

**CONTROL AND CENSORSHIP ON SELECTED
FILMS IN IRAN FROM 2005 TO 2012**

ABBAS SEIFI

UNIVERSITI SAINS MALAYSIA

2016

**CONTROL AND CENSORSHIP ON SELECTED FILMS
IN IRAN FROM 2005 TO 2012**

By

ABBAS SEIFI

**Thesis Submitted in Fulfillment of Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

November 2016

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This dissertation is lovingly dedicated to Allah, the almighty, the most Beneficent, my Lord, whose shower of blessing is for all creations in the universe. My leading regards are due to my helpful and supportive supervisors, dear Professor Madya HJ. Mohammad Md. Yusof and Professor Madya Muhammad Hatta Muhammad Tabut, who guided me in this research. My cardinal thanks to the dean of the school of communication Dato Professor Dr. Adnan Hussein for his effective support and continuous help. I also thank all respectful professors, lecturers and the staffs of the school of communication in USM.

To my honourable late father, Hassan Seifi, who encouraged me to continue studying and improved my way of attitude. To my late mother, Nazanin, who, helped me with her endless kindness in all steps of my life. To my dear brother Ali Seifi, for his support that helped me to pass hard days in my study. To my kind sisters, Eshrat, Ezzat, Sedigheh and Badri who gave me dignity of being their brother. To my faithful and loyal wife, Mahnaaz, who granted me spirit of study through her sacrifice and kindness. To my dear son Omid, who abided to be far from me during my study. To my lovely daughters, Molood and Mina, who helped me a lot to be a successful father. I am very thankful to my friends in Iran, Haji Parviz Safaezadeh, Haji Esmaeel Ghasemi, Haji Mohsen Naeel, Haji Hossein Zamani, and Haji Gholam Reza Kamali and finally thankful to my dear Colleagues, Dr Noman Yaser, Dr Noor Hayat, Dr Aisha Iman, Dr Anna Agustina, Dr Zubair Mahmood, Dr Ruhana Mijan, Dr Intan Soliha Ibrahim, Dr Isiaka Aliagan, Dr Eli Jamila and Dr Raqib Sofian.

Abbas Seifi

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgment	ii
Table of Contents	iii
List of Tables	xii
List of Figures	xiii
List of Schemes	xiv
List of Plates	xv
List of Abbreviations	xxvii
Abstrak	xxviii
Abstract	xxxii

CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION

1.1	Background of the Study	1
1.2	Problem Statement	3
1.3	Research Questions	5
1.4	Research Objectives	6
1.5	Research Methodology	6
1.6	Limitation of the Research	7
1.7	Dimensions of Hegemony	8
	1.7.1 Political Hegemony	9
	1.7.2 Ideological Hegemony	9
	1.7.3 Judiciary Hegemony	11

1.7.4 Military Hegemony	11
1.7.5 Economic Hegemony	13
1.7.6 Cultural Hegemony	14
1.7.7 Corporate Hegemony	15
1.8 Significance of the Research	15
1.9 Definition of Key Terms	16
1.10 Overview of the Chapters	22

CHAPTER 2 – IRANIAN FILM INDUSTRY AND CENSORSHIP

2.1 Introduction	25
2.2 Censorship	25
2.3 Beginning of Iranian Cinema in Ghajar Dynasty	28
2.4 Beginning of Film Censorship in Iran	30
2.5 Cinema in Pre-Islamic Revolution	31
2.5.1 Cinema during World War II and Iran-Iraq War	33
2.5.2 Cinema during 2nd King of Pahlavi Dynasty	33
2.6 Cinema in Post-Islamic Revolution	36
2.6.1 Pressure on Cinema in Post-Islamic Revolution	38
2.6.2 More Pressure and Artists Migration	31
2.6.3 Cinema under New Political Condition	40
2.7 Film Regulations of 1983 and 1996	42
2.7.1 Imposing the Film Regulations	46
2.7.2 Criticism on the Clauses of Film Regulations	48
2.8 Summary	53

CHAPTER 3 - LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1	Introduction	56
3.2	Concept of Hegemony	56
3.2.1	Genesis of Hegemony	57
3.2.2	Development of Hegemony after its Genesis	58
3.2.3	Socialist Thought of Hegemony	58
3.2.4	Gramsci's Thought of Hegemony	59
3.2.5	Contemporary Hegemony	60
3.3	Censorship on Films by Hegemonic Forces outside Iran	61
3.4	Censorship on Foreign Films during World War II and After	64
3.5	Censorship on Iranian Films by Hegemonic Forces in Pre-Islamic Revolution	66
3.5.1	Early Film Censorship Committees in Iran	68
3.5.2	Censorship on Iranian Films during World War II	69
3.6	Censorship on Iranian Films by Dominant Forces in Post-Islamic Revolution	70
3.6.1	Political Hegemony Caused Iranian Film Censorship during Iran-Iraq War	74
3.6.2	Censorship on Iranian Films by Hegemonic Forces from 2005 to 2012	74
3.6.2(a)	Films' Censoring Committees in Iran under Supremacy	75
3.6.2(b)	Censorship on Iranian Films by the Authorities' Dominant	79
3.6.2(c)	Controlling Films' Public Show by Non-Related Forces in Iran	81

