

**Deepa Mehta's Canadian, American,
Indian Bollywood Musical: Showing
Canadians their Country in
*Bollywood/Hollywood***

Amy Fung

“Growing up I didn’t see any images of me in Canada, in magazines, in t.v., anywhere. My whole world consisted of Hindi films ... I never really looked for anything else around me because I have it in my Hindi films.” Neeru, from *Bollywood Bound* (2001)¹

In director Nisha Pahija’s National Film Board documentary, four second generation Indo-Canadian youth travel to Mumbai as they aspire to break into the Bollywood industry. Coming from communities in British Columbia, Alberta, and Ontario, the common experience shared by these four individuals was the lack of cultural identification with anything they experienced in Canadian media representation and the mutual desire to live out their Bollywood-inspired dreams.

Canadian multiculturalism remains a cherished and legally decreed act, but the cultural output of 1988’s Bill C-93 remains dominated by American capitalism. The Hollywood machine dominates the large majority of theatres in Canada. Echoing the sentiment of Jerry White’s introduction to his recent Canadian cinema anthology, *The Cinema of Canada* (Wallflower Press, UK): “Indeed, as I write this sitting in Edmonton—the capital city of the province of Alberta, a city with a population of approximately 800,000—*not a single Canadian film is playing within the city limits.*” As you walk through the aisles of any local video store, Canadian films are always categorized as “Foreign” as opposed to “New Releases.” It is only during the rare occasion of film festivals and independent art house screenings when a Canadian made film can be screened in its country of origin. The fundamental problem is of course having one economically dominant country culturally nourish another, especially when the latter country loudly proclaims itself as a multicultural society while the former declines into a struggle for identification against internal and external perceptions of what it means to be “an American.” Although the Canadian government continues supporting the production of Canadian made films, there remains to be seen a set of regulations regarding Canadian content to be made available in Canadian theatres as there is regarding airtime on Canadian radio and television.

Cinematic cultural identification (or lack thereof) experienced by the four youths in *Bollywood Bound* was ironically not with Canadian culture, but with an American myth that perpetuates the notion of a white and wealthy nation. Mass consumed, Hollywood does not feel the need to change its recipe for success to appease other markets—and in good faith, why should they? The force of the Bollywood Industry far surpasses Hollywood in both production and consumption; with a staggering output of over 900 films each year churning out of India, Bollywood is undeniably the world leader in film production. With this in mind, it is easily understood why the myth of Bollywood would be alluring to India's diasporic communities who find "self-identity" in its cultural reproductions. In these mass-produced and mass-consumed films, their "native" heritage is idealized—and "real" Indians are represented beyond the displaced stereotype as found in most local offerings. Only the trouble is, Bollywood, much like its American counterpart, is based entirely in fantasy-based representation of a fabricated ideal. As Hollywood does not reflect any actual portrayal of every day life in the United States, the same can be said for Bollywood's fantastical representation of day-to-day Indian culture. For those in Canada, India's diasporic culture turns away from the Eurocentric images of American and "Canadian" media; but in a transnationally fluid media system, what constitutes as a representation of diasporic culture?

Understanding Bollywood through a transnational lens, authors Raminder Kaur and Ajay J. Sinha describe Bollywood as having at least three connotations:

First, to allude to the inherently hybrid constituency of Bollywood yet also as an index of variant sense of Indian identity; second, the global distribution of Bollywood movies and a conveyor of "Indianness" to diverse audiences; and third, as a means of negotiating both Indianness and its transformation, particularly when representing and being received by diasporic populations.²

As a generator of "Indianness," Bollywood is creating and mass-perpetuating a fictional and idealized world of India. All the youths in *Bollywood Bound* desired to emulate the songs and dance of Bollywood cinema, but more than anything, they longed to experience their "culture," the culture of their fathers and mothers, glorified on the silver screen and lacking from their everyday existence. Set in their "homeland" of India, itself an estranged and exotic place for second generation Canadians, their identification with Bollywood is the equivalent of those chasing the "American" dream of fame and fortune in Hollywood. Bollywood cinema indeed represents a sense of "Indianness" to

their diasporic population, but what exactly is this “Indianness” that is being prescribed?

