction particularly if they are geographically far away and hence encourages fantasies of such worlds. Appadurai (1990) states that:

the new global cultural economy has to be understood a complex, overlapping, disjunctive order, which cannot any longer be understood in terms of existing center-periphery models (even those that might account for multiple centers and peripheries) (p. 296).

The policy makers in the 1980s and the 1990s flaunted the creative industries as areas of potential growth and employment in the megacities. However, there was very little public funding that was made available to them. The multinational corporations began to outsource production to their subsidiaries in countries with lower labour costs. This strategy enabled the multinational corporations to lower costs as well as enter nascent markets of India and its diaspora communities scattered across the globe (Pathania-Jain, 2001).

**London as a media-hub**

London is a media-rich city where 99.9 per cent of Londoners come across a variety of media every day. Thirty one per cent of London’s population have registered on
Facebook as London users. Londoners have access to commercial television in the form of ITV London (Carlton and LWT) but the residents of the city are generally light viewers of television. (The Guardian, 17 March 2008) Londoners have a wide variety of choices in their media consumption and are therefore, specifically targeted by advertisers in a variety of campaigns. London is often labelled as the creative capital of the UK where the creative industries is the second largest sector following the financial and business services, with an annual turnover of £21 billion (Greater London Authority Economics, 2007).

In terms of employment, the creative and cultural industries employ over half a million people in the capital and it is said that one in five new jobs in the city are in this emerging sector. The London Development Agency’s research shows that the growth rate of 4.5 per cent may prove to be sustainable in the medium term. Other lucrative sectors of the creative and cultural industries are the music industry with a turnover of £1.5 billion annually and the city captures around 50 per cent of the country’s overall market. The theatres in London generate around £450 million from box office receipts.

In film and television there are 1100 independent production companies in the UK and around 700 of these, including most of the larger ones are located in London. The turnover by the UK’s independent producers was £1.5 billion in 2003. Well over half of the workforce in radio and television are in London, resulting in around 25,000 employees who are based in the city. London is also a key site of film production after New York and Los Angeles. Nearly 73 per cent of post-production occurs in the city and nationally it has nearly two-thirds of the jobs in the film industry. A substantial sector of the games industry is based in London and the South East, and a third of TIGA’s members (the trade association that represents the interests of games developers in the UK and Europe) are based in London.

The organisation, Think London which facilitates inward investment to London, describes the city as the ‘World’s Media Centre’ where well known broadcasting companies have their offices - Disney, News International, Pearson, Reed, Time Warner and Viacom. Key players in interactive television include Telewest, NTL, Freeview and BSkyB. The television networks sector in the city includes BBC, ITV, ITN, Channel 4 and Channel 5 as well as Paramount Comedy Channel, CNBC, BSkyB, CNN, QVC and MTV Europe. The city with ‘film friendly labour laws, flexible shooting hours and inexpensive transportation are fundamental to the London scene’ is marketed as an attractive location for films. (‘London - World’s Media Centre’ leaflet from Think London at www.thinklondon.com)

London’s Fleet Street was also a key hub of the national print industry until 1986, when News International sacked around 5000 workers to restructure the organisation and to introduce new technologies in the production of newspapers. This resulted in a formidable dispute between the print unions and the newspaper management that radically changed the newspaper industry in the UK. Additionally, the newspaper hub in Fleet Street disappeared to disparate locations throughout the city, including News International’s move to Wapping in the Docklands area (Tunstall, 1996).
Cities as media hubs of the diaspora

Echoing notions of global cities, Michael Curtin discusses the idea of ‘media capitals’ where attention is on the influence of the media products that are crossing national boundaries. Curtin (2003) proposes that we should shift the focus of attention of study in transnational television from nations to media capitals. Additionally, he states that a number of studies point ‘us to see the nation as an important but not sufficient site of media analysis.’ (p.204). Curtin’s argument for the notion of media capitals is that they are located in a complex juncture of social, cultural and economic flows. The idea of using media capital as a site of analysis is that it ‘is a nexus or switching point rather than a container’ (p. 204). This proposal of a shift from national boundaries to ‘media capitals’ means that the nation has been replaced by urban centres, and the latter have become sites of analysis. Media produced in one city are consumed in many cities, particularly where the diaspora inhabit. Coining the term ‘media capital’, Curtin (2003) describes ‘capital as centre of activity and capital as a concentration of resources, reputation and talent’ (p.205). Curtin (2003) writes:

Media capitals, then, are sites of mediation, locations where complex forces and flows interact. They are neither bounded nor self-contained entities......capital status can be won and lost, and the term itself evokes both senses of the word: capital as a centre of activity and capital as a concentration of resources, reputation and talent. Media capitals are places where things come together and consequently, where generation and circulation of new mass culture forms become possible’ (p.205).

