Society Girl and *Ho Mann Jahaan*: A Comparative Analysis of Modernity in Pakistani Films

Kulsoom Din Malik

Abstract

In order to trace how notions of modernity have evolved over time, this paper compares two Pakistani films from different eras, such as *Society Girl* (dir. Sangeeta, 1976) and *Ho Mann Jahaan* (dir. Asim Raza, 2015). Some of the common themes in these films, which include conflicts within the family structure and clashes over the values and lifestyles of the protagonists, are examined in the context of an emerging local modernity. These films address changes within a certain moral order and a transformation of the family in the face of a globalizing identity. Thus, by engaging with Anthony Giddens' "transformation of intimacy" and Arjun Appadurai's "deterritorialization" frameworks, for example, this study examines how films from different times can legitimize various aspects of modernity through the depiction of conflict and resolution.

Keywords: Society Girl, Ho Mann Jahaan, New Pakistani Cinema, Modernity and Film, Family Conflict, Emerging Local Modernity, Gender and Film

Introduction

This paper addresses how two Pakistani filmmakers—Sangeeta and Asim Raza—have responded to societal changes in the 1970s and in the 2010s respectively. The questions central to this paper are what local iterations of modernity have been depicted, how do they differ in each film, and how they have changed over the years. This research identifies a number of unifying themes within the film plot: conflicts within the family structure due to a clash between the values and lifestyles of people of different generations; the friction between the individual's desire for self-actualization and the pressures from the family and community, and the moral order established in each film conflicting with the individuals' choice of work. Both movies also depict connections to a globalizing world, where social relations are increasingly reterritorialized; a large extent of the characters' interactions take place in public settings—by the beach, in dance clubs, in restaurants, streets, train stations, the university and in hospitals. Both films establish a moral order which is challenged by the protagonists, to differing results: *Society Girl* portrays its protagonist as having fallen from grace for choosing a lifestyles that her family disapproves of, and she is allowed to redeem herself, whereas *Ho Mann Jahaan* depicts the family eventually compromising on their beliefs to reconcile with the protagonists. In doing so, both films differ in the aspects of modernity each legitimates.

Methodology and Background

The two films have been chosen for the themes common to each, as discussed earlier. Moreover, both films can be said to have garnered significant fame—Mushtaq Gazdar refers to *Society Girl* as "bold" and entirely different from what was being produced at the time, and mentions the popularity of the male lead, Ghulam Mohiuddin (142-145). He also addresses the years between 1967 and 1976, as a "Decade of Change" in which General Ayub Khan's reforms geared towards "modernization" and "development" also translated into state-led patronage for the arts; the media were required to highlight the achievements of the decade, which were aimed at helping Pakistan compete globally (102). *Ho Mann Jahaan,* on the other hand performed well in the box office crossing the Rs.100 million mark in 2016 ('*Ho Mann Jahaan*' Crosses 100m Mark). Director Asim Raza's goals were to create a film aimed at the youth, that would compete with Bollywood; his own background in advertising coupled with product placements in the movie, and a collaboration with Coke Studio signal to some of the globalizing influences in the film (Ansari). Contextualizing the film within other societal changes, given how recently it was released is a little tricky, however Ammara Maqsood's work on a new Pakistani middle class suggests that an emerging middle class consists of "upwardly mobile urban groups" (17) who are second generation migrants from smaller towns and villages. Her study focuses on groups in Lahore, and how their aspirations differ from those of an old middle class: their desires for upward mobility, education, material prosperity and individual progress are channeled into personal piety and fashioning a Muslim identity. She also discusses changing fashions such as styles of headscarf that allow Muslim women to participate in global trends, and how this new middle class and its consumption patterns have created a new market (12-17).

