Punyawati Journal
Volume 2, 2026
DOI: https://doi.org/10.3126/punyawati.v2i1.90244 ISSN: 3059-9652 (Print), 3059-9660 (Online)

Political Transition, Structural Challenge and Institutional Reform Practices of Nepalese Film History

Dinesh Raj Dahal[1]

1. Executive Chairperson, Film Development Board, Nepal

Abstract

Hollywood Cinemas are knotted to capitalism and becoming part of western identity whereas Bollywood Cinema often showed middle-class national feelings. In this context, this study assessed political transition, structural challenge and institutional reform practices of Nepalese film history. This study used library based historical research design and my personal reflections to assess past events and present institutional developments practices. The study brought theoretical insights from neo-Marxist political economy, historical institutionalism and cultural institutionalism for interpreting research issues

The study find that early Cinema appeared like something just for the upper class, not something everyone shared. After a moment, Cinema began showing outside the public places and it became part of the Nepalese society and culture. During the Panchayat era, there was a censorship, filmmakers had to be underhand, using stories from myths or social issues. After democratic era, Nepali Cinema got technical support from India and also started mounting investment by the private sectors. During Maoist insurgency, Cinema started focused on specific socio-cultural issues and reaching out globally through streaming platforms. During the second flight, Cinema started mixing commercial fun with independent work, regional stories with investment support of private sector. Local tales and social issues centered narratives diffused in global market that built national history of identity politics.

The study concludes that history of Nepali Cinema has been shaping by instable politics, global industries and modernization. However, Nepal Film Development Board has been actively playing institutional advocacy role to change political economy of the film industry. It can perform better to generate national economy. Therefore, the federation needs to endorse new Film Act and get the pending laws passed right away. New Act must set up a clear framework for transparent foreign direct investment policy with attractive grants. Provincial governments need to make their own film policies to mobilize unique landscapes and culture. They need to set up provincial film offices, to help with local shooting, logistics, and grants for ethnographic narrations. Likewise, at municipal level, there is a need for rapid permitting system that is transparent and cheap for local shoots. They must offer token of grants to the producers and build community screening halls to celebrate local film festivals.

Keywords: Social media, agricultural information, subsidies, digital adoption, Nepal

Manuscript Received	Final Revision	Accepted
22 October, 2025	24 January, 2026	28 January, 2026

*D.R. Dahal (dinesdc@gmail.com)

1. Introduction

Cinema mixes art, industry, politics and society in modern cultural forms. National Cinemas of any particular country follow government rules and regulations to set up Cinema industry and cultural politics that affect making, showing, and watching Cinemas. However, Hollywood makes other country compete, copy, or find their own way to develop national Cinema (Moran, 1996). Hollywood itself built up not just for money-making but as something cultural that tied into modernizing schools, government, and other institutions to become part of western identity (Decherney, 2005). This strength came from economic changes and then adapted later in the post-classical time (Keil & Stamp, 2004; Langford, 2010). Since then such economic changes knotted to capitalism (McMahon, 2022). So Hollywood turned into this standard that everyone else has to deal with, figuring out their own spot, like Rosen pointed out in 1996.

In places after colonialism, making a national Cinema means dealing with identity and independence too. India is a prominent example, with Bombay turning into Bollywood. It has its own identity in global market. Bollywood became producer-driven and mixed with government, culture, policies and politics (Rajadhyaksha, 2009). Popular Cinemas often showed a kind of middle-class national feeling with rising Hindu nationalism (Deshpande, 2007). Then Bollywood went global by changing companies and focusing on audiences abroad, which shifted how films are made and sold (Punathambekar, 2013). It is this back and forth between state, market, and culture, where Cinema might quietly change social ideas about an invisible reformation (Chakrabarti & Sarkar, 2025). Bollywood also get censored by rules pushing majoritarian views that shows how a big commercial Cinema that keeps negotiating in Hollywood's shadow (Gill, 2017).