Citing Miami in Florida, Sinclair (2003) describes the city as the ‘Hollywood of Latin America’ which he claims plays a fundamental role as the ‘geolinguistic region of the Americas for the production and distribution of television (not film) with synergistic links to the music and convergent communications industries’. (p.226) The reason for Miami’s supreme positioning is not because of its geography as the bridge between two continents, explains Sinclair, but that it is due to historical reasons and the inward migration to Miami that has impacted upon the demography and linguistic composition of the metropolis which has subsequently resulted in Miami being described as the ‘cosmopolitan Latin city within the United States’. (p. 226) Inward migration in the metropolis has resulted in the fusion of cultures that has made the city attractive to global media companies keen to exploit the economic and geographical position of Miami in the production and distribution of television programmes. Additionally, Miami has also become the centre for ‘Latin American and Latin-influenced cross over music’ (p.212) that has drawn companies like MTV Latino (owned by Viacom) as well as internet companies and Telefonica from Spain that has interests in telecommunications and television markets in the region.

Concerning politics of representation in cities, Georgiou (2006) examined two multicultural locations Haringey in London and Astoria, Queens in New York city and found that the working class ‘are at the bottom of the hierarchy when it comes to controlling global and national politics.’ (p.292) Georgiou discusses the idea of ‘urban creativity’ which results from the enmeshing of ‘cultural repertoires’ that are not represented in the mainstream culture. This cultural creativity baffles policy makers somewhat in terms of the significance of the resultant ‘hybrid’ products.
Georgoiu’s contemporary study provides some parallels to Karim (2003) who discusses the different ways in which the people relate to ‘landscapes’ that challenge the traditional notions of identity premised on territory. Global mobility defies national borders despite the ‘fortress’ mentality and the diaspora communities seek to develop their ‘transnational spaces’ in the global cities. Transnational media like the news agencies of the 19th century carved out world territories that were directly ‘linked to the configuration and exercise of power’ (p.7). Within this colonial context, London was the imperial capital and therefore, the centre while others were on the periphery. However, with the changes underway, does it mean that those that were once on the periphery are moving slowly to the centre, particularly in the context of transnational media companies that are carving out cultural spaces in the emerging markets like India and China and their diaspora who live in the megacities? Do such developments bring about changes in the configuration of power? These questions have to be explored in the context of what makes London an attractive film location and importantly, the contribution of Indian film and television to the creative economy of London.

**London as an Indian Film and TV Hub**

London as mentioned above has been described as the ‘world media centre’ by Think London, the body that facilitates inward investment into the city. The Greater London Authority’s 2003 report entitled Play It Right: Asian Creative Industries in London, describes the role of Asians in the creative and cultural industries of the city:

> The Asian presence within London’s creative industries is perceived to be a key asset, with the potential to improve the competitiveness of the sector, and forge and sustain unique links between London and several of the world’s fastest growing economies, including India and China (p. v).

Such perceptions have translated into the India Festival in 2007 and the opening of ‘The London India Office’ in Mumbai later that year. In 2008, the city hosted events as part of the China in London season, timed to coincide with the Beijing Olympics year while the Greater London Authority had a presence in China with offices in Beijing and Shanghai. The Greater London Authority’s report claims that although Asians are playing a leading role in London’s cultural and creative industries, this is disproportionately represented in fashion (20 per cent), arts and antiques (18 per cent) and software services (17 per cent), while there is under-representation in the rest of the sector. The report goes on to state that this imbalance will change not only because of demographic transformation, but also due to the attractiveness of the creative industries to the younger South Asians in search of employment. The following section describes the activities of Hindi cinema as well as public service and transnational television services.

