that the people see. Films that they enjoy and films that they somehow find meaningful. They love to see these latter films usually more than once. These are the films I am interested in because my guide is the public. People may be addicted to the frivolous enjoyment -- a little sex, a little violence, a little death -- but usually they do not see the same film twice. There is no need because after they have seen one they can see another. It will be the same thing, the same formula -- eight songs/dances, what not.

Box office hits may not be really popular films. They are films that people see for fun. But the ones that people see for meaning are those I call popular. The reason why popular films are not always seen positively by academics, I believe, is because they see the film in the framework of a western theory of film as expressed by Aristotle two thousand years ago based on the great dramas of his time. I am convinced that if we want to understand the popular film we have to look at it from the point of view of the Indian subcontinent -- because two thousand years ago popular drama was not separate from high drama in the light of Indian art theory which is certainly not inferior to that of Aristotle.

I encourage film scholars here to be a little Greek oriented. If we take dramatic structure positively, perhaps we can help the film industry -- the Indian and Hindi film industry -- to do a better job. If they have to put eight songs and dances in their films at least let there be something of quality.

You have been writing on film and media for many years. During this time span massive changes have taken place, we are told of a 'revolution' in the field of communication. From *Chitrabani* to ence that revolution as a writer?

Although I am involved in the field of audio-visual, my personal medium of expression is writing. If I can put an idea well in writing I feel that I understand it to an extant. In writing a book like *Another Cinema for Another Society*, I was looking for the answer to how you would make another cinema for another society.



The process of writing is my way of learning and publishing is my way of teaching.

When I founded Chitrabani, I felt that although there were many excellent books on film, there was no book designed for Indian students. The result was my book *Chitrabani*. Later I felt that there should be a shorter edition of it for high schools that I called *Mass Communication and Man*. I felt that media education is best started at the high school level where the students are more open, receptive. So that was the beginning of my writing on film.

About ten years ago I became aware that people do not read books from start to finish as in the past, but because of the experience of reading web pages felt less inclined to read a, b, in one of my book. I did not invent that; I copied it from a French encyclopaedia. But I found it interesting that every time in the text there was a verb on which there was an article, it was underlined.

My book *Cyberbani* [2005] is not organised like a usual book. Now I am writing one that is more obviously built like the web. Eventually the text will be on the web also. It will be what you call copyleft, open source. There is a licence authorising you to copy it as often as you want as long as it is not to make business. You are also authorised when you take it to change it, make it better. Because the prevalent culture is a collaborative culture, though this is much impeded by the copyright system.

We are always told to develop a "balanced view" of the world. But in *Cyberbani* you said, "Balanced views are not the views that change the world." Would you please explain it?

There is an accepted principle that your view of the world should be a balanced view. For instance, if you tell me that the streets of Dhaka are beautiful, one can say yes but some are less beautiful. My view is that a balanced view is not for action. If you want to improve the streets of Kolkata, you cannot say there are bad streets but there are good ones so you do nothing.

For action you must target specific facts, you cannot look at all the facts at the same time. Otherwise you don't change anything. You consider the negative side and want to improve it, so then it must be an unbalanced view. For instance, so many students waste a tremendous amount of time on the web. Immediately you can say that is true but others learn a lot from the web, so keep quiet! My approach would be, since many students learn a lot from the web, why not helping those who waste time to also learn.