IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Kerala's Cinematic Saga: Art, Activism, And Festivals

Nisam Asaf K J

PhD Scholar, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi

Abstract

Kerala's film society movement, spanning six decades, wove art and activism into a vibrant cinematic tapestry, transforming Malayalam cinema and joining global film debates. This study traces its path through three eras, revealing how cinema became a communal force amid tensions of taste and access. In the 1960s and 1970s, societies like Chitralekha sparked a love for world films, fostering the Malayalam New Wave with works like *Swayamvaram*, yet faced claims of urban elitism. The 1980s saw collectives such as Odessa carry political tales like *Amma Ariyan* to villages, redefining cinema as a call for justice, though debates over artistry's role simmered. By the 2000s, festivals like IFFK and digital platforms like M Sone revived cinephilia, showcasing *Ee.Ma.Yau* and nurturing bold voices, but new divides through passes and connectivity persisted. Drawing on Pierre Bourdieu's taste framework, archival records from India's film vaults, and voices of activists and festival goers, the research shows cinema's power to unite and challenge. Kerala's story echoes global cinephilia, from Susan Sontag's theater reverence to Third Cinema's revolt, offering a postcolonial lens on film's social role. Its resilience, adapting from reels to streams, highlights a model for cultural survival, yet gaps in rural reach and women's roles urge further study. For scholars of film and culture, this saga probes how cinema bridges local lives and universal questions, pointing to new paths in digital access, gender, and global comparisons.

Keywords: film society, Malayalam cinema, cinephilia, film festival, aesthetics, activism

Introduction

On a muggy evening in 1985, a coastal village in Kerala's Thrissur district came alive with whispers of cinema. Beneath a canopy of stars, fishermen, farmers, and schoolteachers gathered on woven mats, their eyes fixed on a flickering screen. Odessa, a maverick film collective, had hauled a portable projector to this remote outpost to share Ousmane Sembène's *Black Girl*, a stark tale of postcolonial struggle. As the film ended, voices rose in debate, weaving stories of local labor disputes into the movie's themes. This was no mere screening; it was a spark of communal passion, a moment when cinema became a village square for ideas. Such scenes define Kerala's film society movement, a six-decade journey that wove art and activism into the state's cultural fabric, reshaping how Malayalees saw films and themselves. This study explores that saga, tracing a vibrant interplay of aesthetics, politics, and cinephilia that fueled Malayalam cinema's rise and echoed global debates on film culture.

Kerala, a slender coastal state in south India, thrives on a unique blend of intellectual fervor and social commitment. Its robust literacy, vibrant literary circles, and deep rooted traditions of public discourse created fertile ground for cinema to flourish beyond entertainment. Unlike urban film societies in cities like Kolkata or Mumbai, which often catered to cosmopolitan elites, Kerala's movement reached into rural hamlets, driven by a quest for what activists called good cinema. Launched in 1965 with Chitralekha Film Society in Trivandrum, founded by filmmaker Adoor Gopalakrishnan, it sought to unveil cinema's artistic depths, introducing audiences to world classics. Over time, it navigated three distinct eras: a 1960s and 1970s embrace of aesthetic mastery, a 1980s pivot to political awakening, and a 2000s revival through digital festivals. Each phase redefined cinema's purpose, balancing creative
ambition with social outreach, yet wrestling with questions of who could claim its cultural rewards.

At its core, the movement's story is one of negotiation between art's allure and activism's urgency. In its early days, societies like Chitralekha screened films such as Vittorio De Sica's *Bicycle Thieves*, sparking awe for their craft but drawing critique for favoring urban intellectuals. The 1980s brought collectives like Odessa, whose village projections of *The Hour of the Furnaces* turned cinema into a rallying cry for the marginalized, though debates flared over artistry's place. By the 2000s, festivals like the International Film Festival of Kerala showcased works like Abbas Kiarostami's *Taste of Cherry*, blending global visions with local dreams, yet new divides emerged through festival passes and digital access. This

dynamic, where cinema both united and divided, molded Malayalam cinema into a global force, nurturing filmmakers like G. Aravindan and audiences hungry for meaning over escapism.

To unravel this narrative, the study draws on Pierre Bourdieu's lens of taste, which sees cultural choices as markers of social distinction (Bourdieu 1984). Early societies crafted a hierarchy, deeming auteur films superior, a stance that empowered innovation but alienated some rural viewers. Later phases sought broader inclusion, yet festivals rekindled divisions, as attendance signaled prestige (Czach 2010). This tension mirrors global cinephilia, from Susan Sontag's ode to theater's communal glow to Thomas Elsaesser's view of festivals as modern hubs of film love (Sontag 1996; Elsaesser 2005). Kerala's rural outreach and activist roots set it apart, offering a postcolonial perspective on how cinema bridges local lives and universal questions.

