

CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL SCIENCES

PEER REVIEWED, INDEXED & REFEREED QUARTERLY INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL

ISSN 0302-9298

<https://www.jndmeerut.org>

[Vol. 35, No. 3 (July-September), 2026]

<https://doi.org/10.62047/CSS.2026.09.30.90>

Violence on Wheels: Representation of Violence in Hindi Film *Gadar: Ek Prem Katha*

Puneet Yadav

Associate Professor, Department of History, Kirori Mal College, University of
Delhi, Delhi (India) E-mail: <puneetraut@gmail.com>

Abstract

*This article examines the representation of violence in Anil Sharma's *Gadar: Ek Prem Katha* (2001), one of the most commercially successful and ideologically contested Hindi films of the post-liberalization era. Situating the film within the broader discourse of popular cinema, historiography, communal identity, and the Bollywood star system, the article argues that *Gadar* does not merely depict violence; it aestheticizes, nationalizes, and religiously codes it in ways that speak to deeply entrenched social anxieties in Indian society. Drawing on scholars such as Robert Rosenstone, Pierre Sorlin, Hayden White, Bhaskar Sarkar, and Ashis Nandy, this study reads *Gadar* as a cultural text through which post-colonial Indian anxieties about nationhood, religious identity, and masculine honour are simultaneously expressed and amplified. The article further explores how the cinematic aesthetics of blood, the star persona of Sunny Deol, and the film's communal undertones collectively function as a vehicle for understanding the internal social divisions of Indian society. The conclusion suggests that popular cinema is an indispensable hermeneutic lens for comprehending the social, political, and cultural fault lines of modern India.*

Keywords

Partition, Violence, Identity, Star System, Aesthetics.

Research Foundation International, New Delhi
(Affiliated to UNO)

Editorial Office : D-59, Shastri Nagar, Meerut - 250 004 (INDIA)
Ph. : 0121-2763765, +91-9997771669, +91-9219658788

Violence on Wheels: Representation of Violence in Hindi Film *Gadar: Ek Prem Katha*

1. Introduction

Cinema is never an innocent mirror. It is a social apparatus that simultaneously reflects and constructs the realities of its time and space. In the history of Indian popular cinema, few movies have stirred as much admiration, controversy, and scholarly interest as *Gadar: Ek Prem Katha* (Rebellion: A Love Story, 2001)¹, directed by Anil Sharma and starring Sunny Deol and Ameesha Patel. Released during a period of heightened Hindu nationalist politics in India, *Gadar* grossed approximately ₹2.37 billion at the box office, becoming one of the highest-grossing Hindi films of its era.² The movie is set against the background of the 1947 Partition of India, one of the most violent mass displacements in human history. The film tells the story of Tara Singh, a Sikh truck driver who rescues a Muslim woman, Sakina, from communal violence, falls in love with her, and ultimately wages a one-man war against the Pakistani state to reclaim her from her family. The film's narrative architecture is soaked in blood, violence, and spectacle. It begins with images of mutilated bodies on trains, moves through sword fights, mob lynchings, and rape-threat sequences, and culminates in a climactic sequence in which a single Indian man dismantles an entire Pakistani military establishment with his bare hands, most memorably by uprooting a hand pump from the ground as a weapon.

This article interrogates the nature and function of violence in *Gadar* from multiple analytical angles: as a form of popular historiography, as a mirror of communal hatred, as a product of the Bollywood star system, and as an aesthetic practice involving the symbolic use of blood. The article ultimately argues that to understand *Gadar* is, in significant measure, to understand the social psychology of a nation navigating the still-unhealed wounds of Partition, the resurgence of religious nationalism, and the spectatorial pleasures of a masculinist political imagination.³

2. Literature Review: Historical Films as a Source of History Writing

The relationship between cinema and the writing of history has been a subject of sustained scholarly debate since the mid-twentieth century. While traditional historiography privileged written archives, documents, and textual evidence, the emergence of film studies as an academic discipline gradually forced historians to reckon with the epistemic possibilities of visual media. The critical intervention in this conversation came from the