In Nepal, history of national Cinema fits into own bigger picture. Politically, the country went through rampant ups and down. In the beginning, Panchayat system using films for propaganda, to opening up in the 90s with democracy, and then dealing with the Maoist war and becoming a federal republic after. Still, compared to Hollywoods market push or Bollywoods state-market mix, development path of national Cinema is different (Ghertman & Hadida, 1999). Nepal has had big problems, no real ongoing film policy from the government, not much help for making or keeping films, Indian movies taking over the market, and always fighting for cultural respect and money to survive. Beyond doubt, the story of Nepali Cinema is really about how its institutions never fully got set up, and it is always contested. This study thus, assess political shifts and the

ongoing hurdles, structural challenges and path to reform. Nepal can make a strong, unique national Cinema with the support of Hollywoods and Bollywoods.

2. Objectives and Methodology

The objectives of the study were to assess evolution and development of Nepali Cinema, culturally examine Cinema as a contested site for national identity within film narratives and policy discourses and historically trace the institutional path of Nepali Cinema governance. This study used library based historical research design, relying on appraisal of primary and secondary documentary sources to interpret past events and institutional developments (Howell & Prevenier, 2001). Besides, the study also used personal reflections of the senior artists including myself, a chairperson of Nepal Film Development Board (NFDB). During the interpretation, the study integrates three analytical strands. First, neo-Marxist political economy reveals structures of capital and power by analyzing industry financing, distribution, and state subsidies (Miller et al., 2005). Second, historical institutionalism trace institutional path dependence and critical junctures by analyzing archival documents (e.g., NFDB reports, policy acts) to (Mahoney & Thelen, 2010). Finally, cultural institutionalism assess construction of national identity discourse and narrative analysis of selected films and official rhetoric (Anderson, 1991; Lena, & Friedman, 2019). These approaches are synthesized with a review of Hollywood and Bollywood as comparative models (Ganti, 2012) and supplemented by key informant interviews, providing a multi-layered examination of the institutionalization of Nepalese Cinema.

3. Findings and Discussions

3.1 Early Cinematic Experiences in Nepal

Before the emergence of indigenous film production, Cinema entered Nepal primarily as a practice of exhibition rather than creation. During the Rana regime, Cinematic screenings were limited almost exclusively to Rana elites and members of the royal court (Adhikari, n.d). Indian and Western films were occasionally screened in palace spaces, reinforcing Cinema's early association with power, privilege, and elite modernity. At this stage, Cinema did not function as a mass medium; instead, it operated as a cultural marker of status and global connectivity. In the beginning, Nepali Cinemas were more about what it symbolized than what it actually showed. It stood for progress in technology and a kind of modern culture that the elites could connect to modernization and westernization. But mass people could not really get in on it, so the

whole experience felt exclusive. That made Cinema seem like something just for the upper class, not something everyone shared.

However, things started changing when Cinema began showing outside the public places. Setting up actual Cinema halls in cities was a big deal for how Cinema fit into everyday life. Jansewa Cinema Hall, built around 1949 or 1950 in New Road, Bishalbazar that seems like a key moment in history. *Subha Bibaha* (Indian film) became accessible to ordinary citizens. Tickets price were cheap, about twenty five paisa that could affordable to all. Since then, watching Cinema started shifting everything from those private elite viewings to something open to the public. This change really altered how people related to Cinema and society. Suddenly, Cinema hall had all sorts of audiences mixing together, from different classes and jobs, sitting in the same spots watching stories unfold. It was not just about building halls, it felt more like a social shift. This helped create a group of regular Cinema goers, which set the stage for Nepal to start making its own films later on. Cinema turned into this popular thing that everyone could relate to, sparking shared feelings and conversations. Early on, it was all so foreign and distant, but with public screenings, it became part of the Nepalese culture. That part gets a bit messy to explain, but the groundwork was there for Cinema to feel like something homegrown, not just an odd import. Diverse crowds engaging like that made it a collective thing, across lines that usually kept people apart.