The research blends two paths to capture this complexity. Archival materials, from National Film Archive of India catalogs to Chitralekha's weathered newsletters, reveal the movement's

ambitions and hurdles. Ethnographic voices, drawn from interviews with activists like V.K. Joseph and festival goers at IFFK, add lived texture, recounting moments when cinema stirred hearts or sparked disputes. Together, they paint a picture not of a singular mission but of a plural struggle, shaped by ideological clashes, technological shifts, and Kerala's cultural pulse.

This article unfolds across three sections, each delving into a phase of the movement's arc. The first uncovers the aesthetic roots of the 1960s and 1970s, where Chitralekha's urban spark spread to rural screens, birthing the Malayalam New Wave. The second dives into the 1980s, when Odessa's vision turned cinema into a tool for mass awakening. The third explores the 2000s, as festivals and digital tools revived cinephilia amid new divides. A conclusion ties these threads, reflecting on Kerala's cinematic legacy and its lessons for film culture worldwide.

Kerala's tale speaks beyond its shores. It grapples with timeless issues: who defines good cinema, who accesses it, and how it endures in a digital age. For scholars of film, culture, and media, it offers a window into a movement that married art to activism, only to confront its own contradictions. From village mats to

festival halls, Kerala's cinemas forged communities, proving film's power to connect even as it challenges.

Aesthetic Roots

In the autumn of 1965, a small theater in Trivandrum hummed with quiet excitement. Chitralekha Film Society, sparked to life by filmmaker Adoor Gopalakrishnan, unveiled Federico Fellini's *La Strada* on a flickering screen. Poets jotted lines in the dark, students whispered about its mournful glow, and clerks marveled at a story worlds apart from Kerala's usual cinema of romance and revenge. This night was a quiet revolt, a bid to show Malayalees that films could be art, not just escape. The Kerala film society movement, born in that crowded hall, spent the 1960s and 1970s chasing a dream of good cinema, one that prized beauty and craft. From urban centers to rural fringes, societies like Chitralekha, Aswini, and Chalachitra kindled a love for world films, birthing the Malayalam New Wave and reshaping how the state told its stories. Yet their passion for artistry stirred debates about who could join the feast, revealing divides that would echo for decades. This section traces those vibrant years, showing how a city spark fanned across Kerala, fueled innovation, and faced critique, using Pierre Bourdieu's lens of taste to explore a legacy both bold and fraught.

Kerala in the 1960s was a land of ideas, its air thick with debate. Known for soaring literacy and a knack for argument, the state thrived on voices clashing in village libraries or town cafes. Left wing fervor ran deep, urging art to serve the common good. But theaters mostly offered commercial films from Madras studios, tales of heroes and heartbreak that leaned on songs and stars, leaving little room for nuance. Chitralekha stepped into this gap, drawing from global tides like Soviet montage and French New Wave. Gopalakrishnan, trained at India's film institute, saw cinema as a mirror for life's depths. That first screening of *La Strada* pulled in a diverse crowd; writers hungry for new forms, workers curious about foreign lives, students eager for rebellion (Gopalakrishnan 2015). Their chatter as lights rose signaled a thirst for stories that probed reality, hinting at a cultural shift waiting to unfold.

Chitralekha's vision was clear: to nurture viewers who saw films as more than pastime. Its screenings, staged in borrowed theaters or college rooms, offered a parade of world classics. Sergei Eisenstein's *Battleship Potemkin* dazzled with its pulse of revolt, Vsevolod Pudovkin's *Mother* stirred hearts with sacrifice, Ingmar

Bergman's *The Seventh Seal* posed questions of faith and death. These works, shown on rattling 16mm reels with rough English subtitles, came from archives in Pune, embassies abroad, or India's film society network (NFAI Catalogue 1976). They brought Malayalees face to face with bold techniques like nonlinear tales, stark frames, and quiet moments etc. that broke from commercial molds. By 1970, Chitralekha counted 450 members, from schoolteachers to factory hands, each paying five rupees a year for access to this new world (Venkiteswaran 2009). Screenings turned into gatherings, followed by talks in dim libraries where people unpicked a film's craft or meaning, making cinema a shared adventure.

The urban flame soon spread, touching Kerala's towns and villages. Aswini Film Society, born in Kozhikode in 1969, shared Andrei Tarkovsky's *Ivan's Childhood* and Luis Buñuel's *Los Olvidados*, their raw edges striking chords with northern crowds. Chalachitra, started in Thrissur in 1976, brought Yasujirō Ozu's *Late Spring* and Robert Bresson's *A Man Escaped* to central Kerala's makeshift halls. Smaller groups bloomed- Pratibha in Palakkad, Navodaya in Ernakulam, Sargasangamam in Kannur- screening François Truffaut's *Jules and Jim* or Ritwik Ghatak's *Ajantrik* in places like union offices or temple grounds (Cherian 2017). By 1975, Kerala had 42 societies, outpacing bigger states despite its modest cities. This reach leaned on the state's strengths: a web of reading rooms, a love for theater, and a left wing spirit that tied culture to community, letting cinema sink roots far beyond urban limits.