These contexts will be referred to in the analysis further on, to address the differences between the two films. The focus of the analysis will be on narrative and plot, specifically addressing the conflicts between the protagonists and how these are resolved. Special attention is paid to the dialogue to establish what kind of values the characters hold, what their priorities are and how do they change over the course of the film. This is supplemented with an analysis of the mise-en-scène: the costuming provides cues as to what trends the protagonists follow and what values they ascribe to, whereas a discussion of the setting establishes the nature of the social interactions taking place. For example, Arhaan's class background in *Ho Mann Jahaan* can be ascertained by the worn-down dwelling that serves as his house, compared to the larger, brighter and airier homes of his friends. On the other hand, Julie Wilson's attire in *Society Girl* provides important cues that identify her as what Sadaf Ahmad defines as the "Maghrabzada woman" (Ahmad 117).

Literature Review and Theoretical Frameworks

Arjun Appadurai's work looks at modernity as a "theory of rupture that takes media and migration as its two major and interconnected, diacritics and explores their joint effect on the *work of the imagination* as a constitutive feature of modern subjectivity" (3). For Appadurai modernity is defined by global flows in the following dimensions: ethnoscapes (the movement of people), technoscapes (the flow of technology and its configuration), finances capes (the flow of capital), mediascapes and ideoscapes (the transmission of images) (33-36). Appadurai also discusses deterritorialization and how populations from different regions are brought out of their specific

contexts and into contact with each other (37). He discusses Mira Nair's *Indian Cabaret* (1985), a documentary which details the lives of women working in dancing clubs in Bombay, providing entertainment for men in scenes which "cater to ideas about Western and foreign women and their looseness" (37). The idea of migrant women performing using props and ideas that evoke a notion of foreign-ness is the kind of deterritorialization that occurs within *Society Girl*, in which protagonist Julie Wilson dances with strange (*ajnabi)* men at the club, dressed in colorful shift dresses, often donning a blonde wig. *Ho Mann Jahaan* features protagonists who dream of being musicians, against the wishes of their families, and at the end are seen performing in front of the Coke Studio logo.

This essay engages with Giddens' ideas relating to the transformation of intimacy in the face of abstract systems. According to Giddens, modernity brings with it an "emptying of space and time" (18). Interactions in conditions of modernity occur between individuals and institutions which have their own set of rules and require the individual to adopt certain styles and postures to maintain short term interactions within a system. This is an idea originated by Erving Goffman and referred to as "facework" (79-82). What results are a series of social relations, which Giddens contrasts with pre-modern: ties of personal friendship as opposed to kinship and community are a means of stabilizing social relations; threats rise from personal meaninglessness as opposed to a falls from religious grace, and self-actualization by looking "inward" or opening out of the self to the other is seen as a primary purpose (102). These ideas are central to understanding the conflicts taking place in both movies: the family represents the pre-modern values in both films; their values and interests contrasting with the goals of the individual protagonists. Julie Wilson quite literally puts on a face while interacting with people in different situations and settings; her *Society Girl* persona is a separate entity from her life as Julie (a name which is never mentioned in her interactions at the club). Arhaan, Manizeh and Nadir in *Ho Mann Jahaan* exhibit a drive for self-actualization in the form of their passion for music, a vocation which is viewed by their families as going against their values and responsibilities. Both movies also place considerable emphasis on friendship and personal ties of trust between individuals outside of the kin group as central to their growth and development.

Phillip Gilett's work on questions of morality in film help lay the framework for identifying a moral order in the two films this paper analyses. According to him, people are called upon to make moral decisions with matters of the family; events that cause a disruption within the family are related to morality (32). Questions he considers, when attempting to identify the moral order established by the film, are questions this essay addresses as well. For example, whether the morals each character deals with are self-imposed, or imposed by immediate family or by a broader society within the film's text, how do they respond to moral dilemmas (50). Rose Thomas discussion on negotiation of morality in mainstream Hindi films also discusses how notions of "modern" are seen in opposition to "traditional", and implicit in this framework is the conflation of "good" with "traditional" and "bad" with "modern" (157-159). She argues that within movies such as *Mother India (*dir. Mehboob Khan, 1957) elements of the nontraditional can be negotiated, or incorporated into the traditional depending on the context, such as a love marriage being accepted by the family, or a hero who breaks laws but not social codes can be redeemed.