The essentializing of any individual nationality requires the perpetuation and performativity of an essentialized nationality. Though the topic of essential and constructed nationality remains a grey area in the world of Post-Structuralism and Post-Colonialism, in reality, national identity moves in constant fluctuation in today’s globalized world.³

As experienced by these second generation youths, the dichotomy of national identity carried by transnational citizens displaced them into being “the Canadian in India” and “the Indian in Canada.” Neeru, the youngest and also most naive of the four, feels segregated by her high school peers for dressing up as an “Indian princess.” Upon arriving in Mumbai to follow a promise made by a now elusive casting director, the fantasy ideal of her native “homeland” ceases to exist, replaced with the reality of modern day Mumbai, a bustling overpopulated center packed by poverty, competition and modernity.

The rejection of a Canadian representation in which itself is fed by the Hollywood system based on unrealistic ideals versus the imagery of Bollywood and the subsequent acceptance of its non-existence, remains the conflicted reality of self-identification in the early 21st century. Caught between the non-identification of Hollywood Canadian culture and the fictional idealization of Bollywood Indian culture, the future of a culturally enriched Canadian identity heads toward a crisis.

“Different Tree. Same Wood”: Bollywood and Hollywood as Canadian Cultural Capital

The national identity of a second generation individual is conflicted from the beginning. Constructed of one language and culture nurtured within the home and another language and culture assimilated by socializing environments such as school, friends, etc., the issue of a national identity only fractures when we consider the number of ethnicities using hyphenated identities. Between the private and public spheres of perceptions and expressions, second generation individuals can fluently flow between their learned and nurtured cultures, claiming stakes in both territories; but as satirized in Deepa Mehta’s 2002 *Bollywood/Hollywood*, national identity, as well as ethnicity, are ongoing performances played on Canada’s multicultural. In *Bollywood/Hollywood* as it was in *Sam and Me* (1994), Mehta explores the human emotions involved with performing our collective national identity—especially in the conflicting

contrasts of culture and segregation experienced by second generation immigrants of ethnic minorities.

The auteurship of Mehta reveals the duality at play in one of this generation's foremost transnational filmmakers. Born into a wealthy and liberal-minded family in India, Mehta immigrated to Canada after completing her Masters in Philosophy. Moving in between both countries and cultures since the 1970s, Mehta has often stated that she wishes not to be identified as "Indian" or "Canadian," but simply, "Deepa Mehta." With each of her films, Mehta subsequently challenges the all too exclusive "triangular reality" of Canadian identity. Proposed by Canadian philosopher John Ralston Saul, this triangular reality refers to the collective Canadian framework as held up and against the nation's founding communities of Aborigines, Anglophones, and Francophones. As an astute observation, the triangular reality theory fares well; but with the introduction and subsequent placement of immigrated Canadians of first, second, third and fourth generations, these unfortunate citizens fall into the void of a Bermuda Triangle of reality. In her discussion on Mehta as a transnational filmmaker, author Jacqueline Levitin writes:

Transnational filmmaking does not exist in a vacuum; rather, it exists in symbiosis with the dominant and alternative cinemas and in constant negotiation between the global and the local at the moments of encoding meanings and moments of decoding and recoding.⁴

As Canadian films paradoxically remain the "alternative" cinema within its own borders, Mehta plays up the fissures of Canada's multicultural identity as a fusion of Bolly and Holly-wooden clichés. In the film's opening title credits, it is the backslash ("/") that appears first on the screen, a gesture that undermines the difference between Bollywood and Hollywood as an entirely arbitrary choice in examining the Canadian identity. As a transnational filmmaker, Mehta has come under fire from her most vocal critics in India for lacking authenticity and being an exploiter of Indian culture while remaining virtually unknown to Canadians as a Canadian filmmaker. Yet, her films such as *Bollywood/Hollywood* and *Sam and Me* (1991) mark significant points in English Canadian cinema and won Mehta international recognition when her first feature film, *Sam and Me*, received an honourable mention at Cannes. Both films deal specifically about the prejudices and relationships formed between Canadians of different ethnic and class backgrounds. Specifically in *Bollywood/Hollywood*, Mehta makes use of hyper exaggerated cultural clichés

petrified from Bollywood and Hollywood cinema to reconstruct the modern experience of being Canadian.