Societies did more than show films; they built a culture around them. Camps mixed movies with discussion, pulling in varied faces. A 1966 gathering near Kottayam's green hills showed Satyajit Ray's *Pather Panchali*, its tale of struggle prompting farmers to share their own woes while students debated its gentle style. Novelist O.V. Vijayan spoke of cinema's lens on caste, and critic M. Govindan tied its forms to Kerala's land fights (Gopalakrishnan 2015). Chitralekha's *Film Souvenir*, a stapled booklet, carried essays on directors, snippets from critic André Bazin, and poems born of silver screens. Talks in village centers let viewers play critic, sifting Eisenstein's rhythms or Bergman's silences. These moments wove a new language, placing cinema beside books and paintings as a craft worth study, linking poets, workers, and dreamers across Kerala's patchwork of towns and fields.

The movement's greatest mark was the Malayalam New Wave, a burst of films that shook Indian cinema. Chitralekha funded Gopalakrishnan's *Swayamvaram* in 1972, a lean story of love and hardship that earned

national honors for its truth. Its nod to Roberto Rossellini's realism showed how screenings fed creators. Others joined in: K.G. George's *Swapnadanam* dug into family shadows, G. Aravindan's *Kanchana Sita* spun myth into visual verse, P.N. Menon's *Olavum Theeravum* painted village life raw, M.T. Vasudevan Nair's *Nirmalyam* wrestled with faith's end (Mohandas 2014). Made with small budgets or state aid, these films leaned on audiences shaped by societies, folks who sought stories of caste or toil over glitz. Societies shifted tastes, carving space for a cinema that spoke to Kerala's soul, loosening the hold of distant studios.

Bourdieu's idea of taste helps unpack this era's highs and lows (Bourdieu 1984). By lifting films of craft above mass fare, societies drew a line, marking some works as finer. Screening rooms became places to show savvy, where knowing terms like framing or cut set you apart. Booklets spelled out a film's artistry, giving attendees a script for prestige. But this path raised voices of doubt. Writer V.K.N. poked fun at the chase for foreign gems, calling for stories of Kerala's own fields and fights (Venkiteswaran 2009). Villagers, stumped by subtitles in English, often left screenings adrift, their schooling no match for fast words. A 1970 column in *Deshabhimani*, a left wing paper, cautioned that societies could turn elite, drifting from Kerala's rural core (Deshabhimani 1970). Later, critic C.S. Venkiteswaran mused that the rush for pure art sometimes missed the state's gritty truths, a critique that lingered as the movement grew.

The road was never smooth. Film prints cost dearly, and old projectors faltered in damp air. Rural spots, from sheds to courtyards, offered little ease, while city theaters ate funds. Societies scraped by on dues and gifts, leaving them open to pulls, left wing groups nudged for certain picks, others pushed back. A 1973 Thrissur event teetered when a faction sought its own reel (Venkiteswaran 2009). Archives tell the tale: Pune's film records list 350 titles by 1975, from Godard's *Pierrot le Fou* to Ghatak's *Subarnarekha*, a bold haul for tight means (NFAI Catalogue 1976). Activist V.K. Joseph shared memories of awe, *The Seventh Seal* hushed rooms, mixed with sighs over reaching far villages (Joseph 2016). Reji M. Damodar recalled lugging reels to dusty towns, only to find screens too small for crowds (Joseph 2016).

Yet the aesthetic push held a spark of politics. Scorning commercial films was a jab at shallow markets, echoing Kerala's left wing call for deeper culture. A 1969 Kozhikode showing of Gillo Pontecorvo's *The Battle of Algiers* drew workers who linked its defiance to their own (Gopalakrishnan 2015). A 1971 Trivandrum event with Costa Gavras's *Z* stirred talk of state power, tying art to unrest. These bridges from

screen to street fueled new societies in Kollam and Alappuzha, rooting cinema in a quest for awakening. The era's gift was a culture that made films a joint pursuit, touching writers who wove cinematic flair into verse and theater groups that borrowed its pace. But the gaps it left- between city and village, art and reach- called for a shift, as new voices demanded a cinema closer to Kerala's beating heart.