Additionally, she suggests that these films construct an "Other," clad in stereotypical Western dress and associated with decadence and moral decay (160-161), something that is seen in *Society Girl*. Julie is always seen in shift dresses dancing with men donning suits and sipping whiskey. *Ho*

Mann Jahaan does not show this binary as clearly, but instances such as Nadir's mother disapproving of Manizeh's choice of career as a musician caters to similar ideas. Borrowing from Thomas' framework, this essay will also look at the way transgressions are treated in the context of each film, to address how different aspects of modernity are negotiated and legitimated as opposed to others. Sadaf Ahmad expands on notions of morality depicted in Pakistani films from the 1970s by addressing the trope of the "Maghrabzada" or Westernized woman who embodies what are perceived as Western values and lifestyles and displays a degree of sexual autonomy and independence. Ahmad contextualizes this depiction with reference to the rise in popularity of the Jama'at-i-Islami and argues that these films painted this behavior as immoral, prompting either punishment or redemption. Building on Homi Bhaba's ideas about the Other as both an object of desire and derision, she suggests that the *Maghrabzada* is conception of what society should "denounce," while at same time a source of fascination for the viewers (117-122).

Works on Ang Lee's films focus on the role of globalization in shaping cultural identity. Whitney Crothers Dilley's article on *Eat Drink Man Woman* (dir. Ang Lee, 1994) talks about how global forces shape the relationship of a father with his three daughters. The father—representative of Chinese culture and values—comes to terms with the idea that his daughters' lives are influenced increasingly by a globalizing culture. Crothers Dilley points to cues such as the older daughter's adoption of Christianity, the middle daughter's job acquiring worldwide airline routes, and the youngest sister's practicing French as evidence of changing identities. In the end, father and daughters come to terms with the change, but adopting parts from each other's identities, negotiating individual identities in a globalizing world. This essay points out several similar cues in *Society Girl* and *Ho Mann Jahaan:* Julie's style of dress and conversations that take place entirely in English at the club; and Nadir, Arhaan and Manizeh's aspirations to work at either multinational corporations or at Coke Studio.

Mushtaq Gazdar also refers to the class background of the people involved in the film industry in the 1970s as university dropouts or outcasts, and as the cinema produced as "low-brow" (116). He mentions one interpretation of *Society Girl:* the flashback in which Julie is raped while working at a granary as an allegory for the failure of the Bhutto Government to deliver on the "*roti, kapra, makaan"* slogan. Cultural critic and columnist Nadeem F. Paracha shares similar views on the portrayal of decadence, and class on screen. In his book *End of the Past* he describes the filmmakers of the 1970s as hailing from petty bourgeoisie backgrounds, portraying the morality of the upper classes despite engaging in acts (such as drinking alcohol) that they show on film as morally reprehensible. He also discusses a marked shift, as the modern middle class has been exposed to world cinemas, and also grew up in an era in which religion plays a greater role in the public sphere (179-180). The difference between the two movies is noticeable in this regard: whereas the ultimate moral transgression in *Society Girl* is alcoholism and prostitution, in *Ho Mann Jahaan* pursuing music as a career, or choosing one's own spouse and eschewing family responsibility causes conflict within the movie.

Friendships, Family and the Transformation of Intimacy

Friendships are central to the plot of *Ho Mann Jahaan*: the movie starts with Nadir, Arhaan and Manizeh in a university lecture in which Arhaan is slacking off; after his friends tell him off, he

apologizes to the professor, but his friends still express a concern for his future. What binds the three together is their shared love of music; multiple scenes in the movie depict the three singing and making music together. Their lives take different turns after they receive their university results, and their relationships with each other change: Nadir proposes to Manizeh, and Arhaan grows distant from Nadir. A constant rapport between the trio is evident from the start, which suggests that their friendships are on par with those with family. After receiving news of Arhaan failing his final exams, Nadir immediately interrupts a conversation with his parents and asks Arhaan to rush to his house, much to the dismay of his mother. "Nadir now is the time for you to forget about Arhaan and that artist's daughter," she says. Nadir's mother clearly disapproves of her son's closeness to his friends, suggesting that they are simply distractions from his familial responsibilities such as helping his father with the family business. Already there is a clash between the relationships of personal intimacy that occur in conditions of modernity and ties of kinship. These relationships are built upon, as Giddens suggests:

> Trust on a personal level becomes a project, to be "worked at" by the parties involved and demands the opening out of the individual to the other. Where it cannot be controlled by fixed normative codes, trust has to be won, and the means of doing this is demonstrable warmth and openness. Our peculiar concern with "relationships," in the sense which that word has now taken on, is expressive of this phenomenon. Relationships are ties based upon trust, where trust is not pre-given but worked upon, and where the work involved means a mutual process of self-disclosure (121).

Trust is worked upon; the three friends discuss their problems and lives together at train stations and car rides home. Although a certain level of "warmth and openness" is present in Manizeh's relationship with her mother, her relationship with her father is strained because of his objection to music according to his *usool* (principles) and Arhaan completely cuts ties with his father in pursuit of his passion for music. Nadir on the other hand, proposes to Manizeh and reaches a compromise: choosing to marry out of love and giving up music. A mutual process of self-disclosure continues to take place between Nadir and Manizeh, and between Manizeh and Arhaan. Arhaan finds a job and strikes up a friendship with his employer, Sabina; they sit and talk at length and a bond is formed: when Arhaan expresses how grateful he is, Sabina responds by saying "neither of us is doing the other a favor," suggesting that she depends on him as much as he depends on her. Despite their distanced relationship, when Nadir begins to face problems in his relationship with Manizeh, he approaches Arhaan first, stating, "You're the only one I can tell. I really need your help." Arhaan, on the other hand, feels betrayed because in giving up his passion for music, Nadir had also stopped building on their relationship; that level of trust no longer exists to stabilize them, and a fight ensues.

Additionally, all three friends exhibit a concern for "self-fulfillment" (Giddens, 124) and self-actualization by building their identity; although Nadir briefly gives this up to maintain his ties with his family, Manizeh continues to build a relationship with her father to gain acceptance, and Arhaan cuts of his only family to achieve his goals. He speaks passionately about his dreams and ambitions, and what he would do to fulfil them: throughout the movie music is intrinsic to each character's self-development. One key difference is that Arhaan's father—who hails from a working class background—objects to music because it is not economically viable, whereas Nadir's parents think he is shirking his family responsibility, and Manizeh's father feels that it is against his religion, and worries about *"log kya kahein ge"* (what will people say). Manizeh

however, reconciles with her father by using the very language of self-actualization: in her final confrontation with him, she states that if she as an individual can accept her father's choices, then her father should respect hers, even if he does not agree. By the end of the film, these conflicts are resolved by both generations discussing their issues; the older generation compromises and negotiates with the younger generation by building personal ties with them and accepting them as individuals with independent wishes and dreams.

Ho Mann Jahaan does not, however, exhibit relations with abstract systems to the extent that *Society Girl* does. Julie interacts with people in four different situations: as the "Society Girl" in the club, as a daughter and sister at home, an employee during the daytime, a patient at the hospital and as a friend to Aasif. She acts out different roles in each of these situations, wearing dresses and wigs at the club and *shalwar kameez* at home. At her job, she refuses to give her name to strangers, who in turn also refuse to give their names, and she jokingly establishes short-term relationships of friendship when demanding more money for her service, stating in one scene at the beginning: "…my problems, your problems, your purse, my purse… ." At her day job, she deals with her boss telling her that complaints have been lodged against her, and it is a system in which he has no personal say. In comparison her friendship with Aasif is built on trust; he gives her money which she returns and states that he simply likes her company. At another point he asks to see her true face, to which she replies: "*Chehray ki baat chorriye, Aasif Sahab. Na jaane har chehray pe kitnay nakli chehray sajaye phir rahay hain"* (Don't talk about faces, who knows how fake faces decorate the real ones).