3.2 Evolution and Development of Nepali Cinema

Nepali Cinema has gone through sorts of changes. It is tied to the country's political ups and downs. It started back in the 1950s and 60s, when the government was pushing it as a way to build national unity and spread moral gear. At that time, Nepali Cinema got technical support from India to make films properly. That period under the Panchayat system from the 1960s to 80s was tough because of all the censorship. Filmmakers had to be underhand, using stories from myths or social issues to say things indirectly. It feels like they were walking on eggshells. Then the 1990s came with democracy, and suddenly there was more investment in it, commercial films bursting up everywhere. But copying everything from Bollywood, caused some kind of identity problem for Nepali films. The conflict years from 2000 to 2010 were hyperactive, but weirdly that sparked scenes which were real and focused on social matters. It seems like the tough times pushed people to tell actual stories from life. Now in the digital age, things are unrestricted, with films reaching out globally and sticking to local tales and stories.

Table1. Evolution and development functions of Nepali Cinema

Period	Developments functions
Post-Rana era: 1950-1960s Early nation-building	✓ *Aama* (1964) is recognized as the first Nepali-language feature ✓ Cinema used by the state to promote national identity, family values, and social harmony ✓ Heavy reliance on Indian technicians and styles ✓ Learning through imitation and learning by doing
Panchayat era: 1960-1980s Strict ideological control	✓ Content was controlled; mythological, historical, and social melodramas dominated to avoid political critique ✓ Nepal Film Development and Balaju studio were established ✓ Filmmakers used allegory and symbolism to embed subtle social commentary within approved genres
Transition era: 1990s Market liberalization	✓ Reduced censorship led to a surge in private production and expansion of Cinema halls ✓ Heavy imitation of Indian stars, music, plots for market viability ✓ Tension between imitation and the desired nationality and locality
Conflict era: 2000-2010 Maoist insurgency	✓ Damaged/closed Cinema halls, distribution collapsed, and mainstream production slowed ✓ Crisis paved the way for low-budget, realist films focusing on social issues (migration, poverty, conflict) ✓ Cinema became a medium for reflection and documenting social trauma rather than just entertainment
Digital era: 2010-present Global connectivity	✓ Digital cameras and editing barriers, diversifying voices and styles ✓ Films gained visibility at international festivals and via online streaming platforms ✓ Focus on original, culturally specific narratives for both local and global audiences, despite ongoing institutional fragility

3.3 Second Flight: Cultural Identity and Foreign Direct Investment

The idea of a second flight in Nepali Cinema seems like a transformative way to think about where national Cinema stand now. Back in the first flight, which lasted for decades, it was all about trying stuff out, copying others, and just struggling to keep going. There were poor infrastructure, weak policies, instable politics, and low investment. Cinema flopped on mostly because of people putting in their own effort and making do, not because of any strong setup from institutions. Now with this second flight, Nepali Cinema does not have to keep looking outward all the time or worry so much about marketing. It can figure out who it is from inside a stable framework. But it is not like going back to some central control or one big idea of what national Cinema should be. At present, Nepali films are plural, mixing commercial fun with independent work, regional stories and more experimental things. The real issue is keeping that mix going with huge investment and support of private sector.

From a cultural side, this second flight feels like Cinema growing up in how it sees itself. After imitating and dealing with crises, it starts to be specific. Local tales, real social issues, narratives that hit domestic culture in global market. Building a national Cinema ties right into Nepalese history of identity politics. State control ideology, one-size-fits-all nationalism pushed aside different languages and ethnic groups (Onta, 1996). That affected how commercial films worked under market rules and bigger push to blend cultural aspects (Maskarinec, 2002). Federalism pushes and recognition movements of Tharu people that has been challenging whatever single story was there before (Guneratne, 2015).