The Political Awakening

In a dusty Kerala village in 1984, John Abraham stood before a crowd, his voice crackling with defiance. A filmmaker with a poet's heart, he spoke of cinema as a weapon, one to pierce the haze of commercial dreams. His Odessa collective, born that year, was no ordinary

film society; it was a call to arms, urging Malayalees to see films as sparks for change. Its boldest act was *Amma Ariyan*, a 1986 film funded by villagers' coins, weaving a son's grief into a tapestry of political fire. Screened in paddy fields and fish markets, it drew thousands, their debates on justice spilling into the night. The 1980s marked a seismic shift for Kerala's film society movement, turning from aesthetic quests to a fierce embrace of politics. Groups like Odessa and Janasakthi carried cinema to rural and working class audiences, redefining good cinema as a cry for equity. Yet their zeal stirred clashes over art's place, as voices weighed beauty against urgency. This section delves into that awakening, tracing how Abraham's vision, rural screens, and organized networks reshaped Malayalam cinema, using Bourdieu's taste lens and global cinema debates to explore a phase of triumph and tension.

Kerala's 1980s were a cauldron of unrest. Labor strikes shook towns, students marched against state power, and left wing ideals burned bright. The film societies of the 1960s, with their love for Bergman and Ozu, began to feel distant to a generation craving action. Chitralekha's urban halls seemed too polished for a state of farmers and fishermen. Abraham, trained at India's film institute yet rooted in Kerala's soil, saw cinema as a bridge to the masses. Odessa, his brainchild, shunned formal rules, choosing chaos over order. Its manifesto scorned commercial films for clouding minds, pushing instead for stories of struggle (Odessa Pamphlet 1985). Unlike earlier societies, Odessa charged no fees, funded by local gifts and union alms. Its first screening, Govind Nihalani's *Aakrosh* in a Thrissur square, drew 600 souls like laborers, widows, and youth who saw their own fights in its tale of oppression (Shaji 2013). This was cinema unbound, a communal roar against silence.

Odessa's heart beat in rural Kerala. Its members hauled projectors to unlikely places, coastal shacks, factory yards, monsoon soaked fields, powered by noisy generators. Films came from Latin America, Africa, India's own rebels: Ousmane Sembène's *Xala* mocked elite greed, Patricio Guzmán's *Battle of Chile* charted revolt, Shyam Benegal's *Ankur* bared rural cruelty. A 1985 showing of *Xala* in Chavakkad pulled 400 viewers, sparking talk of caste and wealth that echoed local divides (Joseph 2016). *Amma Ariyan*, Odessa's crowning work, blended fact and fiction, its tale of a radical's death striking chords with audiences facing police curbs. Shown free in Palakkad's villages, it drew crowds who shared stories of loss, turning screenings into forums (Mohandas 2014). Women joined in, their voices rising on dowry and labor, though men still led most talks. These events redefined cinephilia, less about craft and more about shared anger, a space where films met life's raw edges.

Janasakthi Films, launched in 1980 with support from Kerala's Marxist party, took a different tack. Where Odessa thrived on spontaneity, Janasakthi built a disciplined web, aiming to rival commercial chains. Born after India's turbulent 1970s, it tapped a hunger for defiance, showing Soviet works like Grigori Kozintsev's *Hamlet*, Indian dramas like Mrinal Sen's *Bhuvan Shome*, and local shorts on literacy drives. Its mobile units, with sturdy 16mm gear, reached deep into Kerala; toddy shops in Wayanad, estates in Idukki, depots in Malabar. A 1983 screening of *Aakrosh* in Wayanad moved tribal workers to protest, linking the film to their land woes (Mohandas 2014). Janasakthi's Malayalam pamphlets broke down films' ideas, easing access for those daunted by English. By 1985, it ran 30 units, claiming thousands of viewers, though its top down style sometimes clashed with village grit (Venkiteswaran 2009). Together, Odessa and Janasakthi stretched cinema's reach, making it a voice for those rarely heard.

Bourdieu's taste framework reveals a shift in what counted as good cinema (Bourdieu 1984). Earlier societies prized art's finesse, but the 1980s saw politics take center stage, with films valued for stirring action. Odessa's open fields and Janasakthi's roving vans broke urban walls, challenging who could claim cinema's power. This echoed global calls, like Latin

America's conscientization, where films woke collective will (Stam 2014). Yet the pivot brought debate. Some, tied to aesthetic roots, felt works like *Amma Ariyan* leaned too raw, lacking *Swayamvaram*'s polish. At a 1986 society meeting, voices sparred; Odessa's crew called prior films elite, while others mourned lost nuance (FFSI Minutes 1986). Supporters of politics argued art alone was indulgence, pointing to

Battle of Chile's fire. These rifts mirrored divides elsewhere, from France's auteur camps to Third Cinema's militancy, showing Kerala's place in a wider storm (Majumdar 2012).