French historian Marc Ferro, who in the 1970s argued that cinema was not merely an entertainment medium but a significant historical document “one that revealed not so much the events of the past as the ideological and cultural anxieties of the moment of the film’s production.”⁴

This idea was further systematized by Hayden White, who coined the term *historiophoty* to describe “the representation of history and our thought about it in visual images and filmic discourse.”⁵ White’s contribution was significant because it suggested that the conventions of filmmaking like montage, characterization, and narrative arc were not dissimilar from the rhetorical strategies of professional historians. Both the historian and the filmmaker select, organize, and present events; both are shaped by ideological commitments that inflect the “facts” they present; both are, in White’s formulation, constructors of narrative rather than neutral transmitters of the past.

Robert Rosenstone, what he called “history on film”, argued that “fictional elaborations of dialogue and setting, or filmic strategies such as condensation, selection, and highlighting, do not vitiate the quality of a film’s contribution to the understanding of history.”⁶ For Rosenstone, what matters is not factual accuracy in the positivist sense but the emotional and interpretive truth that films convey, their ability to make the past present to contemporary audiences in ways that written texts often cannot.⁷

Pierre Sorlin extended this argument by suggesting that historical films are perhaps a branch of historiography in their own right.⁸ Eleftheria Thanouli, in her landmark study *History and Film: A Tale of Two Disciplines* (2019), proposed that cinematic history has in practice replaced academic history as the dominant form of meaning-making about the past in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, describing historical films as “magnified miniatures of a historical book.”⁹ She argued that because historical films do not claim to represent the past as it actually was, they paradoxically allow scholars to examine the underlying mechanisms through which any historical discourse, including academic historiography, constructs an “illusion of objectivity.”¹⁰

Historian John E. O’ Connor proposed a four-part framework for analyzing films as historical documents:¹¹

- a. Moving-image documents as representations of history.
- b. Moving-image documents as evidence for social and cultural history.
- c. Moving-image documents as evidence for historical fact.
- d. Moving-image documents as evidence for the history of film and television.

This framework is particularly useful for the study of *Gadar*, which operates on all four registers simultaneously: it is a fictional representation of

Partition history, a cultural artefact of post-liberalization India, a selective evidentiary account of 1947 events, and a milestone in Hindi film genre history.

3. Indian Cinema and Partition Historiography

Within Indian scholarship, the relationship between cinema and Partition history has been examined by a growing body of scholars. Bhaskar Sarkar's work *Mourning the Nation: Indian Cinema in the Wake of Partition* (2009) traces the shifting representation of the 1947 trauma across several decades of Indian Hindi cinema. Sarkar argues that Partition functions as a "national trauma", an originary wound whose cinematic traces are indexical of "acts of cultural mourning."¹² He identifies three broad phases: an initial phase of "denial" in which Partition is largely absent from cinema; a Nehruvian phase of "supracommunal trauma" that transcends sectarian boundaries; and a third phase, beginning in the 1990s, in which the Partition narrative shifts from collective consciousness into a "purely sectarian phenomenon."¹³ *Gadar* exemplifies this third phase with remarkable clarity.

Gyanendra Pandey has argued that "histories of communal violence have typically been written in terms of nationalist historiography, which sees violence as an aberration, 'a glitch, the result of an unusual conjuncture of circumstances' rather than as constitutive of the nation-making process itself."¹⁴ Pandey's intervention is vital because it forces us to acknowledge what *Gadar* represses: that communal violence was not an exception to the birth of India and Pakistan but was integral to the very process of their becoming.

Mushirul Hasan's observation that "literary narratives, whether in Hindi, Urdu, Bengali or Punjabi, are an eloquent witness to an unspeakable and inarticulatable history"¹⁵ points to a broader methodological premise for this article: that popular cinema, like literature, constitutes a primary site for the cultural processing of historical trauma. Historians Ayesha Jalal and Sugata Bose concur, noting that "the colossal human tragedy of the Partition and its continuing aftermath has been better conveyed by sensitive creative writers and artists than by historians."¹⁶ This article reads *Gadar* as one such cultural witness, imperfect, ideologically skewed, but deeply revealing of the social imagination of its era.