3.6.2(d) Parliamentary Hegemony instead of Legal Censorship on Iranian Films	82
3.6.2(e) Ideological Hegemony as an Alternative of Legal Censorship on Films	82
3.6.2(f) Economic Losses due to Supremacy on Films in Iran	83
3.7 Iranian Filmmakers under Judicial custody	83
3.8 Theoretical Framework	87
3.8.1 Conceptual Framework	88
3.9 Summary	89

CHAPTER 4 – RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1 Introduction	91
4.2 Research Approach	91
4.3 Research Design	92
4.3.1 Data for the Qualitative Method	93
4.3.2 How Films Were Selected to Analyze	95
4.3.3 Enforcers of Hegemony to Control Iranian Films	98
4.4 Content Analysis	99
4.4.1 Content Analysis of Films Based on Impractical Regulations	100
4.4.2 Analysis of Imposing Hegemony on Iranian Films	101
4.5 Context of the Study	103
4.6 Conclusion	103

CHAPTER 5 – FILM ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

5.1 Introduction	105
------------------	-----

5.2	Content Analysis of the Film A Separation	106
5.2.1	Content Analysis of the Synopsis	108
5.2.1(a)	Discussion of Analyzed Synopsis	110
5.2.2	Content Analysis of Selected Dialogues	111
5.2.2(a)	Discussion of Analyzed Dialogues	115
5.2.3	Content Analysis of Selected Images	116
5.2.3(a)	Discussion of Analyzed Images	122
5.2.4	Viewpoints about the Film	122
5.2.4(a)	Viewpoints of Filmmakers	123
5.2.4(b)	Viewpoints of Film Critics	124
5.2.4(c)	Viewpoints of Film Authorities	125
5.2.4(d)	Viewpoints of Non-Related Forces	125
5.2.5	Results and Discussion	126
5.3	Content Analysis of the Film ‘Moral Police’	127
5.3.1	Content Analysis of the Synopsis	129
5.3.1(a)	Discussion of Synopsis	131
5.3.2	Content Analysis of Selected Dialogues	131
5.3.2(a)	Discussion of Dialogues	136
5.3.3	Content Analysis of Selected Images	136
5.3.3(a)	Discussion of Analyzed Images	145
5.3.4	Viewpoints about the Film	146
5.3.4(a)	Viewpoints of Filmmakers	146
5.3.4(b)	Viewpoints of Film Critics	147
5.3.4(c)	Viewpoints of Film Authorities	148
5.3.4(d)	Viewpoints of Non-Related Forces	148

5.3.5	Results and Discussion	149
5.4	Content Analysis of the Film ‘I am a Mother’	151
5.4.1	Content Analysis of the Synopsis	155
5.4.1(a)	Discussion of Analyzed Synopsis	158
5.4.2	Content Analysis of Selected Dialogues	158
5.4.2(a)	Discussion of Analyzed Dialogues	165
5.4.3	Content Analysis of Selected Images	165
5.4.3(a)	Discussion of Analyzed Images	176
5.4.4	Viewpoints about the Film	177
5.4.4(a)	Viewpoints of Filmmakers	177
5.4.4(b)	Viewpoints of Film Critics	178
5.4.4(c)	Viewpoints of Film Authorities	179
5.4.4(d)	Viewpoints of Non-Related Forces	180
5.4.5	Results and Discussion of film ‘I am a Mother’	180
5.5	Analysis of the Film ‘Offside’	182
5.5.1	Content Analysis of the Synopsis	184
5.5.1(a)	Discussion of the Analyzed Synopsis	185
5.5.2	Content Analysis of Selected Dialogues	186
5.5.2(a)	Discussion of Analyzed Dialogues	191
5.5.3	Analysis of Selected Images	192
5.5.3(a)	Discussion of Analyzed Images	201
5.5.4	Viewpoints about the Film	202
5.5.4(a)	Viewpoints of Filmmakers	202
5.5.4(b)	Viewpoints of Film Critics	203
5.5.4(c)	Viewpoints of Film Authorities	205