The Location of Culture: the Location of Home

“Increasingly, ‘national’ cultures are being produced from the perspective of disenfranchised minorities ... The currency of critical comparativism, or aesthetic judgment, is no longer the sovereignty of the national culture conceived as Benedict Anderson proposes as an ‘imagined community’ rooted in a ‘homogeneous empty time’ of modernity and progress.” Homi K. Bhabha in *The Location of Culture* (1994)⁵

Identity is rooted in both time and place. In the film’s opening and closing shots, Mehta localizes the viewer into the city of Toronto, Ontario, a major urban centre with a high population ratio of East Indians, Jamaicans, Chinese, and other ethnic minorities. The Toronto skyline is unmistakable with its famed CN Tower, but as a constant and varied location shoot for many Hollywood produced films, Toronto has also found fame with the moniker of “North Hollywood.” Having been the location for Hollywood’s blockbuster musical, *Chicago* (2002), the idea of shooting a Bollywood musical in Canada seems only appropriate; but *setting* a Bollywood musical in Canada only exposes the fissures in assuming a tangible relationship between culture and place.

Set in the film industry’s stand-in of North Hollywood, the city of Toronto is clearly established as the physical setting for the film. However, as Mehta plays upon the parody of clashing Indian, Canadian, and American national identities, the culture of the film is a contest between Bollywood and Hollywood, and Toronto remains simply as a backdrop for the action that unfolds.

Each character represents a hybrid that humanizes the issue of identity beyond Canadian and Indian. The Seth household’s chauffeur, Rocky (Ranjit Chowdhry), leads a double life as the infamous Rockina, “the first drag queen from the land of the Kama Sutra.” The multiplicity of his identity remains a hidden and embarrassing secret for Rocky, but his character most obviously calls into question the performativity of roles regarding gender and ethnicity. Rockina performs in drag during an unidentified and non-sequitar scene; and although it is only one of many song and dance sequences in the film, it remains unlike anything else in the film. Using a set that holds no other narrative context, Rockina’s song and dance number begins with a close-up of a heavily made-up Rocky/Rockina. The image is both startling and amusing, but in us-

ing traditional Bollywood methods of having characters express themselves through song and dance, Rockina has actually transcended any particular time or place, culture or nation. The song and dance number is performed by Rockina in a club-like setting, but her performance is never once interrupted by her surroundings. Unlike all the other song and dance numbers throughout the film, we do not see Rockina's audience—that is, we never see the identity of Rockina interact with anybody at all. As Sue uses her knowledge of Rocky's alter ego as friendly blackmail, Rocky's shame of being a drag queen is only apparent in his fear of losing his position as the chauffeur for a wealthy and extremely traditional family. Although drag and queer song and dance pieces exist in Bollywood musicals, Rocky/Rockina is just one example of the gap between culture and tradition. In Toronto, Rockina is described as "the first drag queen from the land of the Kama Sutra," a euphemism that reveals a further exoticization and alienation of the complexities in one's expression of identity.

Caught between two worlds of his own, Rahul Seth (Rhanna Khanna)—the eldest and sole male of the Seth household—is a well-privileged young man, educated and wealthy, he is trapped between his personal desires and the wishes of his deceased father and widowed mother. Mehta sets up a Hollywood fairy tale infused with Bollywood sentiments and beginning with an opening sequence that establishes an utterly fictional atmosphere with the first of many clichéd subtitles ("It was a dark and stormy night ...") and equally clichéd dialogue ("Take the baseball bat of destiny ... You are the team captain of the family now ..."). The dying father figure's last wishes set into motion the conflicted role that his then young son will later take on. From the very beginning, we are informed that this film will be one continuous cliché after another and that this rhetoric is playing on our (Canadian) familiarity with those cinematic clichés that are not our own. Relying on the viewer's familiarity with Bollywood cinema, the role of a dutiful son fulfilling his filial duties is a dominant and modern Bollywood theme. Struggling with his individualistic wishes and the wishes of his family (and also the greater community and state), a happy ending can only be found in the conventional collapse of the son's individualistic desires matching those of his family's wishes.

Rahul's two love interests never cross paths, as one dies prior to Rahul meeting the other—negating the possibility of choosing one over the other—a major narrative gap that reveals Rahul's personal growth as not a choice. In Kimberly, played by French Canadian Jessica Paré, Mehta creates a New Age pop star that resembles the glossy starlet of a Britney Spears or Jessica Simpson, but also someone who searches for a deeper spiritual identification

with recitations from new age guru, Dr. Deepak Chopra. Kimberly signifies the Hollywood dominance of Canadian identity, but she is more parody than threat. In her introduction, a shooting of her latest music video, choreographer David Corroly was employed to re-simulate the work he's done in the past for Spears and other American pop stars such as Janet Jackson. Only instead of coming off as polished, Mehta goes over the top with exaggerated angles and editing, creating an over-the-top scenario that distinguishes itself more as parody than as an aesthetic of emulation.