**Film: Hindi cinema and ‘crossovers’**

The famous sites of London have often been used as backdrops that have provided additional dimensions branding the city for tourists from the Indian subcontinent. For example, films like Bend it Like Beckham (Gurinder Chadha, 2002), Kabhi Khushi Kabhi Gham/Sometimes Happiness Sometimes Sadness (Karan Johar, 2001) which showed the British Musuem, Tower Bridge, Butler’s Wharf and Heathrow airport, Dilwale Dulhania Le Jayenge/ We will take the bride away (Aditya Chopra, 1995) had an open bus tour with a variety of landmarks in the city and Bhagam Bhag/ Helter Skelter
(Pryadarshan, 2006) showed the Big Ben, Houses of Parliament and Tower Bridge. In 2005, 35 films were filmed in the London Borough of Westminster. Movie Maps managed by England Marketing have been so successful in branding UK locations of Hindi films that a map featuring several locations for the movies has been developed to attract tourists to the UK from the Indian subcontinent (www.visitbritain.co.in). Potential visitors from India are also reminded of the exhibition at Madame Tussauds in London where Hindi cinema stars like Shah Rukh Khan, Aishwarya Rai, Salman Khan and Amitabh Bhachan can be seen face-to-face.

Hindi popular cinema /Bollywood has made a spectacular entry into UK’s film sector. According to the UK Film Council’s Statistical Yearbook, 63 films from India were released in the UK, compared to 107 UK films in 2006. UK is the largest market for Hindi films beyond India and of the 63 Indian films released in the UK in 2007-08, 52 were in Hindi with the top performing title Om Shanti Om (Farah Khan, 2007) followed by Namastey London (Vipul Shah, 2007). The box office figures indicate that Indian films grossed £14.6 million (1.6 per cent of the UK box-office share) in 2007 down from £15.6 million in 2006-07 when films like Kabhi Alvida Naa Kehna (Karan Johar, 2006), Don (Farhan Akhtar, 2006) and Fanaa (Kunal Kohli, 2006) were released. Films made in India are realising 20-30 per cent of their revenues from exports. Other income comes from cable and satellite television, Internet, as well as DVD rentals, CDs and merchandising. (UNESCO, 2005) The bigger markets for Indian films are the countries where the Indian diaspora reside such as USA, UK and the Middle East.

The market share of films from India exhibited in the UK, although relatively small has seen fractional increases over the last few years. (Table 2) USA dominates the market share followed by films from the UK, while films from Europe, India and the rest of the world have significantly smaller market shares.

| Table 2 Market share of films exhibited in the UK by country of origin |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
|           | 2003 (%)  | 2004 (%)  | 2005 (%)  | 2006 (%)  | 2007 (%)  |
| USA       | 81.6      | 73.2      | 63.1      | 77.1      | 67.7      |
| UK        | 15.7      | 23.4      | 33.0      | 19.1      | 28.5      |
| Europe    | 0.9       | 0.6       | 1.6       | 1.2       | 1.8       |
| India     | 1.0       | 1.1       | 1.5       | 1.8       | 1.6       |
| Rest of the World | 0.8 | 1.8 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.5 |

Source: UK Film Council - RSU Statistical Yearbook, 2007/08.

The companies that distribute Indian films include two majors - Eros International and Yash Raj Films, both have offices in Greater London. Other distributors include Film India Company and UTV Communications, ADLABS Films and Artificial Eye. Screening of South Asian films occurs mainly in town or city centres and suburban areas where the population lives. In 2007 the proportion of town or city centre screenings of South Asian films was 80 per cent, significantly up from 44 percent in 2006. The rise could be attributed to the increasing number of multiplex cinemas that are owned by major cinema operators showing South Asian films. According to Dodona Research and
Research and Statistics Unit of the UK Film Council, 80 per cent of South Asian films were screened in London, followed by 20 per cent in the East Midlands in 2007.