5.5.4(d)	Viewpoints of Non-Related Forces	206
5.5.5	Results and Discussion of film ‘Offside’	206
5.6	Content Analysis of the Film ‘Private Life’	208
5.6.1	Content Analysis of the Synopsis	211
5.6.1(a)	Discussion of Analyzed Synopsis	213
5.6.2	Content Analysis of Selected Dialogues	214
5.6.2(a)	Discussion of Analyzed Dialogues	222
5.6.3	Content Analysis of Selected Images	222
5.6.3(a)	Discussion of Analyzed Images	233
5.6.4	Viewpoints about the Film	234
5.6.4(a)	Viewpoints of Filmmakers	234
5.6.4(b)	Viewpoints of Film Critics	235
5.6.4(c)	Viewpoints by Film Authorities	235
5.6.4(d)	Viewpoints of Non-Related Forces	236
5.6.5	Results and Discussion of film ‘Private Life’	237
5.7	Content Analysis of the Film ‘Salve’	238
5.7.1	Content Analysis of the Synopsis	240
5.7.1(a)	Discussion of Analyzed Synopsis	241
5.7.2	Content Analysis of Selected Dialogues	241
5.7.2(a)	Discussion of Analyzed Dialogues	246
5.7.3	Content Analysis of Selected Images	247
5.7.3(a)	Discussion of Analyzed Images	257
5.7.4	Viewpoints about the Film	257
5.7.4(a)	Viewpoints of Filmmakers	258
5.7.4(b)	Viewpoints of Film Critics	258

5.7.4(c)	Viewpoints of Film Authorities	259
5.7.4(d)	Viewpoints of Non-Related Forces	259
5.7.5	Results and Discussion of film ‘Salve’	259
5.8	Content Analysis of the Film ‘Santouri’	261
5.8.1	Content Analysis of the Synopsis	263
5.8.1(a)	Discussion of Analyzed Synopsis	264
5.8.2	Content Analysis of Selected Dialogues	264
5.8.2(a)	Discussion of Analyzed Dialogues	270
5.8.3	Content Analysis of Selected Images	270
5.8.3(a)	Discussion of Analyzed Images	280
5.8.4	Viewpoints about the Film	280
5.8.4(a)	Viewpoints of Filmmakers	281
5.8.4(b)	Viewpoints of Film Critics	281
5.8.4(c)	Viewpoints of Film Authorities	282
5.8.4(d)	Viewpoints of Non-Related Forces	283
5.8.5	Results and Discussion of film ‘Santouri’	283
5.9	Content Analysis of the Film ‘Payback’	285
5.9.1	Content Analysis of the Synopsis	286
5.9.1(a)	Discussion of Analyzed Synopsis	287
5.9.2	Content Analysis of Selected Dialogues	288
5.9.2(a)	Discussion of Analyzed Dialogues	292
5.9.3	Content Analysis of Selected Images	293
5.9.3(a)	Discussion of Analyzed Images	296
5.9.4	Viewpoints about the Film	296
5.9.4(a)	Viewpoints of Filmmakers	297

5.9.4(b) Viewpoints of Film Critics	297
5.9.4(c) Viewpoints of Film Authorities	298
5.9.4(d) Viewpoints of Non-Related Forces	299
5.9.5 Results and Discussion of film ‘Payback’	299
5.10 Overall Summary of Results and concluding remarks	301

CHAPTER 6 – CONCLUSION

6.1 Introduction	303
6.2 Summary of the Research Findings	303
6.2.1 Violation of Film Regulation Clauses	305
6.2.2 The impact of Political Hegemony on films	307
6.2.3 Mixture of Political and Ideological Hegemony on Films	308
6.2.4 Hegemony Replaced Legal Film Censorship	309
6.2.5 The Impact of Economic Hegemony on Films	310
6.2.6 Judiciary Hegemony on Filmmakers	311
6.3 Contribution of the Research	311
6.4 Suggestion for Future Research	312

REFERENCES	314
-------------------	-----

APPENDIX	341
-----------------	-----

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 2.1 Controllers of Film Censorship in Iran from year1900 to 2004	54
Table 5.1 Extent of violation of film regulations by eight analyzed films	301
Table 5.2 Types of hegemony imposed on the selected films	302

LIST OF FIGURES

		Page
Figure 2.1	Censorship in Media	26
Figure 3.1	The conceptual framework (Hypothetical model) of the study	89
Figure 4.1	Material used in the qualitative study	94
Figure 4.2	Main types of hegemony Imposed on Iranian films	102
Figure 6.1	Hegemonic Enforcers and their functions in Iran	304

LIST OF SCHEMES

	Page
Scheme 3.1 The dominant forces on films' outside Iran	66
Scheme 3.2 Hegemonic Powers Imposing Control on Iranian films from 2004 to 2012	87
Scheme 4.1 Schematic representation of the research	93

