



Day One, Session One
Presentation 2 & 3

Framing Curricula

Ranjani Mazumdar
Ira Bhaskar

Ranjani Mazumdar

Thank you to the organizers for inviting us. Moinak Biswas has already posed some questions, I can't say that I agree with all of them and I can see that in the next two days we are going to have a lot of conversations on many of these issues. I think what I will do is to actually lay down some of these issues. Unlike the department at Jadavpur University which has had a long history and has gone through many kinds of changes and transitions and has had a more sustained encounter with the discipline of film studies for more than fifteen years, we are I would say, still in a state of discovery. We started in 2006 as an integrated programme at The School of Arts and Aesthetics in J.N.U which has Theater and Performance Studies, Visual Studies and Cinema Studies. We were both actually appointed in 2006 under Cultural Studies and then we quickly renamed our stream to Cinema Studies and brought it under an integrated programme of Arts and Aesthetics.

Part of the issue here is that both of us were trained in Cinema Studies and when we set up the department, we recognized that the discipline was going through a crisis or a transition of sorts. So a lot of what we developed in terms of our course work in J.N.U was in a sense addressing that crisis in the way we

framed the courses. We did not want to give up on what the discipline's history was but at the same time we felt we had to integrate some of the new questions and issues which we tried to develop in the M. Phil program.

We have divided up what we will do together here. I will start first by introducing how the M.A. program works so that you get a sense of how we are not just a Film Studies department but trying to do film studies in an integrated program. The J.N.U M.A. program is actually a two year program and over a period of four semesters, the students take sixteen courses with each course weighed at 4 credits. Of the sixteen courses eight are compulsory that all students have to take in the different streams. This means that no one can only do Cinema Studies or just Theatre and Performance studies or just Art History. Every student has to take compulsory courses in all these three streams. The two Cinema Studies compulsories are 'Introduction to Film Studies' and 'Indian Cinema: Past and Present', with a focus on Bombay recognizing that we cannot actually address everything that comes out of India.

Along with these compulsories we have had lots of optional courses for instance, we have offered a course called 'Film and the Historical Imagination' that Ira and I teach together as two modules. We have also invited lots of visiting faculty to offer courses. We have had people teach courses on Global Art Cinema, Cinema and Modernity, Italian neorealism, Non-fiction Cinema and Science Fiction. We have also had a Writing Seminar, which is like directed reading and supervised research where students work on a topic of their choice and with guidance develop a paper by the end of the semester. So we try and ensure that students get different kinds of options. Scholars who have visited so far are Christine Gledhill, Neepa Majumdar, Nitin Govil, Ravi Vasudevan, M. Madhava Prasad and Mark Betz from Kings College, London.

We went through training in which film theory was a separate discipline from historiography - that's how I was trained. We have tried an integrated approach here. We don't do everything, we cannot possibly. The 'Introduction to Film Studies' course is structured around 24 sessions in which we map the main debates of the field especially since we are in a program where students come from different disciplines with no background in Cinema Studies at all. They don't even know how to recognize the difference between a film and any other kind of product. So we actually start with the real basics and then move into mapping the various debates in the discipline and provide adequate attention even to Screen Theory because we feel that it is important to provide a history of the discipline. The first few sessions are on the language of cinema so that we can actually introduce them to terminology. This is followed up

with some sessions on the silent period.

Ira Bhaskar

So as Ranjani has pointed out, the objective of the Introduction to Film Studies course for the M.A. students is to actually introduce students coming in with or without a background in film studies to debates in the field. Sometimes there may be a student who might have done a course here and there or attended a film appreciation course. Our course is an attempt to map the field and so we combine issues relating to film language, film history and historical movements, film theory and film analysis. Once we have done the first few set of lectures on film language we move into the history section and I do sessions on early cinema, the silent period and the debates around silent cinema. Then we do Classical Hollywood Cinema and the genre system.

Ranjani Mazumdar

Genre is a constantly changing category so I do a session on genre where debates on genre are introduced. This is followed by sessions devoted specifically to particular genres such as *film noir*. I teach *film noir* and Ira teaches melodrama, so that the students can get some sense of generic particularities. We have limits, we cannot do everything but we try to at least enter certain kinds of genre practices so that students get the sense of how to negotiate specific forms and the debates generated by them.

Ira Bhaskar

We also look at theoretical issues such as those around realism, authorship, semiotics and historiography.