As both Sue and Kimberly represent two opposite strands of the modern Canadian identity, the choice for Rahul is the essential conflict for most second generation immigrants. Choosing between being unrecognizably Indian or an Americanized Canadian respectively, either choice will compromise the nature of a Canada's national identity.

It is also difficult to assume the casting of Paré was entirely arbitrary. As a popular young actress working mainly within Canada, she was cast as the leading actress in well-respected Quebecois filmmaker Denys Arcand's commercial satire *Stardom* (2000). Panned by critics and audiences alike, the main objection was to how the rebellious and often unabashedly caustic Arcand can turn out such a soft film about the rise and fall of a Canadian starlet. The same argument has often been made against *Bollywood/Hollywood* since Mehta had only been known to craft exceptionally poignant films such as works from her elements trilogy *Fire* (1996), *Earth* (1998), and *Water* (2005), in a coolly tempered melodramatic fashion. As it appears, the commercial viability of Canadian identity and its reality remains too confounded to be critically satirized.

Kimberly's avid interest in Chopra and her eventual demise in a bizarre Hollywood levitating accident is simply an easy disposal of her character. Throughout *Bollywood/Hollywood*, a film so unapologetically goofy, the measure of parody is used to tackle the facade of Canadian multiculturalism, but can easily mislead those who do not identify with the lack of any coherently Canadian culture. The formal qualities of the film are a conflation of manipulated idioms in Hollywood and Bollywood film language; standard banister dolly shots and low angle establishing shots—barely noted by those who know it and alienating to those who are new to it. It is then in each of her principle characters which Mehta ingrains a different representation of what it is to be “Indian” in Canada or simply “who they are” in Canada.

“You can be an honorary East Indian”: Performing an Essentialized Identity

Rahul is the typical Bollywood “tragic hero” who is mired by his middle class values and his promise to his deceased father. Before her accidental death, Kimberly had already been rejected by the Seth household when she came before Rahul’s mother and grandmother dressed in traditional East Indian attire. In an air of costumes, roles, and language barriers, the underpinning hitch is that Kimberly is not a “traditional” East Indian girl. The grandmother, who speaks English fluently and quotes Shakespeare throughout the film, insists on being translated by her daughter-in-law for the sake of tradition. The resulting embarrassment of Kimberly is all caught on tape by Rahul’s younger brother, a teenager who videotapes everything and exclaims “This is better than any Bollywood movie!”

The constant self-reflectiveness in the film creates a web of cross-cultural intertexts, producing its own lineage of Canadian heritage, which is essentially a shuffle of Hollywood clichés mixed with Bollywood drama and clichés. When Rahul learns on the news that Kimberly has fallen to her death in Hollywood, he clutches to the television--the media’s last representation of the woman he loves. Failing to levitate properly and banished by Rahul’s family for being a “white whore,” Kimberly earlier admitted, “It’s not everyday Hollywood comes calling.” Clearly in this world where Hollywood means death (of a culture), Rahul is the *bildungsroman* who must grow in his understanding and acceptance of what it means to be an Indian and a Canadian.

Enter Sue Singh, played by Indo-Polish-Canadian Lisa Ray, a bold and outrageously forward young woman who approaches Rahul in a bar as a potential escort. There is an undeniable parallel to Garry Mashall’s *Pretty Woman* (1990), from the basic narrative of enlisting a woman for her escort services (on a strictly business level) to the balcony serenade following the inevitable romance that blossoms. Rahul hires Sue to pretend to be his fiancé for just long enough so that his younger and secretly pregnant sister can marry her boyfriend. Keeping with tradition, his sister cannot marry before he does, but this cultural fact is not revealed by Mehta’s narrative, but played out as a given in any other Bollywood produced film.