She reveals to Asif her true face as Julie: an ailing woman simply forced into work as a "Society Girl" by the circumstances of her rape. The idea that Julie is aware of the multiple faces she puts on for each situation is also suggested at points where she separates "Julie" from "Society Girl." Her relationship with Mona, however, is only salvaged after the two sisters acknowledge that the other is all they have left in the world. Here Julie has to negotiate her relationship based on kinship, not a relationship of trust with Mona. At another point, Julie asks her mother to disown her and think of her only as a servant, as her lifestyle is not accepted in the home. In comparison, her friendship with Aasif eventually gives her an avenue to redeem herself for her perceived sins by reuniting Aasif with his long-lost wife. It is the "opening out of the self to the other" (Giddens, 125).

Shifting Morality

The concerns that the families have with the choice of lifestyle and work of the protagonists in both movies stem from a difference in values; the protagonists defy roles and expectations that are imposed on them, which becomes a moral transgression. The parents in *Ho Mann Jahaan* (barring Arhaan's father) believe that pursuing music is against an established code, in which one sacrifices one's personal ambitions for the sake of preserving family ties, and in the case of Manizeh's father, his religion will not allow it: "*Yeh music theek nahi hai*." Morality is attached with serving one's family, not one's self and with remaining in what the family deems respectable professions. In Nadir's context, this means serving the family business, in Arhaan's it is whatever makes him money, whereas Manizeh's father offers to talk to people in multinational corporations so that she can get an office job. Manizeh's choice of career is questioned by Nadir's mother, who believes

that Manizeh should be paying greater attention to wedding preparations, and her role as Nadir's wife.

In *Society Girl,* Julie is made aware of her immorality by her sister, those at her workplace, and at the club. Mona constantly prays for her sister to be led to the right path, and for her "sins to be absolved," and her clients do not consider her fit to be married to. Throughout the film, Julie's mother and sister insist they do not need her "dirty money," and on one instance Mona even wonders aloud whether Julie enjoys the work she does. Certain cues paint Julie as an immoral woman—Sadaf Ahmad identifies lifestyles associated with the Westernized *Maghrabzada* woman and how these are shown on screen. These include wearing short dresses, donning blonde wigs, consuming alcohol, speaking in English, dancing at clubs (Ahmad, "Morality and Desire", 122), all of which are acts Julie engages in. Whereas Ahmad discusses how these tropes function as forms of entertainment, and as cautionary tales about the dangers of Western decadence, Rose Thomas argues that within each movie, there is room for some negotiation (Thomas, 160): a character's transgressions may pale in comparison to their transgressions, or their actions may be incorporated into the social order (160-161).

Although Julie's transgressions are not accepted, her arc is painted not as one of punishment, but one in which she is able to redeem herself. According to Ahmad, rape as a form of punishment is doled out to women who violate "normative gendered expectations" (Ahmad, "Sexualized Objects", 392) of being dutiful wives, mothers and daughters, and of restraining their sexuality. The "rape as punishment" (Ahmad, "Sexualized Objects", 392) trope is defied as the film begins by showing Julie drinking, going to clubs, and displaying sexual independence, which is seen by her family and her co-workers as immoral. More than halfway through the film Julie's rape is shown in a flashback, in which Julie is shown as a dutiful daughter, dressed in long white frock with hair plaited in ribbons (like the way her sister Mona is depicted) going to buy rice for her mother from a local warehouse, where she is raped by the owner. Her father—unable to live with the shame—commits suicide leaving Julie to support her family. This presents a twist in conventional portrayals of rape: Julie is not raped to further the narrative arc of a man's story, and neither does the scene set up a revenge arc for her. As a result, the audience sees Julie a victim of unfortunate circumstances, and her actions further on in the narrative serve to redeem her. Although Julie succumbs to her illness at the end of the movie, she only does so after fighting off a horde of gangsters while protecting Aasif's long-lost wife, and then reuniting the two.