Economically, in the early 2040s B.S., Nepali Cinema did well with informal team-ups from South Asian countries, getting seen a lot regionally. Stars such as Shiva Shrestha got famous overseas, and they managed to bring earning back home. But today, even though films reach more people worldwide, especially Non-Resident Nepali (NRN) diaspora, the finance generation system has gotten weaker. About 75 percent of earnings from outside come back informally, skipping the official ways. Without a productive Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) policy, it is hard to get clear investments from NRN diaspora for the film industry. It seems like Cinema runs as this modern cross-border thing, but the state rules for FDI are still questionable. Films circulate more in foreign spots, particularly with NRN diaspora communities, yet the ways to capital transfer seems still weak. Many NRNs are willing to invest in Nepali film industry from cultural ties and business reasons. Nepali Cinema can perform better production, can be open, responsible, and accountable to generate economy through own cultural identity.

3.4 Structural Challenges and Institutional Reform

Nepali Cinema has been stuck with this generic policy and laws for a long time. The Film Act from 2026 B.S. just sat there unchanged for fifty six years, even though Nepal went through huge changes in politics, media, and culture. Cinema started as something the state controlled for cultural stuff, but it turned into more of a business with ties global market. Film industry thus tried to revise and replace that Act, They are thoughtfully making draft bills, setting up committees for translating generic laws into specific, and prepare enforceable laws through the legislative process. But nothing ever got past the ministry. Without specific modern act, it was hard to plan ahead, and the Film Development Board could not do much more than basic administrative works. That hurt investor trust, made working across borders tricky, and messed up accountability too.

For years, reporting film revenue in Nepal seems manual, with informal deals and no standard ways. This led to fights between producers, distributors, and theaters, and it scared off real investors because no one trusted the board numbers. Besides that, licensing, investments, revenue rules, and professional standards were handled inconsistently. It shows how Cinema gets undervalued in national level cultural policies. Such policies are supposed to do symbolic work but without real support from the institutions.

After the 2006 peace agreement, reforms started affecting how cultural policy forms, including ideas of a national Cinema. The ongoing political shift, with fights over the states structure started valuing cultural identity (Shneiderman et al., 2026). That kind of instability makes long term planning for culture tough. Because of deep exclusion in society and politics, state mechanism could not bring cultural change (Riaz & Basu, 2007). Without an inclusive state, building a national Cinema might not get the backing or clear vision it needs. This might be reason that institutions reform is must to foster national economy and cultural identity (Khanal et al., 2005). Reforming policy can fight exclusion based on gender, caste, ethnicity, but traditional cultural views and lack of power for marginalized people affect their inclusion (Bennett, 2008). This matters a lot for national Cinema, like who gets to tell stories and whose stories get told. The process of making it official has to deal with those same old exclusions. However, urban ideas in films making shift into a secular republic after 2006 (Karki, 2023). It was hard to define national Cinema in a place where the industry link to the state and identity keeps changing and getting argued over. This seems like the closest connection between political changes and the everyday fights in film representation and support.

When I as a chairperson took over at NFDB in September 2024, the weaknesses in Nepali film showed up slightly right away. Even after over sixty years of making films, there was no proper indoor studio for controlled, big scale, technical production. Filmmakers had to use makeshift spots or go abroad, which raised costs and limited what they could try. No studio also meant less training, less experimenting, and breaks in how production works. Without a current Film Act, policies in film felt reactive, not planned out. Under my hopeful leadership, the new Act is almost done passing in the National Assembly. Dealing with all these structural challenges meant changing advocacy role of the institution from just symbolic help to real reforms. One of the first steps was setting up a digital box office system for real time data. Producers and others can now check revenue online, which helps transparency and cuts down on old fights about money. The indoor studio project, called Cinepa, is moving fast now. It is meant for different kinds of production, not just a building but something to build skills, training, and standards over time. It should cut reliance on outside places and boost local film making. This is like trying to fix how Cinema and the state mechanism connect for addressing structural challenges through institutional reform.

4. Critical Reflection

National Cinemas do not just growing culturally, they are more like setups built by politics, global influences, and constant cultural back and forth. Hollywood shows this well in its own history, where it made deals with the government and cultural groups to get accepted and shape what American identity meant, around the time its classic style and global economy (Decherney, 2005; Keil & Stamp, 2004). Later, it turned into this huge global power through building up money, merging companies, and kind of harmonizing downcast politics in its stories (Langford, 2010; McMahon, 2022; Boggs & Pollard, 2001). That power sets the stage for other film industries to react against, often by going their own national way with government help comparing the US and French setups (Ghertman & Hadida, 1999; Moran, 1996).