Ranjani Mazumdar

After the sessions on realism, authorship and semiotics we actually enter another terrain. We have a session on non-fiction film theory and stardom and then we move to Apparatus Theory. The moment of Apparatus Theory, psychoanalysis and feminism are mapped and this cluster comes just before we go to questions related to historiography and cultural studies. Then we come back to the last sessions addressing questions of race, Third cinema debates which are intended to include some of the other debates of the world and then at the end have a session on postmodernism and post-cinema. Our dream was always to end with the digital explosion but we have not always been able to do this. This year we are addressing that issue. The course is therefore structured over 24 sessions and we see this as a journey across the

major debates that provide the student a background but doesn't cover everything. The idea is that depending on their inclination they can pursue what is of interest to them.

Ira Bhaskar

The second course that's compulsory is the Indian Cinema course. The Intro to Film Studies and the Indian Cinema are the two compulsory courses in Cinema Studies. The Indian Cinema course is also organized in a manner that once again maps the major debates in the field and combines them with a historical overview where historiographical questions about the field are raised. So we begin with the issues and debates related to silent cinema and the work that has been done on the silent period, little as it is, with the qualification, of course that the material is missing and continues to be unavailable, I mean the primary film material. And we have a couple of sessions on the coming of sound and the early sound period, the studio system, the rise of genres and the continuity or ruptures between the silent and the sound period. These are some of the issues that we mark and lecture on paying some attention to the 30's and the 40's both in terms of the issues that are raised as well as in terms of films that are available for screening. We offer a sense of genre and its development during that time and then we move into the 1950s.

Ranjani Mazumdar

So the 1950s is spread out into almost six sessions between Ira and myself because of our attempt to break away from a particular way in which the 50's has been looked at. We do sessions on the 50's dealing with questions of nationhood and modernity, the city, and Nehruvian India. And then we come to the *auteurs*, Ghatak and Ray. We have been criticized a lot by our students for reproducing only these two *auteurs*. But we continue to do this because we think that our students need to get some sense of *auteur* debates as well. Unfortunately we have not been able to introduce many other filmmakers, but we had some of our PhD students to do special sessions on Tamil Cinema and Bengali Cinema. And then we come to the 1960s, again a neglected area which is now the subject of my research. In the Indian Cinema course we have had to resort to a kind of chronology or decade wise mapping. This is not something we are happy about but at least we can raise some of these questions and we have realized that our new students every year haven't seen anything even from the 70's or 80's so it's important to present all that. We do a session on the 70's that is split into the parallel cinema moment, the Indian New

Wave and the Amitabh Bachhan moment. And then we come to globalization which in the course is divided into two moments; the first is the 1990s moment and the second is the Multiplex moment. In the first moment we deal with the emergence of the 'underworld films' and the 'family films' and what happened with the re-structuring of the industry involving changes in distribution, and the diaspora emerging as one of the biggest markets. In the Multiplex period we look at how the exhibition context has changed the nature of how films are being made. We address the rise of Bhojpuri Cinema as a major force through some of the information we have acquired from our encounters with distributors in North India. And Ira does a session on communalism and the return of the Partition in contemporary cinema.

Ira Bhaskar

Since we attempt to combine a kind of survey and a sense of a period we try to address questions related to the different moments in Indian cinema history with also certain recurrent issues. For instance we do have a session on 'the figure of the double', a session on the Muslim *social* and the 'courtesan film'. In the contemporary period we look at the return of the Partition, in the 1950s we deal with the larger issue of the Partition and cinema and then we address the return of the Partition along with communalism. So there is a certain thematic structure as we are looking at the way in which Indian Cinema has been affected by globalization and by political and social issues of the contemporary. We attempt, as Moinak Biswas has pointed, to look at cinema as a cultural object and as a form that is deeply invested in issues of the cultural and cultural formation. The readings we assign for these classes draw upon the work that has been done by historians and political theorists especially in areas where we feel those arguments are relevant, for instance we feel that Partha Chatterjee's arguments about nationalism and the women's question are relevant, and so we assign that piece. We thus attempt to locate cinema within a wider field of political and cultural discourses.