Sue, with her light skin and continental features, could “pass” for East Indian, thinks Rahul after their first encounter. He has already ruled out the possibility that any East Indian girl would dare sit in a bar alone, let alone approach a strange man. He has decided that she must be Spanish instead. This notion

of an essentialized gender role of passive East Indian women (and sexually aggressive Spanish women) is reinforced by his mother, a widow who has learned to cry on cue and plays the role overtly well. In a round table gossip with her friends, one woman claims that Indians in India are more modern than Indians here in Canada, but then that observation is cast off decidedly with the suggestion that it is because they (modern Indians) are all on Ecstasy. In perpetuating a traditional "Indianness" to its diasporic communities, Mehta is pointing out that Indian communities in Canada are more traditional than the Indians in India, and that the offspring of these diasporic communities will be confronted with an extinct or at least poorly outdated notion of national identity. Rahul's understanding of what passes as Indian is inherently much like his mother's understanding. In his eyes, Sue's knowledge of Bollywood cinema makes her an "honorary East Indian," but she must still learn to perform the role. Reminiscent of *Pretty Woman's* shopping montage, where Roy Orbison croons the eponymous inspiration, Sue goes on a shopping spree on Rahul's bill that will transform her into a proper East Indian woman. Hamming it up for Rocky, he astonishingly describes Sue as "J-Lo meets K-Go." Again using only Hollywood and Bollywood references, the Canadian referent is that there is none. Sue plays along, but it is because she is in fact East Indian, revealed to Rahul in an elaborate song and dance routine with Bollywood star Akshaye Khanna playing himself. His spotlighted entrance amongst swooning fans and audio-recorded applause marks yet another interplay on Mehta's self-reflexive part. Acknowledging the "star" of Bollywood cinema with these simple Hollywood signifiers, the film's narrative then seamlessly shifts into an all-out Hindi song and dance choreographed in Bollywood style. Everyone joins in except for Rahul, the only one left out while his understanding of what an East Indian *can* and *cannot be* vanishes before him.

Sue does love Bollywood cinema, as does her wistful father who lives in the world of idealistic cinema; but Sue also appreciates the films of Atom Egoyan, adorning her bedroom wall with a poster of his seminal work, *Exotica* (1994). As the film that launched a wave of English Canadian cinema into an international roundtable over interrelated and convoluted identities, Sue is the embodiment of that non-essentialized citizen who is just plain "Sue." She refuses to compromise herself to her father's handpicked and ignoramus suitor, or to pray on demand as requested by Rahul's grandmother, or to Rahul when he questions her past. Sue's performance is the only one that is self-consciously put on, and in most cases it is a performance that others are projecting upon her. It is the juxtaposition of her father's love for Bollywood and her admiration of Egoyan that captures the rift of identity and generational conflicts that holds most of the film's attention. Sue's father (Kulbhushan Kharbanda) tries

to understand his life in Canada by paralleling himself to Bollywood characters he has seen on screen, living in a romanticized ideal of his homeland and aided by Mehta's playful addition of an audio track filled with whistling bells and children's laughter. Sue's impatience for her father, and his intolerance for Sue's behavior, reveal that despite their mutual love for Bollywood cinema, there is a widening generational gap in transplanting culture. As Sue is of the second generation, she confronts the conflicting values between her parent's memories of culture and her transplanted country's multicultural values.

The *Exotica* in Being Canadian: Show Canadians Their Country

Atom Egoyan's *Exotica* marks a significant moment in filmic history when Canadian cinema shifts into the realm of a commercially viable, yet art house representation of an unprecedented national multiplicity that attempts to embody the diversity of Canadians. *Exotica*'s characters, modern Canadians of all races and sexualities, are trapped between two seemingly conflicting identities, each living out their lives in a repetitive and liminal state. In Bill Beard's reading of *Exotica*, he writes:

Exotica is a feast for the viewer, a film to be sifted over and decoded and speculated about ... The test is whether the network of tropes and concealments and revelations is mustered to a purpose beyond hermetic formal virtuosity, and here the other side of the film's equation - the side of human crisis and the drama of affect—provides the necessary substance.⁶

As a humanist filmmaker, Mehta has demonstrated her penchant for creating complex human dramas in equally complex social settings. Setting her Bollywood inspired film in Toronto gives her all the more reason to re-examine the construction of nationalities and the emotive conflict that arises between families and lovers similarly created by Egoyan. *Exotica*, the idea and the film, comes up in *Bollywood/Hollywood* on several occasions as a subtle passing referent. As the name of the strip club where Sue gets harassed, the aforementioned poster lining her bedroom wall, and as a remark in conversation between Rahul and Sue while they hatch out a plan to make her his "Indian" bride; in each instance, the reference is abiding, lingering on screen for barely a moment, but this is how Egoyan's central themes pervade. Author Adam Need in *Moving Pictures, Migrating Identities* (2003) refers to the Armenian-Canadian director as this:

Egoyan undermines simple binarisms of exploiter/exploited and dominator/dominated, offering instead the image of a world in which both interpersonal and international relations are often complex and contradictory, dictated by multiplied intertwined, often mutual desires.⁷

In mere sparks, the fluid notion of identity arise in *Bollywood/Hollywood* as power struggles between those who enforce essentialism and those who are essentialized. Although Mehta's film remains mostly a light hearted romantic comedy, she acknowledges the formal and contradictory issues which arise in creating a Bollywood musical set in the culturally multifaceted city of Toronto. For example, all the song and dance sequences (with the exception of Kimberly's music video and Sue's surprise song) use the city of Toronto quite prominently as a backdrop. In particular, the rooftop number following Sue and Rahul's first stages of love uses simple choreography and plain clothes against the clear Toronto city skyline. Missing all the flash of Kimberly's music video and the elaborate costume and choreography of Sue and Khanna's Bollywood performance, these stripped down versions are the literal decoding and recoding of cultures re-situated in a foreign Canadian setting.

Identity as performance or replica moves in constant fluctuation as demonstrated by Rahul's misguided, yet comprehensible misunderstanding of Sue "Sunita" as being Spanish. Playing up the arbitrary notions of how nationality can be easily (mis)construed, Sue's ability to quote her favorite poem by Chilean poet Pablo Neruda and to say a few vernacular phrases in Spanish is all that is needed to convince Rahul of his superfluous assumption. Upon their second meeting in an Indian fast-food restaurant, Sue wolfs down a plate of chilies whereupon Rahul remarks to Rocky, "The Spanish sure like their spicy food." The complete irony in this scene is based entirely upon the blind spot of Canadian multiculturalism that simultaneously essentializes ethnicity while distinguishing presumably identifiable nationalities. The bigger problem is the lack of representation for these fragmenting identities, often losing to culture creating machines like Bollywood and Hollywood that plague Canada's diversified and under-represented nation and peoples.

In over twenty years, Canada has fed a myth of a multicultural haven for the transnational: an incubating region of diverse ethnicities and culturally transplanted rhizomes. In today's global climate, there is no such thing as a national cinema. At least not in Canada. There cannot be one, two, or three versions of a unified cinematic voice to represent the global diaspora thriving within Canada's borders. Nor should there be—and here lies the crux of forming any coherency of a portable "Canadian culture."

The inception of a Canadian cinema began with Scotsman John Grierson's vision for The National Film Board of Canada. In his vision, it included the mandate of producing documentaries that would show Canadians their country. After 70 years, that pioneering sentiment of Canadian cinema remains. A filmmaker like Deepa Mehta is still showing Canadians their country, showing them the changing face of the nation state into a culturally globalized and confused identity.

Endnotes

- ¹ Dir. Pahija, Nisha. *Bollywood Bound* NFB 2001
- ² Kaur, Raminder and Sinha, Ajay J. "Indian Cinema Through a Transnational Lens." *Bollywood: Popular Indian Cinema*. Sage Publications, New Delhi, 2005. 11–34.
- ³ In the field of Ethnic Studies, Post-Coloniality, and Transnational Studies, even Post-Structuralist ideology tends to digress into ethnic naturalism over the philosophical perspectives of performance and repetition. To quote editors Julie Rivkin and Michael Ryan in *Literary Theory: An Anthology*, "The belief that physical traits refer to or express an ethnic interiority, an identity or substance of genetic being that provides the external traits with meaning, is one of the last remaining uncriticized ideologies." 855.
- ⁴ Levitin, Jacqueline. "Deepa Mehta as Transnational Filmmaker, or You Can't Go Home Again." *North of Everything*. Eds. William Beard and Jerry White. University of Alberta Press, 2002. 270–293.
- ⁵ Bhaba, Homi K. "The Location of Culture." *Literary Theory: An Anthology*. Eds. Julie Rivkin and Michael Ryan. Blackwell Publishers Inc., 2001. 936–944.
- ⁶ Beard, Bill. "Exotica." *The Cinema of Canada*. Ed. Jerry White. Wallflower Press, UK, 2006. 195–204.
- ⁷ Knee, Adam. "Exotica: The Uneasy Borders of Desire." *Moving Pictures, Migrating Identities*. University of Mississippi, 2003. 159–179.