Bollywood is a good example of all this negotiation going on. It started tied to the state and producers, linked to India's post-colonial building of the nation (Rajadhyaksha, 2009; Deshpande, 2007), but now it is practicing globally, chasing audiences abroad and picking up neoliberal ideas (Punathambekar, 2013; Sathe, 2024). The stories there do this tricky thing, sort of reforming society invisibly by pointing out problems but keeping it nationalist (Chakrabarti & Sarkar, 2025), and at the same time making up nation tales for people worldwide (Mehta & Pandharipande, 2010). Calling it Bollywood was a successful move to handle local politics in geopolitical contexts

(Vasudevan, 2008; Virdi, 2017). Still, there are thunders of conflict inside, especially with government censorship pushing majoritarian views (Gill, 2017), which shows the pull between free expression and supportive national rules/regulations. This kind of stuff happens in debates too, like over violence in films, which affect how the industry gets seen socially and what rules come in (Slocum, 2000), or when producers try to use movies for better social movements (Giovacchini, 2001). For regional Cinemas, studies show how local efforts and big socio-political breaks shape things in a national setup (Chatterjee, 2010). So for Nepali Cinema, we need to analyze our own economy and politics, not just the stories and identity shifts. We also need to appraise, how Nepali Cinema deals unevenly with Hollywood and Bollywood. The question is how it handles those big pressures from money, state control, and cultural dominance from the sources here, fitting it into a wider comparison.

Theoretically, paths of Nepali Cinemas and its recent changes fit neo-Marxist political economy, historical institutionalism and cultural institutionalism frameworks together in interesting ways. Back in the Panchayat time, films were used by the state to push one single national identity, which fits Cultural Institutionalism, using setups to build an imagined community and squash other voices for state control (Anderson, 1991). Then the Film Act from 2026 B.S. stuck around for 56 years with no real update, a clear case of Historical Institutionalism and path dependence, where early choices lock Cinemas through political turns without fixing the legal gaps that held the industry back so long (Thelen, 1999). Now with reforms like new studios, a fresh Film Act, and global markets, it looks at Neo-Marxist Political Economy, trying to reshape the base of how culture gets prepared (Miller et al., 2005). Shifting from informal financial dealings to systematic digital dealing for investment, NFDB has been reforming national economy for lasting growth. It makes national Cinemas viable keeps getting argued in this digital world (Rosen, 1996).

5. Conclusion and Policy Implications

The study comes to the conclusion that history of Nepali Cinema got shaped by multiple forces such as politics, political economy of the country, global industries and modernization, Cinema has always been this battleground for what national identity even means. Back in the Panchayat days, the state used it to push this one-size-fits-all nationalism, and then in the democratic period, there were all these identity crises dashing up. Now, it might be starting to express stories from more diverse society and culture for strengthening national Cinema. The way the industry has been governed historically shows this strong path dependence. First Film Act from 2026 B.S. kept

everything stuck for decades, leading to underdevelopment and perform informal practices. It locked such structural challenges into this bad trajectory. But the current reforms seem promising, with a drafting new Film Act in the works, investments in infrastructure and making administrative services more transparent and digitalized. This could be a turning point to perform advocacy role by the members of NFDB and concerned stakeholders.

The study also comes to the conclusion that NFDB has been actively playing institutional advocacy role to change political economy of the film industry and turning it from just improvises to survive into a real cultural sector. This can take off again for handling local stories and circulating it into global film marketing through streaming platforms. Administrative services have been shifting from just licensing to really developing the industry. And also willing to provide indoor studios and a national digital box-office system as well as handle certifications and incentives. It has developing standards for credits, crew contracts, safety protocols and research to track market data and emerging trends. Also willing to conduct training programs with schools on technical skills, production management, and intellectual property law that could professionalize the workforce over time.