In addition to these two courses, Ranjani has already mentioned that we also offer a series of optionals. Of the sixteen courses for the M.A. program eight courses are optional for the students and they are free to choose optional courses from the basket of courses that are offered at the School. Those interested in cinema look out for the cinema courses and like wise with theatre and with visual studies and art history. So each of these three disciplines offers courses every semester and the students are free to do them. We have had situations where students take as many film courses as they can in order to

prepare themselves to apply for the M.Phil program later and to get a certain kind of disciplinary focus and location as well. Of the optional courses Ranjani and I teach classes on film history.

Ranjani Mazumdar

I will quickly go through this so that then we can introduce you to our M. Phil structure which is where the students acquire a disciplinary specialization in Cinema Studies. But before we speak of that let me introduce our M.A. Optional course on Film and the Historical Imagination. We have had history students who also enroll for some of our courses, and this one has been one of our most successful and popular optional courses because it's really about why historians never like films that deal with history and how filmmakers don't care a damn about what historians think and that's part of the charm of this debate on cinema and history. The course is structured in the form of two modules. I do the first part in which questions related to the 'history effect' in cinema are discussed across different kinds of events including the French Revolution, the Chilean coup of 1973, the Vietnam War, the Cuban Revolution, the First and Second World War and the Holocaust. All these different moments are mobilized to actually force some of these questions about the relationship between films and what we refer to as a historical imagination. It was originally called 'Film and History' and then we changed the title to 'Film and the Historical Imagination' because we wanted to focus on these different kinds of issues in the course.

Ira Bhaskar

The second part or the second module of this course is a special module on traumatic history and cinematic representation. There are three focus areas where issues related to these questions are addressed. Those three focus areas are Hiroshima, the Holocaust and the South Asian Holocaust through which issues like writing history and writing trauma are addressed; which of course as you know is the title of Dominique La Capra's book. Issues addressed include how to write traumatic history, questions related to historical allegory and the question of trauma and genre, specific genre formations that can address a traumatic history, questions about witnesses and the importance of testimony. I also address debates on form around the 'Holocaust films' particularly referring to the classic realism-modernism debate which has come to be known as the Shoah- Schindler's List debate. So I address that debate and through that address larger questions of representation, issues of form and cinema,

cinema as testimony itself and how cinema can act as a witness. The last section of the course is related to South Asia and the questions of trauma and traumatic memory and the return of trauma as it operates within contemporary communalism. My attempt is to look at South Asia and not just focus only on India so we have readings and screenings from Bangladesh, Pakistan and Sri Lanka as well. Every year I sort of vary the focus, so sometimes the focus is on Bangladesh, sometimes on Pakistan, sometimes on India. We attempt to raise these issues and look at South Asia, the traumatic formation of Southern Asia and History. That's the Film and Historical Imagination course which is an optional course which has been quite popular, and a lot of our own students take it and students from other departments too because optional courses in J.N.U are open across the University.

Ranjani Mazumdar

There's one writing seminar that we teach at the M.A. level, but I don't want to spend too much time on that. For this writing seminar we only take five to seven students and during the semester they come with a topic. We meet regularly and help them develop a full fledged paper which could perhaps be published. We have taught it only once till now with seven students. The course actually moves in terms of meetings every two weeks where they present their ideas and research and start struggling with both theoretical and historical issues. This is important at the M.A. level. The M.A. students wanted a seminar course because the M.A. course is run more like lectures and discussions and not a seminar format. We instituted this course primarily because there was a demand from the students to have a course in which we could actually pay closer attention to what they were writing. It requires a lot of reading of drafts and returning comments to them on their research.

Ira Bhaskar

So this is the M.A. program, and as we have said it is not specifically an M.A. in Cinema Studies, it's an M.A. in Arts and Aesthetics and that's why we have the structure that we do. The M. Phil on the other hand is a specific M. Phil program in Cinema Studies. In J.N.U the M. Phil program is an M. Phil-PhD program. The M. Phil is two years and the students who successfully complete the M. Phil, if they have a B + grade point average, they can automatically move into the PhD stage. When we joined in 2006 we were asked by our then Dean that the School of Arts and Aesthetics students have been demanding an M. Phil so this is what we want to do, and we want all the

three streams here to offer M. Phil in Arts and Aesthetics. All the faculty members felt that we cannot offer an M. Phil in Arts and Aesthetics. It does not make any sense, and since we have three disciplines we need to develop three M. Phil programmes. So we developed three M. Phils in Theatre Performance Studies, Visual Studies and Cinema Studies. The M. Phil-PhD program is a specific program with twenty eight credits for the M.Phil. . And in the J.N.U structure, the first year of the M. Phil is course work and the second year is dissertation writing. So it's a research degree, at the end of which students produce a dissertation of about forty five to fifty thousand words which is hundred and fifty to two hundred pages. It's proper training for them to develop their first project with critical methods and strategies in order to produce the researched dissertation. The first year we have two courses in the first semester, and two courses in the second semester, and these four courses total up to sixteen credits. And in the second year the students write the dissertation that carries twelve credits. The entire program thus has a twenty eight credits structure.