The number of Hindi films screened in UK is likely to grow with India’s entry into the transnational economy. In December 2005, the governments of India and UK signed an agreement to work together on the availability of film-making facilities, suitably skilled work force and locations for filming. This agreement will enable both India and the UK to collaborate ‘creative, artistic, technical, financial and marketing resources’ for future film and television productions. Additionally, this bilateral agreement facilitates tax breaks offered by the UK government, provided the co-production meets the criteria of the film qualifying as British. This criteria on the UK Film Council’s website states that for films to qualify as British and therefore, UK’s tax relief system have to be ‘one of UK’s official bi-lateral co-production treaties’ or be part of the ‘European Convention on Cinematic Co-production’ or meet the ‘Cultural Test (Schedule 1 to the Films Act, 1985)’. The negotiations under this agreement were successfully completed in May 2008 and it is expected that 10 Indian-UK co-productions will be made within the first two years. Additionally, UK Trade and Investment is running several workshops for Indian filmmakers interested in co-productions (www.culture.gov.uk, accessed 20 May 2008).

**Television**

In the late 20th century, public service terrestrial television network in the UK was mandated to provide multicultural programming in Britain. In the early 21st century, the public service remit of ‘culture and other diversity’ in the Communications Act (2003) is stated in very broad terms where Section 264(4) states that public service broadcasters should deal with a wide range of subject matters that meet the needs of different communities and cultural interests and traditions within the UK.

Programming for South Asians on British television began in the 1950s, with the Asian Club (BBCTV, 1953-61) which was a studio discussion programme broadcast live and aimed at the viewers from the Commonwealth who were living in Britain. Lobbying by the Campaign Against Racial Discrimination who made the case for diversity in programming resulted in two programmes: Apna Hi Ghar Smahiye/Make Yourself at Home (BBC1) and Nai Zindagi, Naya Jeevan/New Life (BBC, 1968-1982). Both of these programmes were part of the public service remit that was based on the premise of integration and assimilation (Malik, 2002). Within the frame of integration, other programmes like Look, Listen and Speak (BBC, 1977) and Parosi (BBC, 1978) were designed to provide information on integration, particularly concerning food and dress. These programmes were created to assist Asians who were perceived to need more help than African Caribbeans who were thought to need less assistance. (Malik, 2002) In 1977 Gharbar/Household (BBC, 1977-1987) was launched and targeted predominantly at Asian women and discussed issues of health, marriage, housekeeping, hygiene as well as career advice and Nai Zindagi was relaunched as Asian Magazine (BBC, 1982-87).

There were programmes that were also broadcast on commercial television that had public service requirements as part of their licence. Some of these programmes include Here Today, Here Tomorrow (ATV/ITV, 1978-79), Here and Now (Central TV/ITV) and Babylon (LWT/ITV, 1979) and in the 1980s the London Weekend Television set-up the London Minorities Unit that made Skin (LWT, 1980). Channel 4 was launched in 1982 and had the first commissioning editor for multicultural programmes. The channel
was influential in providing Black and Asian spaces on a regular basis on British television. However, the overall trajectory of programming for African Caribbean and South Asian viewers on public service television has been patchy. Despite the patchy output, a few memorable shows have appeared on BBC TV which includes Goodness Gracious Me (BBC, 1998-2001) originally a radio show translated to television and Kumars at No.42 (BBC, 2001-06) the comedy chat-show. The latter has been broadcast in Asia on the Star World Satellite TV as well as Australia, New Zealand, USA, Canada, Sweden Netherlands and Switzerland. Attempts to include Asian families in mainstream soap operas like EastEnders (BBC, 1985-) have been mired in controversy on issues concerning authenticity. For example, casting of an Asian family in EastEnders in 2005 would have been more realistic if it was a Bangladeshi family rather than the Ferreiras – a Goan family who were subsequently removed due to a large number of complaints. Mukti Jain Campion (2006) states that research over the last 20 years has shown that ‘ethnic minority’ audiences look for ‘authentic representation to which they can relate’. Realistic representations engage South Asian viewers more than having an extra in a comedy show or a presenter on the evening news. Mukti Jain Campion (2006) writes:

The casting-quota approach largely treats people from minorities as being interchangeable and they often find themselves competing with each other. Few parts played by minority actors are culturally specific, but even when there is an attempt by white writers to acknowledge the cultural background of an ethnic minority character, it rarely rings true. So cultural diversity of perspectives remains rare and is largely restricted to issue-led stories, particularly about race or religion, which usually portray ethnic minorities as problematic (p.71).