Therefore, the federation need to push through amendments to the Film Act and get the pending laws passed right away. The new Act must set up a clear framework that is modern, covering stuff like digital content, intellectual property, co-productions, and a way for foreign direct investment that is transparent, especially to bring in diaspora money formally. It seems important to formalize that. Provincial governments need to make their own film policies that work with the federal ones, playing to strengths like unique landscapes or cultural festivals. They need to set up provincial film offices to help with local shooting, logistics, and grants for ethnographic narratives. Likewise, at municipal level, there is a need for a rapid permitting system that is transparent and cheap for local shoots. They must offer token of grants to the film producers and need to build community screening halls to celebrate local film festivals.

References

Adhikari, S. R. (n.d.). *Nepali chalchitrako itihas* [History of Nepali Cinema]. Kathmandu, Nepal.

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* (2nd ed.). Verso.https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=650367

Bennett, L. (2008). *Policy reform and culture change: Contesting gender, caste, and ethnic exclusion in Nepal.* In Inclusive States: Social Policy and Structural Inequalities. The World Bank.

Boggs, C., & Pollard, T. (2001). Postmodern Cinema and Hollywood culture in an age of corporate colonization. *Democracy & Nature, 7*(3), 159-181. https://doi.org/10.1080/10855660020028818

Chakrabarti, R., & Sarkar, S. A. M. (2025). Invisible reformation: understanding the construction of nation in select Bollywood films. *National Identities, 27*(1&2), 13-27. https://doi.org/10.1080/14608944.2025.2473041

Chatterjee, S. (2010). Remapping transitions of Bengali Cinema into the 50s. *Journal of the Moving Image,* (9). https://www.jmionline.org/articles/2010/remapping_transitions_of_bengali_Cinema_into_the_50s.pdf

Decherney, P. (2005). *Hollywood and the Culture Elite: How the Movies Became American*.

Deshpande, A. (2007). Indian Cinema and the bourgeois nation state. *Economic and Political Weekly, 42*(50), 95–103.

Ganti, T. (2012). *Producing Bollywood: Inside the Contemporary Hindi Film Industry*. Duke University Press. https://www.dukeupress.edu/producing-bollywood

Ghertman, M., Hadida, A. L. (1999). *Institutions, institutional change, strategic assets and competitive advantage of American and French film industries, 1895-1998*. Groupe HEC.

Gill, H. S. (2017). *Censorship and ethnographic film: Confronting state bureaucracies, cultural regulation, and institutionalized homophobia in India.* https://www.google.com.np/books/edition/The_Routledge_International_Handbook_of/5eaXEQAAQBAJ?hl=en&gbpv=0

Giovacchini, S. (2001). *Hollywood modernism: Film and politics in the age of the new deal.*

Guneratne, A. (2015). *Many tongues, one people: The making of Tharu identity in Nepal*. Cornell University Press.

Howell, M., & Prevenier, W. (2001). *From reliable sources: An introduction to historical methods*. Cornell University Press. https://www.google.com.np/books/

edition/From_Reliable_Sources/wSqgwOZPjJ4C?hl=en&gbpv=1&dq=Howell,+M.,+%26+Prevenier,+W.+(2001).+From+reliable+sources:+An+introduction+to+historical+methods.+Cornell+University+Press.&printsec=frontcover

Karki, D. (2023). *Cinematic Kathmandu: Imaginaries of the city* [PhD Dissertation]. Heidelberg University.

Keil, C., & Stamp, S. (Eds.). (2004). *American cinema's transitional era: Audiences, institutions, practices.*

Khanal, D. R., Rajkarnikar, P. R., Acharya, K. P., & Khadka, R. B. (2005). *Understanding reforms in Nepal: Political economy and institutional perspective.* Institute for Policy Research and Development.

Léna, J.-C., & Friedman, J. (Eds.). (2019). *Cultural institutions and the Nation. Éditions de la Sorbonne.* A Contemporary Collection Specifically Examining the Role of Institutions in Shaping National Cultural Identity.