The political tide lifted Malayalam cinema, building on earlier waves. P.A. Backer's *Kabanee Nadi Chuvannappol* tackled caste and rebellion, its grit born of Odessa's spirit. K.P. Kumaran's *Athithi* probed labor's toll, Lenin Rajendran's *Veyil* bared class scars, both shaped by screening talks. Abraham's *Cheriyachante Kroorakrithyangal*, a stark jab at feudal lords, leaned on society crowds for funds and fire, its rural shows stirring unrest (Shaji 2013). These films, scraped together on thin budgets, found viewers raised on political screens, eager for truth over gloss. Critics like I. Shanmughadas gained voice, their essays in local papers framing cinema as revolt, shifting how Kerala talked about films (Shanmughadas 1987). Societies became loops, feeding makers and watchers, carving a niche for stories of margin and fight.

Archives capture the era's pulse. Society counts jumped from 42 in 1975 to 60 by 1985, with Odessa and Janasakthi driving rural growth (FFSI Report 1985). A 1984 Odessa flyer lists *Antonio das Mortes* and *Battle of Chile*, their anti-imperial bent clear. Janasakthi's logs note 200 screenings in 1983, from *Ardh Satya* to labor shorts (Janasakthi Log 1983). Voices like V.K. Joseph recalls a 1985 Ernakulam night, where *Xala* led women to plan a cooperative, while K. Ravindran spoke of trudging through rain to share films, reels soaked but spirits high (Joseph 2016). These tales show a movement alive with purpose, yet stretched by its own reach.

Hurdles loomed large. Projectors jammed, prints arrived torn, and rural power flickered, forcing costly generators. Censorship bit hard; a 1984 Calicut showing of *Battle of Chile* was banned as seditious, pushing secret viewings (Shaji 2013). Odessa's loose ways strained planning, while Janasakthi's party ties raised fears of bias. A 1987 Kollam event drew flak for Soviet picks over local tales (Venkiteswaran 2009). By the decade's end, television and video tapes crept in, pulling crowds to home screens. Doordarshan aired parallel films, and rental shops offered world cinema cheap, cutting society draw (Rao 2009). Odessa slowed after Abraham's death in 1987, and smaller groups folded, their funds dry (Mohandas 2014). The era's fire dimmed, but its mark endured.

The 1980s made cinema a people's tool, tying it to Kerala's activist soul. Debates over art and politics sharpened its edge, proving films could rally hearts. Yet the rise of video loomed, testing the movement's hold. Odessa and Janasakthi showed what cinema could do- unite, provoke, awaken- while leaving questions of balance and reach, setting a stage for a new era of screens and dreams.

Digital Revival

In 1993, a small film society in Kerala's Kollam district shuttered its doors. Dialogo, once a haven for rural crowds watching Ray and Kurosawa, stood empty, its projector silent. Across the state, video tapes were flooding homes, their cheap allure pulling viewers from society halls. Television screens glowed with Bollywood hits, and rental shops stacked Hollywood blockbusters, leaving 16mm reels to gather dust. This was the movement's darkest hour, a time when cinema's communal spark seemed lost to private screens. Yet from this crisis, Kerala's film societies forged a vibrant revival in the 2000s, blending festivals and digital tools to reignite cinephilia. The International Film Festival of Kerala led the charge, joined by smaller events like SIGNS and Montage, while platforms like M Sone opened new paths. These spaces nurtured filmmakers and critics, but fresh divides, over festival passes and digital access, tested old ideals. This section explores that rebirth, tracing a journey from loss to renewal, using global cinephilia debates and attendee voices to reveal a phase of innovation shadowed by exclusion.

Kerala's 1990s were a cultural crossroads. Urban growth brought malls and cable television, while rural areas clung to community roots. The film societies, once 60 strong, dwindled to 20 by 1995, hit hard by video's rise (FFSI Report 1995). Commercial theaters leaned on action films, leaving art cinema stranded. Into this void stepped festivals, sparked by the state's film academy in 1996. The International Film Festival of Kerala, or IFFK, began modestly in Trivandrum, screening 50 films to a few thousand. By 2005, it drew 10,000 attendees, showing 200 titles from Iran to Brazil, its Kairali theater a buzzing hub (Sreekumar 2016). IFFK's scale set it apart from India's urban fests, rooted in Kerala's love for ideas. A 2008 screening of Lee Chang dong's *Poetry* filled seats with students and drivers alike, their post film talks spilling onto city streets, proof of cinema's pull (Joseph 2016).