4. Film, Ideology, and Social History

Marc Ferro's insight that cinematic texts are "useful to the historian precisely because they are unreliable; they do not picture reality but an interpretation of reality"¹⁷ is particularly instructive here. Films like *Gadar* are unreliable as literal historical records but are extraordinarily reliable as documents of the fears, desires, prejudices, and power structures of the societies that produce them. As Fantoni observes in his survey of film historiography, an "eclectic and interdisciplinary approach merging history,

cultural studies, film studies" is required to do justice to the complexity of cinematic texts as historical sources.¹⁸

The significance of cinema as social history is especially acute in the Indian context, where, as M. Madhava Prasad has argued, the Hindi film industry has historically been a terrain where ideological contestations over nationhood, gender, caste, and religion play out with particular intensity.¹⁹ It is within this framework that the violence of *Gadar* must be situated and analyzed.

5. *Gadar* and the Spectacle of the Violence

Gadar: Ek Prem Katha opens with an extended and brutally graphic sequence of post-Partition violence: trains arrive carrying piles of blood-soaked bodies; mobs of Hindus, Sikhs, and Muslims attack each other in frenzy; women are dragged, threatened with rape, and murdered. The film's very first act of characterization is telling: the character of Tara Singh (Sunny Deol), the film's Sikh hero, is introduced not as a romantic figure but as a sword-wielding participant in mob violence against Muslims. In the opening moments, he is a killer. This foundational ambivalence the hero as perpetrator of communal violence who is later redeemed through love is never fully resolved by the narrative. Instead, it is symptomatically displaced onto the Pakistani state in the film's second half, allowing the audience to enjoy the spectacle of violence without moral accountability.²⁰ The film structures its violence along a deeply asymmetric axis. While both communities are nominally shown to have committed atrocities Tara's family is killed by a Muslim mob; Sakina is nearly raped by a Sikh-Hindu mob the dominant trajectory of the narrative maps evil onto Pakistan and, by extension, onto Pakistani/Muslim male authority. Sakina's father, Ashraf Ali (Amrish Puri), the film's principal antagonist, is the Mayor of Lahore and the embodiment of an irrational, authoritarian, Islam-coded patriarchy that holds women captive and demands that Tara chant "*Hindustan Murdabad*" (Death to India) as a condition for his family's acceptance. As film critic Shabana Azmi pointedly observed, "The movie reinforces the canard that every Muslim is a Pakistani. It mixes issues of identity and nationalism, which should be handled sensitively."²¹ This conflation of religious identity with national enmity is precisely the mechanism through which *Gadar* converts what might have been a humanist anti-war narrative into what several critics identified as a vehicle of xenophobic nationalism.

Gadar's representation of Pakistan follows a pattern that scholars of postcolonial cinema have identified as characteristic of the Indian nationalist film of the late 1990s and early 2000s. In Prasad's formulation, the assignment of the role of "Pakistani and 'other'" to Muslim characters serves a "xenophobic ruling ideology that serves the interest of a corrupt and highly authoritarian political elite."²²

The film depicts Pakistan as a monolithically repressive, fundamentalist state in which individual will is crushed under the weight of anti-India hatred. Pakistani characters, except for a single sympathetic figure who helps Tara and Sakina escape, are presented as “pawns of their evil leaders, ready to be unleashed or sacrificed against India.”²³ This dehumanization is not incidental to the film’s ideological project; it is constitutive of it. By constructing Pakistan as an entity driven by religious fanaticism and anti-India sentiment, *Gadar* provides the moral justification for Tara Singh’s spectacular violence in the film’s second half.