Both movies address moral concerns that are viewed as a threat to the institution of the family; the characters choose lifestyles that do not fit into their family's notions of respectability. However, the nature of these concerns differ vastly: the ultimate transgression in *Ho Mann Jahaan* is choosing music as a career, whereas in *Society Girl,* it is the display of sexual independence and alcoholism. The same cues which present Julie Wilson as immoral (wearing Western attire, dancing, relations with men, speaking in English), are presented as normal in *Ho Mann Jahaan*. Ahmad discusses how these notions disappeared slowly after the 1970s, when it "became increasingly acceptable for women to be shown wearing western attire, marker of global modernity, with its commodification of women's sexuality…" ("Morality and Desire", 128).

Globalizing Identity

The previous section addressed how aspects of "Western" identity and lifestyle are depicted as immoral, signifying "otherness". While referring to Mira Nair's *Indian Cabaret* (1985) Arjun Appadurai discusses how Cabaret dancers use props and styles of dress to "cater to ideas about Western and foreign women and their looseness" (17). These images—which are the result of global flows of information, people and technology—evoke a sense of foreign-ness, as things are lifted out of their contexts and transplanted elsewhere. People and images from different contexts encounter each other in a process called "deterritorialization" (37) and individual identities have to be negotiated with respect to these changes. This section examines the portrayals of processes of deterritorialization and globalization, and how these affect the protagonist's identities.

Both *Ho Mann Jahaan* and *Society Girl* have very few explicit references to the nation, and the action takes place in restaurants, clubs, at train stations and hospitals. The only explicit reference to a place comes from Manizeh in *Ho Mann Jahaan,* when she mentions her time working in Lyari, where she befriended some Balochi migrants and learned their language. The only reference to a place in the movie signals towards flows of people, and exchanges between those of different backgrounds. Other scenes during the movie see the protagonists relaxing and drinking chai together at a train station; Arhaan smokes cigarettes and engages in deep philosophical discussions with an old *Baba Jee.* These discussions seem vague—Arhaan asks the man who he is waiting for, and the man responds with "death." Crothers Dilley points to how Ang Lee's works negotiate global identity by focusing on certain universals. In similar ways, Arhaan's conversations with a man he shares no context with show how the characters negotiate their identity in these situations by referring to ideas about universals such as death. Moreover, the characters' aspirations serve to anchor them in a globalizing world: their parents wish for them to work at Multinational corporations, and as musicians they are seen performing at Coke Studio—a venture that exists outside of the narrative of the movie as well. Brand placement of this sort can be linked to conscious effort on director Asim Raza's part, and shows how flows of global capital determine aspirations within film.

Society Girl uses the English language and Western dress to construct notions of otherness which are then seen as morally reprehensible as discussed in the previous section. There are no specific markers of place— the only city referred to, is, London, where Aasif has business concerns and is called abroad to—and interactions take place in clubs, the hospital, offices and church. However, as compared to *Ho Mann Jahaan,* where aspects of this globalizing world are incorporated into the lives of the protagonists, shape their dreams and aspirations, *Society Girl* paints these as influences the character must denounce.

Conclusion

The ways conflicts play out in the film legitimate elements of modernity to varying degrees. Both movies depict certain transgressions, but the more recent film shows the moral and social order negotiating and compromising with the protagonists who want to break free from it, as opposed to *Society Girl,* in which the protagonist must conform in order to be redeemed. Additionally, a marked shift is shown in the role globalization plays in *Ho Mann Jahaan* as compared to *Society*

Girl—the former sees its global forces shaping the aspirations of its characters. This has important consequences for how changes in morality also play out: whereas the moral concerns in the 70s created the idea of a "Western" other, in recent years many of those characteristics are accepted. However, the moral transgression varies in scale: pursuing music as a career as opposed to engaging in sex work and drinking alcohol seems to be what populates the screen, and although this might be related to censor board regulations in the current era, it points to trends that Ammara Maqsood highlights as characteristic of a Pakistani modernity today. She notes that a rising middle class, which is more concerned with individual piety, and locating itself within global trends is now increasingly viewed as a market for consumption. These changes are reflected in the differences between the two films.