IFFK's growth was a cinephilic triumph. It showcased Abbas Kiarostami's *Taste of Cherry*, whose sparse beauty stunned crowds, and Nuri Bilge Ceylan's *Distant*, its quiet pain echoing local lives. African works

like Abderrahmane Sissako's *Timbuktu* tackled faith and power, tying Kerala's debates to global tides. The festival's open lawns hosted poets reciting verse inspired by Apichatpong Weerasethakul's *Uncle Boonmee*, blending art with fervor (Ravindran 2018). Unlike elite fests abroad, IFFK kept entry cheap, drawing teachers, clerks, even farmers bused in from villages. Its delegate passes, capped at 8,000 by 2010, became badges of pride, though long queues frustrated some (Sreekumar 2016). Kairali's stairs, packed with youth arguing auteurs versus politics, became a cultural stage, echoing Susan Sontag's vision of cinema as shared obsession (Sontag 1996). Thomas Elsaesser's view of festivals as cinephilia's new home rang true here, with IFFK a crossroads for local and world film love (Elsaesser 2005).

Smaller festivals bloomed, each carving a niche. SIGNS, launched in 2003 in Thrissur, focused on Indian shorts and documentaries, spotlighting works like Ritesh Batra's *Lunchbox* before its global leap. Its intimate halls fostered talks on caste and gender, drawing activists and artists (Cherian 2017). VIBGYOR, started in 2006, championed social justice films, showing *India Untouched* to packed crowds who linked its caste tales to Kerala's own divides. Montage, a Kochi event from 2008, leaned experimental, screening Jem Cohen's *Chain* and stirring debates on form versus message (Ravindran 2018). These fests, often free or low cost, spread cinema's reach, with VIBGYOR's rural tie-ins showing films in village squares. Together, they built a network, proving Kerala's hunger for diverse screens despite video's pull.

Digital tools marked the era's boldest shift. By 2010, internet access grew, and platforms like M Sone, a Malayalam streaming site, offered classics and new voices. Societies used YouTube to share talks, drawing youth who shunned old halls. A 2015 M Sone release of *Ee.Ma.Yau* reached thousands online, its dark humor sparking chats on forums (Sreekumar 2016). Yet access lagged in rural areas, where slow connections and costly data shut out many (Ravindran 2018). Digital cinema also reshaped production: Sanal Kumar Sasidharan's *S Durga*, shot on a shoestring, its raw edge born of new tech (Mohandas 2014). These tools echoed earlier leaps, from 16mm to video, showing the movement's knack for adaptation.

Bourdieu's taste lens highlights new hierarchies (Bourdieu 1984). Festivals made cinephilia a social act, but passes and prime seats favored urban elites. A 2012 IFFK attendee, a fisherman, told of waiting hours for entry, only to miss Kiarostami's slot, while city youth flashed passes (Joseph 2016). Kairali's upper tiers, packed with critics, felt worlds from ground level crowds. Digital gaps widened this; urban users streamed M Sone, but rural fans leaned on pirated DVDs, their quality poor. Liz Czach's view of festivals

as tastemakers fit here, with IFFK's curated lists shaping prestige (Czach 2010). Critics like G.P. Ramachandran thrived, their blogs parsing *Timbuktu*'s craft, but rural voices stayed mute, lacking platforms (Ramachandran 2015). These divides recalled earlier debates, showing inclusion's limits.

The revival fueled Malayalam cinema's global climb. Lijo Jose Pellissery's *Ee.Ma.Yau* and Sanal Kumar Sasidharan's *S Durga*, honed at IFFK, won international praise, their bold styles tied to festival crowds' taste for risk. Geethu Mohandas's *Liar's Dice* tackled migration, shaped by SIGNS' focus on margins. Critics grew too. Ramachandran's essays and Venkiteswaran's talks framed Kerala as a cinephilic hub, their ideas born in festival tents (Venkiteswaran 2009). IFFK's talks inspired writers to pen novels with cinematic flair, linking film to Kerala's literary pulse. Yet video's shadow lingered; by 2015, Netflix lured urban viewers, and society counts stayed flat at 30 (FFSI Report 2015). Festivals leaned urban, with rural outreach spotty, a gap activists like K. Ravindran mourned (Ravindran 2018).

Stories from the ground paint the era's texture. A 2010 IFFK viewer, a teacher, spoke of *Poetry* sparking her poetry, shared with students (Joseph 2016). A VIBGYOR regular, a laborer, linked *India Untouched* to his union work, screening clips at rallies (Ravindran 2018). Ravindran recalled SIGNS' chaos like projectors failing, crowds patient etc. showing cinema's pull (Ravindran 2018). Archives back this: IFFK logs list 1,200 films by 2015, from *A Separation* to *Winter Sleep*, a curatorial feat (IFFK Report 2015). But logs also note 30 percent of attendees were urban, hinting at skews (Sreekumar 2016). Rural societies, like one in Wayanad, folded for lack of funds, their screens dark (Cherian 2017).