The film’s political subtext was inseparable from the historical conjuncture of its release. The year 2001 in India was a moment of heightened Hindu nationalist politics. The right-wing party was in the service of the country, had recently fought the Kargil War (1999) with Pakistan, and the Godhra communal violence was only months away. The film’s anti-Pakistan sentiment, several scholars have noted, “gained a certain kind of legitimacy” within this context, with Indian audiences experiencing Tara’s violence as patriotic catharsis rather than as aggression.²⁴ The communal protests triggered by *Gadar*’s release were themselves a form of social evidence: Muslim groups in Mumbai, Ahmedabad, and Bhopal organized demonstrations; vehicles were torched; the Muslim League filed petitions calling for a ban. The Ahmedabad protests, in which theatres were set on fire, represented the real-world extension of the communal hatred the film had, arguably, helped to stoke.²⁵ That the film also drew the support of Shiv Sena chief Bal Thackeray, who found “nothing objectionable” in it, reveals the political terrain it occupied.²⁶

5.1 Women’s Bodies as Sites of Communal Conflict

A central mechanism through which *Gadar* stages communal violence is the figure of Sakina, a Muslim woman whose body becomes the literal site of contestation between Hindu-Sikh India and Muslim Pakistan. Feminist scholars have extensively documented how, during the actual Partition, women’s bodies were made into “sites of honour, control, and political assertion.”²⁷ *Gadar* reproduces this logic cinematically: Sakina is nearly raped by Hindu-Sikh rioters; she is “saved” by Tara Singh’s application of *sindoor* (vermilion) on her forehead, symbolically claiming her as a Hindu wife; she is later detained in Pakistan by her father; and her eventual return to India constitutes the film’s resolution.

In every phase of this narrative, Sakina’s agency is evacuated. She does not choose India – she is chosen for India by the men who fight over her. The film’s ideological unconscious reveals itself here: the woman is not a subject of history but its object, the prize around which male violence in both Indian and Pakistani contexts is organized, justified and depicted.

5.2 The Star System and the Body of Violence

The representation of violence in *Gadar* cannot be understood independently of the body and star persona of Sunny Deol. The star system in Bollywood functions, as Richard Dyer has argued in a different but analogous context, as a mechanism through which social values and contradictions are embodied, negotiated, and resolved in the spectacular figure of the star.²⁸ Sunny Deol's body is portrayed as muscular, hairy, working-class, and unpolished, encoding a very specific vision of Indian masculinity that is distinct from the urbane, glamorous masculinity of contemporaries like Shah Rukh Khan or Aamir Khan. Deol's screen persona personified masculinity and anti-authoritarianism. His characters are "men of modest backgrounds" entangled in "conflicts with crime syndicates and systemic corruption" who are "initially conflict-avoidant" but "pivot to unfiltered anger when met with opposition."²⁹ The trajectory from reluctance to explosive violence is the emotional arc that Deol's films rehearse across his career from *Ghayal* (1990) and *Ghatak* (1996) to *Border* (1997) and *Gadar* (2001). In each film, the violence he enacts is framed as reactive, righteous, and therefore morally unblemished.

In *Gadar*, this persona is invested with nationalist content. Tara Singh's violence is not personal vengeance – it is India striking back. When he uproots the hand pump and wields it as a weapon, when he roars "*Hindustan Zindabad*" (Long Live India) before a crowd of Pakistanis, when he dismantles the Pakistani military single-handedly, Deol's body becomes the synecdoche of the Indian nation – invincible, indignant, and ultimately triumphant. The film's famous climax, in which a single Sikh truck driver defeats a military battalion, operates less as realism than as nationalist fantasy – a compensatory myth for a nation still psychologically scarred by the trauma of 1947.

5.3 Hyper-Masculinity and the Politics of Spectatorship

The star system thus functions in *Gadar* as an apparatus for the production of what critics have termed "hyper-nationalism" – a fantasy of Indian male invincibility directed specifically at Pakistan. As one reviewer observed, Sunny Deol is "the OG poster boy of hyper-nationalism. An image that was, in retrospect, a big part of his Bollywood career."³⁰ The political economy of this spectatorship was not neutral. The film's audiences were, in significant part, drawn from constituencies invested in a Hindu nationalist politics that found in Tara Singh's violence both a mirror and a mandate. The social learning implications of this were noted by several scholars: "when likeable, attractive characters such as heroes perpetrate violence on screen, they are more likely to be imitated by viewers."³¹ The question of whether *Gadar*'s spectacular violence contributed to the normalization of real-world anti-Muslim sentiment in the post-Kargil, pre-Godhra climate remains a live scholarly debate. Importantly, Deol's filmography is also marked by graphic bodily

violence — the arm-tearing scene in *Ziddi* (1997), the hand-pump sequence in *Gadar*, the battlefield carnage in *Border* that consistently fetishises the male body's capacity to inflict and endure damage. This deployment of the aestheticization of bodily violence, in Deol's films more than those of any other Bollywood star of his generation, invites analysis through the lens of what Susan Sontag called "the pornography of violence."³²