Mahoney, J., & Thelen, K. (Eds.). (2010). *Explaining institutional change: Ambiguity, agency, and power.* Cambridge University Press. Expands the theory to account for incremental change through modes of institutional layering, conversion, and drift.

Maskarinec, G. (2002). The organization of Nepali Cinema. *Visual Anthropology, 15*(1), 97–106.

McMahon, J. (2022). *The political economy of Hollywood: Capitalist power and cultural production*.

Mehta, R. B., & Pandharipande, R. V. (Eds.). (2010). *Bollywood and globalization: Indian popular Cinema, Nation, and Diaspora*. Anthem Press.

Miller, T., Govil, N., McMurria, J., & Maxwell, R. (2005). *Global Hollywood 2*. British Film Institute. https://www.bfi.org.uk/global-hollywood-2

Moran (1996). Terms for a reader: Film, Hollywood, National cinema, cultural identity and film policy. *In Film policy* (pp. 1-10). Routledge. https://www.routledge.com/Film-Policy-International-National-and-Regional-Perspectives/Moran/p/book/9780415097918

Onta, P. (1996). *The politics of bravery: A history of Nepali nationalism* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania]. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses

Global. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/The-politics-of-bravery%3A-A-history-of-Nepali-Onta/e19d7085ddf5599386d7de62f9d4c088de80278e

Punathambekar, A. (2013). *From Bombay to bollywood: the making of a global media industry*. NYU Press. https://www.google.com.np/books/edition/From_Bombay_to_Bollywood/4bclkJ3V7XYC?hl=en&gbpv=0

Rajadhyaksha, A. (2009). *Indian cinema in the time of celluloid: From Bollywood to the emergency.* Indiana University Press. https://iupress.org/9780253352682/indian-Cinema-in-the-time-of-celluloid/

Rajadhyaksha, A., & Willemen, P. (1999). *Encyclopedia of Indian cinema* (2nd ed.). British Film Institute. https://archive.org/details/encyclopaediaofi0000raja

Riaz, A., & Basu, S. (2007). *Paradise lost? State failure in Nepal.*https://www.martinchautari.org.np/storage/files/sinhas-vol16-no1-book-reviews-seira-tamang.pdf

Rijal, A. (2020). Digital disruption and the Nepali film industry. *Media Asia, 47*(3–4), 122–136.

Rosen, P. (1996). Nation and anti-nation: Concepts of national Cinema in the "new" media era. Diaspora: *A Journal of Transnational Studies, 5*(2), 227-247.

Sathe, N. R. (2024). *The neoliberal self in Bollywood: Cinema, popular culture, and identity.* Routledge. https://www.amazon.com/Neoliberal-Self-Bollywood-Popular-Identity/dp/1789388805

Sharma, L. N. (n.d.). *Nepali chalchitra itihas* [History of Nepali Cinema]. Kathmandu, Nepal. https://www.goodreads.com/book/show/205419907

Shneiderman, S., Wagner, L., Rinck, J., &Johnson, A. L. (2016). Nepal's ongoing political transformation: A review of post-2006 literature on conflict, the state, identities, and environments. *Modern Asian Studies, 50*(06), 2041-2114. https//doi.org/10.1017/S0026749X16000202

Slocum, J. D. (2000). Film violence and the institutionalization of the Cinema. *Social Research, 67*(3), 1-681. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/291815533_Film_violence_and_the_institutionalization_of_the_Cinema/citations

Thelen, K. (1999). Historical institutionalism in comparative politics. *Annual Review of Political Science, 2*(1), 369-404. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.2.1.369

Vasudevan, R. (2008). The meanings of 'Bollywood'. *Journal of the Moving Image.*https://jmionline.org/article/the_meanings_of_bollywood

Virdi, J. (2017). A national cinema's transnational aspirations? Considerations on "Bollywood." *South Asian Popular Culture*, *15*(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/14746689.2017.1351785

~O~