The public service consultation by the Office of Communications (OFCOM) has shown that ‘ethnic minority’ audiences turn to satellite digital channels and the Internet followed by the public service channels. In other words, viewing of public service television channels is a small part of the overall viewing among ‘ethnic minority’ groups. (OFCOM, 2008) Given the above scenario it is therefore, not surprising that South Asian viewers who can pay, tune into pay television services. London hosts several transnational cable and satellite companies. There are channels for Chinese viewers, services that broadcast in Arabic, Farsi and Japanese. The cable and satellite channels for the South Asian viewers include: Bollywood For You (B4U) Network Europe, Sun TV UK, New Delhi Television (NDTV) Ltd, Sony Entertainment Television (SET) and Zee TV to name a few.

The Sun TV Network (formerly known as Sun television) is a regional Tamil language cable television network, based in South India. Established in the early 1990s, Sun TV covers South India as well as many parts of the world where the South Indian diaspora live. Sony Entertainment Television began to establish itself in the Indian market through a film channel. This meant that Sony needed a large library of films which the corporation has acquired over the years. Zee TV (UK) was launched in the UK in 1995 as the first Asian channel to be launched as a satellite channel. Additionally, Zee also broadcasts a news bulletin on weekdays which provides ‘analysis from an Asian perspective’. Zee has been extremely successful among South Asian viewers in the UK (Dudrah, 2002)

Having provided an overview of the activities in the city that relate to Indian film and television, the policy decision by the Department of Media, Culture and Sport which encourages Indian film companies to use the city as a film location, the section below
provides analysis of the relationship between the transnational media companies mentioned above and the South Asian diaspora communities living in London. The discussion focuses on India’s repositioning in the global marketplace and how this impacts upon the cultural products emanating from the country, the disenchantment of diaspora communities with public service television and the network of ‘media capitals’ that links London with Mumbai and Delhi, cities where its residents have more in common with each other than their compatriots living in the rural areas.

**London as South Asian creative and cultural hub**

In media and cultural studies the ‘peripheral vision’ thesis countered the media and cultural imperialism critique in the mid-1990s by stating that the ‘peripheral centres’ were connecting with diaspora communities as well as other regions by providing content (Sinclair, Jacka and Cunningham, 1995). Additionally, Dan Schiller in his ‘digital capitalism’ thesis leads us to the idea that transnational media corporations will dominate the periphery countries through alliances of the global companies with the local entrepreneurs and the resulting content will be aimed at the urban residents with a high spending power (Schiller, 1999). In making a case for reappraisal of transnational companies aiming for global media markets, Keane (2006) provides a five-part framework which can be used to assess the growth models in the emerging economies. These five areas are: low-cost outsourcing, cloning, co-productions, multiple-channels and media capitals. In this framework, Keane (2006) argues that media and cultural studies should shift away from the ‘fascination with the powerful West’ and that it is important to learn from the ‘emerging sites of production in East Asia’ (p.852). Further, Keane (2006) says that it is important to explore ‘the effects that the new competition from these centres will have on international production and flows of audio-visual content’ (p.852)

To understand the role of London as a hub for Indian film and television, the paper uses the framework proposed by Keane (2006) to explain the growth and expansion of the Indian creative and cultural sector in the city. The paper employs three aspects of Keane’s (2006) framework: (1) co-productions and franchises (cultural technology transfer), (2) multiple channels (niche markets) and (3) media capitals (creative/industrial cluster). Further, the paper provides an overview of how each helps to explain London’s status as the hub for Indian film and television.