5.4 The Use of Blood and Aesthetics of Violence

Blood in *Gadar* is not merely an indexical sign of injury; it is a full-blown cinematic language. The film's opening sequence establishes blood as the primary metaphor for the trauma of Partition: trains arrive packed with bloodied corpses; the railway platform is a charnel house; blood stains clothes, faces, and stone. This opening establishes a visual grammar in which blood signifies communal identity, victimhood, and the broken promise of the Indian nation.

The film's most iconic use of blood is symbolic rather than literal: when Tara Singh smears *sindoor* — traditionally associated with the blood-red of a Hindu wife's marital status — on Sakina's forehead to protect her from a mob, the gesture collapses the distinction between religious ritual and bodily violence. The *sindoor* saves her life precisely because it mimics the stain of blood, claiming her as Hindu in the eyes of a murderous crowd. Blood, in this moment, is simultaneously a mark of death and a sign of belonging. Subsequent uses of blood in the film are more conventionally spectacular but no less ideologically coded. The action sequences of the film's second half - in which Tara battles the Pakistani military - are staged with the maximalist aesthetics of the 1990s Bollywood action genre: blood spurts from wounds, bodies fly through the air, and the hero emerges bloodied but victorious. The hero's blood functions as a sign of his sacrifice for love and nation; the enemy's blood functions as a sign of justified retribution.

The aesthetics of violence in *Gadar* are inseparable from the conventions of the Bollywood *masala* film, a genre that has historically organized its spectacle around the pleasures of action, music, and melodrama.³³ Director Anil Sharma and action choreographer Karim Hajee constructed action sequences that were extravagant even by the standards of the genre; the hand-pump sequence in particular became a cultural touchstone, widely parodied and celebrated in equal measure.

The question that this aesthetic raises: what does it mean that spectacular violence is pleasurable? Cultural theorists from Walter Benjamin to Roland Barthes have argued that the aestheticization of violence, its transformation into spectacle, operates as a form of political narcosis, displacing real political engagement with vicarious emotional catharsis.³⁴ In the specific context of *Gadar*, the film's aestheticization of anti-Pakistan violence offered Indian audiences in 2001 a fantasy of national triumph that the political and military realities of South Asian geopolitics could not provide.

The film's use of music further amplifies this aesthetic of violence. Songs like "Udja Kale Kawa" and "Main Nikla Gaddi Leke" punctuate the film's violent sequences not as counterpoints but as emotional fuel, transforming violence into the culmination of romance and patriotism. The melodic structure of the Bollywood action film in this way domesticates violence, making it aesthetically consumable and emotionally affirming for mass audiences.

5.5 Violence, Memory, and the Partition Archive

Scholars of Partition history have noted the particular challenge of representing Partition violence in ways that neither sanitize its horror nor sensationalise it into entertainment. *Gadar* arguably fails this test: its opening sequences are horrifying enough to establish the reality of Partition's brutality, but the film's second half converts that horror into the raw material of nationalist entertainment. As Sarah Waheed has argued, the archive of Partition is a "wounded archive", a repository of fragmented, traumatic memories that conventional narrative cinema consistently fails to honour in their full complexity.³⁵

The film's representation of rape and sexual violence during Partition is particularly instructive in this regard. The threat of rape is a recurring motif - Sakina is nearly raped by Hindu-Sikh rioters in the first half, and Muslim women are threatened with sexual violence in the second half, but the film consistently uses the threat of rape as a plot device to motivate male heroism rather than as a serious engagement with gendered violence as a historical phenomenon. Women's trauma is instrumentalized for male narrative action, reproducing the very logic of Partition violence that feminist historians like Urvashi Butalia and Ritu Menon have spent decades critically excavating.³⁶

6. *Gadar*: A Contested Text

Gadar's ideological coherence is deceptive. A closer reading reveals significant internal tensions and contradictions that prevent the film from being dismissed as simply a communalist propaganda piece. The film does show, however briefly, violence perpetrated by Hindu-Sikh mobs against Muslims. Tara Singh himself begins the film as a participant in mob violence against Muslim refugees, a fact that the film subsequently represses rather than resolves. The film also includes a Pakistani Muslim character who assists Tara and Sakina in their escape, disrupting the binary of good Indian/bad Pakistani that the film otherwise constructs.