Film Synopses

Society Girl

The titular *Society Girl* (dir. Sangeeta, 1976), Julie Wilson (played by Sangeeta in her directorial debut), works as a secretary during the day, and a dancing girl—it is heavily implied that she is a sex worker—at a club at night. Her second job pays for the treatment of an ailing mother, who turns a blind eye to Julie's night job. On the other hand, her sister Mona is a devout Christian, who funds her school fees by selling dolls, and is vocal about her disapproval towards Julie's lifestyle. Julie strikes a friendship with a man she meets at the club, Aasif, who is heartbroken after his wife drowned. After her mother passes away, Julie becomes increasingly ill and cannot support herself; desperate to reconcile with Mona who offered to sell herself at the club, Julie asks a customer to marry her only to be mocked. While she is hospitalized for her illness, Aasif returns and offers to marry her to save her to which Julie agrees. Soon after, Mona and Julie encounter a young woman with amnesia in the hospital, who they suspect is Aasif's wife. Julie reunites Aasif with his long-lost wife, and then succumbs to her illness after briefly encountering happiness.

Ho Mann Jahaan

Ho Mann Jahaan (dir. Asim Raza, 2015), is centered on three friends from varying socio-economic backgrounds living in Karachi, and studying at the same university: Nadir, Arhaan and Manizeh. Nadir belongs to an upper-middle class family (his father runs his own business, and his mother does not work); Manizeh lives with her divorced, artist mother (it is implied that they are well off financially) and Arhaan with his widowed father who struggles to put him through university. The central conflict occurs after the friends graduate and must choose between joining the workforce or pursuing their passion for music; these decisions come into conflict with those of their parents. In Nadir's case, his choice to marry Manizeh, causes a rift between him and his parents, whereas Arhaan leaves his father's home to pursue his passions. Eventually compromises are reached between the parents after witnessing the suffering their children are being put through.

References

Ahmad, Sadaf. "Morality and Desire: The Role of the 'Westernized' Woman in Post-Independence Pakistani Cinema." *The Postcolonial World*, edited by Jyotsna G Singh and David D Kim , Routledge, 2016.

Ahmad, Sadaf. "Sexualized Objects and the Embodiment of Honor: Rape in Pakistani Films", *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, vol. 39, no. 2, 2016, pp. 386–400.

Ansari , Hasan. "Coming of Age with Ho Mann Jahaan." *The Express Tribune*, 5 Nov. 2015, http://tribune.com.pk/story/985137/coming-of-age-with-ho-mann-jahaan/.

Appadurai, Arjun. *Modernity at Large Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. University of Minnesota Press, 1998.

Dilley, Whitney Crothers. "Globalization and Cultural Identity in the Films of Ang Lee." *Style*, vol. 43, no. 1, 2009, pp. 45–64. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/10.5325/style.43.1.45.

Gazdar, Mushtaq. *Pakistan Cinema: 1947-1997*. Oxford University Press, 1997

Giddens, Anthony. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Polity Press, 1991.

Gillett, Philip. *Film and Morality*. Cambridge Scholars, 2013.

"'Ho Mann Jahaan' Crosses Rs100m Mark." *The Express Tribune*, 13 Jan. 2016, http://tribune.com.pk/story/1026932/ho-mann-jahaan-crosses-rs100m-mark/.

Maqsood, Ammara. *The New Pakistani Middle Class*. Harvard University Press, 2017.

Paracha, Nadeem Farooq. *End of the Past: An Immediate Eyewitness History of a Troubled Nation*. Vanguard Books, 2016.

Thomas, Rosie. "Melodrama and Negotiation of Morality in Mainstream Hindi Film." *Consuming Modernity: Public Culture in a South Asian World* , edited by Carol A. Breckenridge, vol. 2, University of Minnesota Press, 1998.

Filmography

Eat Drink Man Woman (dir. Ang Lee, 1994)

Ho Mann Jahan (dir. Asim Raza, 2015)

Indian Cabaret (dir. Mira Nair, 1985)

*Mother India (*dir. Mehboob Khan, 1957)

Society Girl (dir. Sangeeta, 1976)