Ranjani and I felt that in the first semester, we need to keep the focus on Cinema Studies courses because once again we face a situation where owing to entrance examination systems we have students applying from all over and quite often students come into the program without any cinema studies background at all. So we have made it compulsory for those students with no orientation to actually attend all our M.A. courses in order to familiarize themselves with the discipline and its concerns. In the first semester we both offer a course each - Ranjani teaches a course on 'Cinema and the City' and I teach a course on 'Melodrama and Popular Culture.' Both these courses are international cinema courses. The attempt is once again to familiarize students with debates. These are seminar courses that have readings and presentations by students on the readings and films screened in the classes. The idea of the Melodrama course is to actually address one of the most popular and internationally dominant forms for the addressal of contemporary social and political issues and it's a course that I have conceptualized as a structure that looks at the prevalence of melodrama across cinemas. We address both popular melodrama and art cinema forms. For instance the Hollywood family melodramas of the 50's, the women's film of the 30's, the question of the formation of the field of melodrama studies and debates around whether melodrama is a mode or whether it is a genre are addressed in the course. We also address issues such as how does melodrama actually intersect with modernity, and the crises of modernity? We also look at, as I said, international

forms, so Japanese, Chinese, Indian forms and also European melodramas and the way in which the melodramatic, not only the genre or the mode that travels, but also particular texts travel internationally. So, for instance, I am quite interested in the way in which a Douglas Sirk text like *All That Heaven Allows* would be remade by Fassbinder and then remade by Todd Haynes and how does a text like that travel and what are the intersections between melodramatic formations and other forms in the different cinemas. So that's the Melodrama course.

Ranjani Mazumdar

The Cinema and City course is also an international cinema course and it really deals with 'the spatial turn' in social theory, allowing us to look at the intersection between cinema and architectural space. This is where we read a lot of Benjamin, Lefebvre, De Certeau and other architectural theorists and over a period of twelve sessions we look at different sites and cities like Hong Kong, Algiers, Los Angeles, New York, Tokyo, Bombay and more and the way in which film is configured around these particular kinds of metropolitan cities. So it's really a course about the intersection between architecture, urban space and cinema. I do believe that cinema has a lot to do with architecture and it's a suppressed history of cinema because its other kinds of forms have taken over including narrative. So this is the course in which we deal with these questions and it follows the same format of class presentations and students write abstracts; we now have an e-mail list where all the abstracts are uploaded the night before the class and then the students come to the class with the abstracts and present.

In the second semester, we do two courses and this is where we move out of cinema studies into broader areas. One course is called 'Critical Theory to Cultural Studies' which we are going to now rename as 'Twentieth Century Cultural Theory'. I think there is a crisis across the disciplines, not just in cinema studies. The biggest crisis is in the discipline of history and I don't always find historians recognizing the crisis that is there in their discipline. So in the Critical Theory to Cultural Studies course we actually deal with diverse topics in fourteen sessions divided between the two of us where both Ira and I do seven sessions each. These classes are really long, without movies and go on for six hours with a twenty to twenty-five minute break, but they have been very successful. We have also learnt a lot from the classes and enjoyed them a lot because there are heated debates in the class and everybody argues with each other on many of these questions. But I just want to take you through

some of the sessions that I do and then Ira will talk about her sessions.