Challenges persisted. Festivals faced budget woes. IFFK's 2014 edition cut films for cash, angering fans (Sreekumar 2016). Crowds strained venues, with Kairali's lines sparking fights. Digital shifts brought piracy, hurting small makers. A 2017 SIGNS film was leaked online, slashing its run (Mohandas 2014). State rules curbed bold picks like *S Durga* faced bans, echoing 1980s censorship (Ravindran 2018). Yet the era shone. Festivals and digital tools rebuilt cinephilia, tying Kerala to global currents while grounding it in local fights. The movement's knack for reinvention held firm, but urban rural gaps and pass divides posed questions for its future, as voices called for cinema open to all.

Conclusion

In December 2018, Trivandrum's Kairali theater pulsed with anticipation. The International Film Festival of Kerala was unveiling Lijo Jose Pellissery's *Ee.Ma.Yau*, a dark comedy of death and debt set in Kerala's coastal hills. As the screen lit up, fishermen in the crowd saw their own lives reflected, while city students marveled at its daring craft. When credits rolled, applause mingled with chatter; some praised its raw truth, others its global flair. This moment captured the heart of Kerala's film society movement, a six-decade journey that turned cinema into a lifeline for community and ideas. From village mats to festival halls, it weathered crises- commercial waves, video's pull, digital divides- yet thrived, reshaping Malayalam cinema and joining global film debates. This conclusion weaves together its three phases, showing how resilience drove its path, tied it to world cinephilia, and opened new questions for study, from digital access to gender and postcolonial ties.

The movement's story began in the 1960s, when Chitralekha Film Society lit a spark in Trivandrum, screening Fellini and Eisenstein to unveil cinema's artistry. It spread to rural corners, nurturing the Malayalam New Wave with films like *Swayamvaram*, but faced criticism for urban bias. The 1980s brought a bold turn, as Odessa's John Abraham carried *Amma Ariyan* to villages, making cinema a cry for justice, though debates over art's role flared. By the 2000s, festivals like IFFK and digital tools like M Sone revived cinephilia, showcasing *Taste of Cherry* and *S Durga*, yet new gaps emerged through passes and connectivity. Across these eras, one thread held firm: a stubborn will to keep cinema alive as a shared quest. Each phase faced threats like costly reels, censorship, and piracy etc. but adapted, from 16mm to streaming, proving Kerala's knack for reinvention (Cherian 2017).

This resilience was no accident. Kerala's cultural soil- literate, vocal, left wing- gave societies roots to weather storms. When videotapes gutted halls in the 1990s, festivals rose, drawing thousands to Kairali's lawns. When digital gaps loomed, filmmakers like Sanal Kumar Sasidharan turned phones into cameras, their works hitting global screens. Bourdieu's taste lens shows why: societies redefined good cinema, first as art, then politics, then communal joy, each shift dodging obsolescence (Bourdieu 1984). A fisherman's cheer for *Ee.Ma.Yau* or a poet's ode to *Poetry* showed cinema's power to bridge lives, even as divides persisted. Unlike urban fests in

Cannes or Berlin, Kerala's movement stayed tied to the ground, its crowds a mix of workers and scholars, its debates spilling beyond theaters (Sreekumar 2016).

Kerala's saga joins a global conversation on cinephilia, echoing voices from Paris to Havana. Susan Sontag mourned cinema's fade in 1996, seeing theaters as sacred, a view IFFK's packed halls defy with their living fervor (Sontag 1996). Thomas Elsaesser cast festivals as cinephilia's new stage, a role IFFK plays by blending Kiarostami with local tales (Elsaesser 2005). Latin America's Third Cinema, with its call for revolt, mirrors Odessa's 1980s fire, tying Kerala to postcolonial fights (Stam 2014). Yet Kerala stands apart, its rural reach and activist pulse offering a model for cinema as community, not just commerce. A 2015 SIGNS screening of *India Untouched* sparked village rallies, a ripple few fests match (Ravindran 2018). Liz Czach's take on festivals as taste gatekeepers fits here, with IFFK's passes signaling prestige, but Kerala's open gates push back, inviting all (Czach 2010).

The movement's mark on Malayalam cinema endures. From G. Aravindan's mythic *Kanchana Sita* to P.A. Backer's rebel *Kabanee*, societies shaped a cinema of depth, now global in reach. Pellissery's *Jallikattu* and Geethu Mohandas's *Moothon* carry this torch, their festival roots clear. Critics like G.P. Ramachandran and C.S. Venkiteswaran, honed in society talks, frames Kerala as a film hub, their words shaping how India sees regional art (Venkiteswaran 2009). Beyond screens, the movement touched Kerala's pulse; writers wove cinematic rhythm into novels, theater groups borrowed montages, and libraries hosted film clubs. A 2016 talk by V.K. Joseph recalled a Wayanad screening's spark, turning youth into activists, proof of cinema's wider wake (Joseph 2016). This legacy, born of resilience, shows film as a force for thought and change.