- **Co-productions and franchises (cultural technology transfer)**

India’s entry into the transnational economy has resulted in recasting the nation’s image on the global landscape. The industrialisation of the cinema industry in India in 2000 has changed the structure of the Hindi film industry in that it has developed corporate structures that attract international as well as domestic investors. This trend in corporatisation continues and in 2006, more than half the films released in India were produced by corporations. (FICCI-PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2007) Within the frame of corporatisation the producers are looking at overseas markets. In 2007, the Government of India announced that it wanted to double its share of two per cent of the global film industry. (Johnson, 2007) This forecast will be helped by the joint agreement that was completed in May 2008 when the governments of India and UK agreed to work together on the availability in each country of film-making facilities, skilled work force and film locations. It is predicted that 10 India-UK co-produced films will be made in the next two years.
The agreement between India and UK on co-producing films goes beyond issues of cultural technology transfer. There are financial as well as cultural gains to be made from the UK-India film co-productions (Martin-Jones, 2006). Using two Hindi films Kuch Kuch Hota Hai (Karan Johar, 1998) and Pyaar Ishq aur Mohabbat (Rajiv Rai, 2001) Martin-Jones states that on the one hand Scotland is being sold as a tourist destination in these films and on the other ‘Bollywood is taking advantage of international location shooting to target the lucrative diaspora, whilst also retaining its appeal to the Indian market’ (p.58). The Indian market consists of the middle class which are predicted to grow from 50 million in 2005 to 583 million in 2025. Likewise, the spending power of the Indian middle class is expected to grow from 17 trillion rupees in 2005 to 70 trillion rupees in 2025 (Beinhocker, Farrell and Zainulbhai 2007).

- **Multiple channels (niche markets)**

The mid-1990s witnessed the expansion of Indian television with the entry of satellite channels in the global marketplace. The expansion of television in the national context impacted on the global repositioning of India as an exporter of television programmes. In 2006, television accounted for 45 per cent of the Indian entertainment and media industry’s share and this figure is predicted to rise by a further 6 per cent to reach over 51 per cent by 2011. (FICCI-PricewaterhouseCooper, 2007) The key drivers will be the pay-TV revenues that the Indian television industry anticipates will grow in the next few years. This optimistic forecast is based upon the buoyant Indian economy, where television penetration into the rural areas will be a significant development. In the international frame, India is set to re-position itself for a share of the global television market through exports of content to the Indian diaspora communities. The evidence for this trajectory is the success of satellite channels that show content from ‘homeland’ to the diaspora communities. In the UK, OFCOM’s second public service broadcasting review has shown that ethnic minority communities prefer to watch the pay-per-view services that show programmes from the Indian sub-continent than the public service channels. Thus viewing of public service television channels is secondary among ‘ethnic minority’ groups. (OFCOM, 2008) Such a scenario warns Dudrah (2002) can lead to exclusive identities that are reinforced via the growth of transnational channels that provide niche programmes to the diaspora communities.

- **Media capitals (creative/industrial cluster)**

The choice of television channels afforded by the transnational television companies may offer sites of resistance to the dominant culture and therefore, become spaces of empowerment for the Indian diaspora communities. Within the context of the Indian film industry, the diaspora communities are seen as markets for the globalisation of the Hindi film industry as well as an essential part of the imaginary of the Hindi cinema. In terms of the audience, Martin Albrow’s essay published over a decade ago explains the impact of globalization on the daily lives of residents in London boroughs. Using Tooting a locale in south west London in the London Borough of Wandsworth, Albrow (1997) says that the diverse cultures, lifestyles and social networks are ‘socioscapes’ in the borough that consist of shifting social relationships impacted by the global cultural flows. These shifting social relationships could be an indicator of the activities in the spaces of transnational identities proposed by Sassen (2002) and mentioned earlier.

On the other hand, the Greater London Authority and the Department of Media, Culture and Sport views the activities of the Indian film and television scene in London
as one where the creative cluster brings inward investment and increases jobs in the city as well as tourism revenues. Such a development requires less public sector funding. The success of London as a creative city is attributed to its recent wider economic success. Creative industries are one of the drivers of the city’s economic status and in the city’s ambition to become a global ‘creative broker’, attention has shifted away from supporting smaller businesses or provide training to marginal groups to one where it attracts and facilitates foreign direct investment from global companies. (Knell and Oakley, 2007)

Conclusion

This paper has attempted to map the activities of Indian film and television in the capital city of London. It has sought to articulate the presence of media in India in the city which serves the South Asian communities whilst fulfilling the transnational media corporations’ search for bigger markets. The governments of India and UK have grasped the potential of Indian media-particularly film and its role in boosting tourism and trade. It seems that transnational television’s success in the city in part is due to lack of authentic representations of South Asians on public service television in the UK. The activities within the film and television industries have resulted in a creative cluster that is beginning to make a contribution to the audio-visual economy of London. These dynamic relationships are now part of the urban experience that need to be recorded, particularly with globalisation making a major impact upon lifestyles and consumption patterns of metropolitan life.
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