Since in the Cinema and the City class we deal with the early 20th Century debates on modernity and that's where we do Simmel and Benjamin, we start the Critical Theory course with the Frankfurt School and the Culture Industry debates. The first three sessions take us through debates related to technology -from the Frankfurt School to Althusser and Gramsci and the debates on ideology, to debates amongst the Situationists, the technology debate that emerged around the 'Society of Spectacle' and that's where we do Baudillard and Guy Debord. After the first three sessions, I do a class on Foucault where we read five extracts from Foucault around which we stage the discussions and this year I introduced Giorgio Agamben in that same session. Towards the end I have a session on Cultural Studies and Performance and this is followed by a session where we have a special focus on Judith Butler and Ranciere. The last session is really on Globalization and Networks and that's where we do Hardt and Negri, Arjun Appadurai, Garcia Canclini and Deleuze. This year in the coming semester we are planning to introduce two scholars, Bernard Steigler and Bruno Latour. The attempt with this course is to actually stay as updated as possible with the kind of debates that are going on in the world so that our students don't go out feeling we haven't exposed them to contemporary debates. This is actually a course in which we are constantly updating and introducing all the debates that are going on currently. There is also a session on Subaltern Studies.

Ira Bhaskar

Well you got an overview of the course. My sessions are earlier and they actually deal with the Linguistic Turn, semiotics, modernism, post- modernism and a section on postcolonial theory. In a theoretical course like this where does India fit in? And so we have a Subaltern Studies session along with sessions on Gandhi and Nandy. We attempt to place these thinkers within a larger discourse on modernity and cultural theory. We do special sessions on Stuart Hall and Cultural Studies. The course includes discussions and debates and student presentations. Though this is not a course on cinema the students are always responding to questions related to cinema, so film does enter at the level of discussions.

The second course that we do is actually the official Research Methodology course. But the way we have structured this is based on the experience of addressing a number of our students who would not have had a background before and need training in the methodologies for film and dissertation writing.

The end semester assignment for this course is to develop the dissertation proposal for their research project, which they eventually have to present and defend. So the first part of the course has been structured to actually help them understand the research methodological questions that would be specific to cinema but also introduce them to the idea that cinema studies has always been an inter-disciplinary field in many ways and that it has constituted itself through methodologies from other disciplines. We pay special attention to historiographical questions, we draw upon methodologies from the fields of history, anthropology and ethnography and we assign wider readings outside the field of cinema. We do special focus sessions such as on Industrial Practices where both of us teach one session each. Here the focus on the mode of production question is done by me via the Classical Hollywood Cinema example. These debates allow us to demonstrate the question of how research can be done on the film industry. It also allows us to showcase the connection between an industrial formation, a mode of film practice and a mode of production.

Ranjani Mazumdar

I do a session on Industrial Practices too which is centered on genre. Here I lay down all the related debates. And then we do the historiographic turn, mapping specific shifts in the discipline. So in the historiographic turn Ira looks at the works of Miriam Hansen, Tom Gunning, Vivian Sobchack, Thomas Schatz and Douglas Gomery. And I do debates in film theory which is now called the 'Celluloid and the Beyond' and in which again we deal with the Apparatus theorists and then go on to Anne Friedberg, David Rodowick, Sean Cubitt and all those other debates on technology and celluloid that have emerged in the recent past. Rodowick is a major figure over here. Moinak mentioned some of the people and new debates and I think both Rodowick and Friedberg are pretty significant in this debate. And then we do these sessions on ethnography and history. Amongst the historians we also read scholars like Carlo Ginzburg and Shahid Amin, and wherever we can, we deal with research questions. We look at how historians go about their research? What kinds of material they mobilize? What methods they adopt? And then we have sessions on ethnography and field work and draw from anthropological debates and that's where we read Clifford Geertz, Igor Kopytoff, Arjun Appadurai. Then we have sessions around people who have done field work in relation to film such as Brian Larkin, S.V. Srinivas and Neepea Majumdar.

Ira Bhaskar

The idea is to actually have general readings and then look at people who have worked on Indian Cinema. Scholars like Stephen Hughes or Priya Jaikumar who have drawn upon these methodologies are read in the course of the semester. Ranjani has already mentioned the others. And then two years ago we introduced two new sessions on 'Indian Cinema Debates' because what we realized from practice was that when our students moved to the second year of dissertation writing, suddenly when they were developing the literature review section for their proposal, and also for their dissertation introduction in the rationale and intervention sections, they were having difficulty in being able to mobilize the work that's been done on Indian cinema. And we felt that it was too late in their program to actually be grappling with these issues. So we introduced two sessions called Indian Cinema Debates One and Two in which they read works of important contemporary scholars amongst whom, some are present here - Ashish Rajadhyaksha, Ravi Vasudevan, M. Madhava Prasad and S. V. Srinivas.