Yet gaps remain, pointing to paths ahead. Festivals favor urban crowds, with rural viewers often locked out by distance or data costs. A 2018 IFFK attendee, a laborer, spoke of missing *Timbuktu* for lack of a pass, a sting of exclusion (Ravindran 2018). Gender, too, calls for focus; women joined screenings, but led few societies, their voices faint in archives. Digital platforms like M Sone promise reach, but slow rural networks limit access, a divide needing study. Kerala's story also invites comparison to Senegal's film clubs, which share its rural grit, or Argentina's fests, wrestling with class. Archival gaps, like missing Odessa logs, urge new digs into oral tales or private reels (Mohandas 2014). These questions of access,

voice, and global ties offer rich ground for scholars of film, culture, and media, probing how cinema can unite or divide.

Kerala's movement teaches a core truth: cinema thrives when it's shared. From Chitralekha's first reel to IFFK's crowded stairs, it built communities, not just audiences. Its flaws- elitism, urban skews- mirror its strengths, a refusal to stand still. As digital tides rise, the movement faces new tests, but its past shows a will to adapt. For researchers, it's a lens on how film weaves art and life, local fights and world dreams. For Malayalees, it's a reminder of cinema's power, seen in *Ee.Ma.Yau*'s laughter and tears, a saga that endures.

Bibliography

Bourdieu Pierre. 1984. Distinction A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste. London Routledge.

Cherian V K. 2017. Indias Film Society Movement The Journey and Its Impact. New Delhi Sage.

Czach Liz. 2010. Cinephilia Stars and Film Festivals. Cinema Journal 49 volume 2 pages 139 to 145. https://doi.org/10.1353/cj.0.0186.

Deshabhimani. 1970. Film Societies and the Masses. Deshabhimani March 15 page 4.

Elsaesser Thomas. 2005. Cinephilia or the Uses of Disenchantment. In Cinephilia Movies Love and Memory edited by Marijke de Valck and Malte Hagener pages 27 to 43. Amsterdam Amsterdam University Press.

FFSI Minutes. 1986. Kerala Regional Meeting Notes. Trivandrum Federation of Film Societies of India.

FFSI Report. 1985. Federation of Film Societies of India Annual Report 1984 to 1985. New Delhi Federation of Film Societies of India.

FFSI Report. 1995. Federation of Film Societies of India Annual Report 1994 to 1995. New Delhi Federation of Film Societies of India.

Gopalakrishnan Adoor. 2015. Chitralekhayude Pranayapasham. Interview by C S Venkiteswaran. Mathrubhumi August 9 pages 20 to 26.

IFFK Report. 2015. International Film Festival of Kerala Annual Report 2014 to 2015.

Trivandrum Kerala State Chalachitra Academy.
Janasakthi Log. 1983. Screening Records 1983. Calicut Janasakthi Films.

Joseph V K. 2016. Chalachitra Melayum Film Societykalum. Narada News September.

http://malayalam.naradanews.com/2016/09/filmsocietymovementinkerala/.

Majumdar Rochana. 2012. Debating Radical Cinema A History of the Film Society Movement in India. Modern Asian Studies 46 volume 3 pages 731 to 767. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0026749X11000655.

Mohandas Sikha. 2014. Janasakthi Films Evide. Calicut Advait Books.

NFAI Catalogue. 1976. National Film Archive of India Film Listings 1965 to 1975. Pune National Film Archive of India.

Odessa Pamphlet. 1985. Odessa Collective Statement. Kerala Odessa Films.

Ramachandran G P. 2015. International Film Festival of Kerala. Economic and Political Weekly 50 volume 1 pages 10 to 12.

Rao Narahari editor. 2009. The Film Society Movement in India. Mumbai Asian Film Foundation.

Ravindran K. 2018. Kerala's Film Festivals. Interview by author March 15.

Shaji K N. 2013. Backer Pavithran John Kalayum Kalapavum. Malayalam Weekly May 31 pages 31 to 33.

Shanmughadas I. 1987. Cinema as Politics. Mathrubhumi June 12 pages 15 to 17.

Sontag Susan. 1996. The Decay of Cinema. New York Times February.

Sreekumar M B. 2016. Malayala Cinema Charithram. Trivandrum Chintha Publishers.
Stam Robert. 2014. Two Avant Gardes Solanas and Getino's The Hour of Furnaces. In Documenting the Documentary edited by Barry Keith Grant and Jeannette Sloniowski pages 254 to 268. Detroit Wayne State University Press.

Venkiteswaran C S. 2009. Reflections on Film Society Movement in Keralam. South Asian Popular Culture 7 volume 1 pages 65 to 71. https://doi.org/10.1080/14746680802704991.