Moreover, the film's romance plot—a Sikh man falling in love with a Muslim woman and defending her right to choose her own life—carries within it a potentially progressive message about inter-communal love and human solidarity that cuts against its more nationalistic impulses. Several audience members interviewed by scholars noted the film's implicit critique of religious fundamentalism on both sides of the border.³⁷

These internal divisions suggest that *Gadar* is a contested text, one that cannot be reduced to a single ideological message but must be read as a site of negotiation between competing social meanings: love and hatred, tolerance and bigotry, historical memory and nationalist myth.

7. Conclusion: Understanding Indian Society through the Lens of Cinema

The study of *Gadar: Ek Prem Katha* reveals cinema as an indispensable instrument for understanding the internal social architecture of Indian society. The film is a lingering cultural artefact that defies classification in the official archives of Indian independence. What the film makes legible through its violence, its star system, its communal anxieties, and its aesthetic choices is a portrait of a society still wrestling, more than eighty years after Partition, with the unresolved traumas of that catastrophic rupture. Several conclusions can be drawn from this analysis:

First, popular Hindi cinema is not mere entertainment; it is a form of public history-making that shapes how millions of Indians understand the past. *Gadar's* version of 1947 has, for large sections of the Indian populace, become more emotionally real than the academic histories written by professional historians. This places a profound responsibility on filmmakers and a profound analytical imperative on scholars. *Second*, the violence in *Gadar* maps the fault lines of Indian society with unsettling precision. The film's anti-Pakistan, anti-Muslim undertones are not aberrations but symptoms of a nationalism that has been systematically constructed through cultural production over decades. To study the film's violence is to study the conditions of possibility for real-world communal violence. *Third*, the Bollywood star system—epitomized by Sunny Deol's hyper-masculine, nationalistic persona functions as an ideological apparatus that normalizes certain forms of violence (patriotic, retributive, male) while delegitimizing others. The social consequences of this normalization, particularly in the context of India's communal politics, demand continued critical scrutiny. *Fourth*, the aesthetics of violence in *Gadar* the language of blood, the spectacle of the male body, the use of melodic violence reveals the deep entanglement of pleasure and politics in popular cinema. As Sontag warned, the aestheticization of violence does not neutralize it; it amplifies its social impact by embedding it within the structure of desire.

Finally, and most broadly, the study of *Gadar* confirms what film theorists from Ferro to Rosenstone have consistently argued: that cinema is one of the most powerful archives of social experience available to historians and social scientists. To understand Indian society, its caste hierarchies, communal wounds, gender politics, class aspirations, and nationalist fantasies, one must engage seriously with the films it makes, the stars it celebrates, and the violence it finds pleasurable. As Bhaskar Sarkar wrote,

"Partition cannot be isolated from larger historical processes."³⁸ And neither can *Gadar*. It is a film of its time, a film of its nation, and a film for all its ideological contradictions that tells us more about who India is than many official histories dare to.