Ranjani Mazumdar

So Indian Cinema is also divided into two sessions. Here we read absolutely everyone who has a voice on Indian cinema or intervention in Indian film studies ranging from Rosie Thomas, Sumita Chakravarty to Laitha Gopalan, in order to fill the gaps and go through all the different voices in the field, laying out for the students to then decide who they want to identify with or not. Our job is to present the whole spectrum of debates and then the students decide how they want to situate their intervention because M. Phil requires this kind of chapter or introduction where the student has to stage the intervention. You can't just come and say what you want to do, you have to address these debates. So, they actually have to have access to all the debates. We read Geeta Kapoor, Priya Jaikumar, Ashish Nandy, Neepa Majumdar along with all the names I have already mentioned.

The M. Phil is a one year program; it is too little time to do something very detailed in the dissertation. So it is really training ground for certain kinds of work that the students can actually do for their Ph.D. In the first year we allowed the students to be very ambitious about what they wanted to do and then we learned from our and their mistakes. We learnt that in the limited time we have, the dissertation had to be structured around three core chapters with an introduction and conclusion and we try and help the students to showcase the different kinds of skills that they can have. And so some

ethnographic work, some archival work and their ability to handle philosophical and theoretical debates are tested in the dissertation writing process. Students are encouraged to organize the chapters in a way where they can actually showcase their skills. One of the things that has happened on its own in our School, and we are not unhappy about it, is that research based projects that employ tracking material and a lot of actual field work has really become the sort of work that's been identified with our institution

I just want to quickly give you some sense of the topics the students have worked on. We have had students working on exhibition sites that are implicated in narratives of violence, we have had a dissertation on Manto's imaginative geography across the film industry in the 30's and 40's in which the student has dealt with popular journalism, women's performances and scandal and the art of script writing. We had a student working on Ramsay Brothers, technology, taste and the retro recovery of the Ramsays today in the context of new technologies. We have had a student work on the circulation of Korean videos in the North-East in the context of insurgency, piracy debates on subtitling, a dissertation on the remake and its relationship to technology and memory. We have also had work on the disappearance of older theaters and what they mean in relation to the city. We have had a project on Iranian Cinema and currently someone is writing on Korean Cinema. We have had dissertations on cinephilia in the digital age and also work on Delhi's iconic place in cinema.

Ira Bhaskar

So, the other thing that we have done, and it's not possible to do this every year, is to take our M. Phil students on a trip to the Pune Film Archives. This is a field trip to the archive to introduce them to the archives and at the location have a walk around the archive and show them how to deal with the archive and reflect on the ways in which the archive can be mobilized and how an archive is constructed, etc. I think the M. Phil program has actually led to some interesting new work which I think our students can then develop and publish. I've had a group of students who have done different *auteur* studies. So, we have had work on B. R. Chopra, and Andrei Tarkovsky. I have had other students' dissertations on 'the Child in Swedish Cinema', 'the celluloid Gandhi', 'the middle cinema and the middle-class cinema', on 'Cinema and self fashioning of women performers in the early sound period', also 'post liberalization Bengali parallel cinema' was just recently completed and a dissertation on 'the remix'. We have already had twenty two M. Phil dissertations that have been submitted and that doesn't take into account the

people who are working this year on the dissertations. These M. Phil students go to the PhD program but we also have direct PhD admissions. So, people can apply directly, for example those who have M. Phils from other universities can apply directly to our PhD program. And once again if they are coming with an M. Phil in English or History we make them attend all the M. Phil and M.A. courses. I think we may have two-three students submitting in a year's time. But the areas so far have all been related to Indian cinemas and the areas that they are working on are areas like the 'coming of sound', there are two or three dissertations on that area. 'Film music' is another area of interest, so is 'Bengali cinema'.

Ranjani Mazumdar

We have got students working on 'Law and Cinema'. Perhaps you know Lawrence Liang. He is registered in our department. We have got people working on 'early Malayalam silent cinema', 'the representation of love in cinema' and a host of other issues. It's too difficult to chart out every dissertation topic amongst the PhD students. We have thirty PhD students right now and it's a bit overwhelming since we are just the two of us as of now. The crisis we face is linked to lack of appointments and too much load as a result of that. The rest is a crisis that cuts across disciplines and not just in our discipline. But in our discipline it is taking a particular form and perhaps we can have a discussion on what the nature of the crisis is and when exactly did the crisis surface.

Ranjani Mazumdar and Ira Bhaskar

Thank You.