References

1. A brief note about the film's production details and a summary of its cast have been mentioned. *Gadar: Ek Prem Katha* (Zee Telefilms, 2001), Producer: Nitin Keni, written by: Shaktimaan Talwar, and Directed by: Anil Sharma. Cast: Sunny Deol, Ameesha Patel, Amrish Puri, Vivek Shauq, Lillete Dubey, Utkarsh Sharma.
2. Chopra, Anupama "Location impacts power of stars", *Variety*, 4 November 2005. Archived from the original on 18 July 2022. (Retrieved 16 August 2026).
3. Bhaskar Sarkar, *Mourning the Nation: Indian Cinema in the Wake of Partition*, Durham: Duke University Press, 2009, 4-7.
4. Marc Ferro, *Cinema and History*, trans. Naomi Greene, Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1988, 15-20.
5. Hayden White, "Historiography and Historiophoty", *American Historical Review*, 93(5), 1988, 1193.
6. Mahir Saul, "Film and Video as Historical Sources", Thomas Spear (ed.), *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of African History*, New York, NY, online edn, Oxford Academic, 27 Feb. 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190277734.013.247>.
7. Robert Rosenstone, *History on Film/Film on History*, Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2006, 35-40
8. Pierre Sorlin, *The Film in History: Restaging the Past*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1980, 55.
9. Eleftheria Thanouli, *History and Film: A Tale of Two Disciplines*, New York: Bloomsbury, 2019, 12.
10. *Ibid.*, 59.
11. John E. O'Connor, "History in Images/Images in History: Reflections on the Importance of Film and Television Study for an Understanding of the Past", *American Historical Review*, 93(5), 1988, 1200-1209.
12. Bhaskar Sarkar, *Ibid.*, Note 3, 14.
13. Sharma, Manoj, "Cinematic Representations of Partition of India", *People: International Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(3), 2017, 1120-1140.
14. Gyanendra Pandey, "In Defence of the Fragment: Writing about Hindu-Muslim Riots in India Today", *Economic and Political Weekly*, 26(11-12), 1991, 559-572.
15. Mushirul Hasan, quoted in Sarah Waheed, "Partition's Hauntings and Bombay Cinema", *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, 2015, 17-18.
16. Ayesha Jalal and Sugata Bose, *Modern South Asia: History, Culture, Political Economy*, London: Routledge, 2004, 165.
17. Marc Ferro, *Ibid.*, Note 4, 18.

18. Gianluca Fantoni, "Film and History", *Research in Film and History*, NTUI Rep, 2014, 22. https://irep.ntu.ac.uk/id/eprint/12865/1/2755_Fantoni.pdf.
19. M. Madhava Prasad, *Ideology of the Hindi Film: A Historical Construction*, Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998, 1-10.
20. "Fascist Imaginaries and Clandestine Critiques: Young Hindi Film Viewers Respond to Violence, Xenophobia and Love", *CiteSeer Document*, 2003. doi=507d20b5397db457d067d7b5a9a9ffd603e4f6f7
21. Shabana Azmi, quoted in "Gadar: Are the Muslim League's Objections Justified?", Hindu Vivek Kendra, June 2001, <http://www.hvk.org/2001/0601/129.html>.
22. M. Madhava Prasad, *Ibid.*, Note 19, 5.
23. *Ibid.*, Note 20, 5.
24. "Millennial Review: Sunny Deol's Hyper-Nationalism in Gadar", *The Quint*, May 2019.
25. *Ibid.*
26. *Ibid.*
27. "Gendered Violence, Religious Identity, and the Role of Popular Cinema: A Study of *Gadar: Ek Prem Katha*", *Academia.edu*, 2025. <https://www.academia.edu/145398868>.
28. Richard Dyer, *Stars*, London: BFI Publishing, 1979, 34-38.
29. "Angry Young Man to Grumpy Old Man: How Sunny Deol Expanded the Definition of Hero", 19 October 2023. Archived from the original on 4 February 2024. (Retrieved 4 February 2024)
30. "Millennial Review: Sunny Deol's Hyper-Nationalism in Gadar", *The Quint*.
31. *Ibid.*, Note 20, 4.
32. Susan Sontag, *Regarding the Pain of Others*, New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2003, 87
33. Ravi Vasudevan (ed.), *Making Meaning in Indian Cinema*, Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2000, 45-70.
34. Walter Benjamin, "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction", Hannah Arendt (ed.), *Illuminations*, New York: Schocken Books, 1969, 241-242.
35. Sarah Waheed, "Partition's Hauntings and Bombay Cinema", *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, 2015, 1-5,
36. Urvashi Butalia, *The Other Side of Silence: Voices from the Partition of India*, New Delhi: Viking, 1999), 12-18.
37. *Ibid.*, Note 20, 8-10.
38. Bhaskar Sarkar, Note 3, 22. ★