LIST OF PLATES

Plate 5.1	Close up of women is not allowed in Iranian films, Islamic veil must be obeyed	116
Plate 5.2	Any physical contact between men and women is prohibited	117
Plate 5.3	Razieh touched Hojat on his chest	118
Plate 5.4.	Any physical contact between men and women is prohibited. Razieh is holding Hojat's hand to stop him from beating himself.	119
Plate 5.5	Hojat's reaction in the court could encourage roughness and violence.	120
Plate 5.6	Razieh cried bitterly to help her husband in the court; it shows the women's misery in Iran.	121
Plate 5.7	The film portrays a dirty picture of Iran through Convicts' bad condition in the court waiting for his trial.	122
Plates 5.8	Closeup view of young girls is not allowed in Iranian films.	137
Plate 5.9	Abbas behaves aggressively to get money to pay back his father's loan from a usurer.	137
Plate 5.10	The film portrays dirty pictures of Iran	138
Plate 5.11	An irresponsible Iranian who has to dreams only.	139
Plate 5.12	Portrait of a drug pusher in Iran	140
Plates 5.13	Azam was raped by a gang of drug pushers	140
Plate 5.14	Cigarette smoking is prohibited in Iranian films	141

Plate 5.15	Problem of unsuccessful marriage in Iran	142
Plate 5.16	Image is criticizing moral police officers as corrupted people	142
Plate 5.17	Abbas is criticizing economic issues in the society	143
Plate 5.18	Abbas gets close to Parisa	144
Plate 5.19	The censored scene of the film shows the final place of wrong doers.	144
Plate 5.20	Saeed told Nader that he knows the history of his wife's friendship with him.	166
Plate 5.21	Nader at the airport to fetch his former girlfriend returning from Paris.	166
Plate 5.22	Simin showing her closeness to Nader when she returned home	167
Plate 5.23	Existence of a lonely house is a secret between them.	168
Plates 5.24	Saeed drinking wine and served it to Aawaa.	168
Plates 5.25	Saeed and Aawaa drink alcohol spent the full night together.	169
Plates 5.26	Cigarette smoking is prohibited in Iranian films.	169
Plate 5.27	Aawaa and Saeed, Nader and Nahid touched each other.	170
Plate 5.28	Nader has shown fully drunk	171
Plate 5.29	Aawaa shown happy when listens to Saeed's willingness	171
Plate 5.30	Nader does not know that his best friend is the rapist	172
Plate 5.31	Aawaa committed suicide after she was raped	172
Plate 5.32	Aawaa touched Pedram's coat requesting forgiveness	173

Plates 5.33	Remorseful Saeed asked for forgiveness	173
Plates 5.34	Simin thinks of revenge only and has lost her manners.	174
Plate 5.35	Aawaa informs Simin that she is pregnant by Saeed.	174
Plate 5.36	Aawaa requests her boyfriend to leave her alone.	175
Plate 5.37	Simin thinks of revenge	176
Plate 5.38	A girl in boys' dress, intending to break the taboo of girls' prohibition to enter sport stadiums.	192
Plate 5.39	The boys in the car knew some passengers were girls.	193
Plate 5.40	These girls are professionals; they know how to enter the stadium.	193
Plate 5.41	The boys in the car knew some passengers were girls.	194
Plate 5.42	Tickets are usually sold in the black market at the stadium.	194
Plate 5.43	Girl arrested by a soldier; while touching her.	195
Plate 5.44	Arrested girl makes fun of the soldier.	195
Plate 5.45	The girls' desire to enter the stadium is a headache	196
Plate 5.46	The arrested girls kept in bars are prevented of watching the football game.	196
Plate 5.47	The girl looks upset for missing her right of watching the game.	197
Plate 5.48	The soldier unable to reply logical questions of the girl.	197
Plate 5.49	To use the gents' toilet a girl has to cover her face in the stadium.	198
Plate 5.50	A boy with long hair threatens the soldier.	198

Plate 5.51	The soldier wished to return his home village, so he did not want to have any trouble.	199
Plate 5.52	The father of a girl who entered the stadium searches for her daughter.	199
Plate 5.53	The soldiers do not allow the old man to beat the girl.	200
Plates 5.54	The scenes show the girl was a heavy cigarette smoker.	200
Plates 5.55	The arrested girls and soldiers joined the people to celebrate Iranian football team victory.	201
Plate 5.56	The mobilization forces (Basij) brought down the films from screens and act against unveiled ladies. Ebrahim as the leader of the group encouraged them to be firm against the enemies.	223
Plate 5.57	Unknown individuals watched and perhaps guided the oppositions against Iranian films.	223
Plate 5.58	Ebrahim led a mobilization group to disturb unveiled girls by terrible action of tacking down on their foreheads. Ebrahim's operations were not accepted by some reasonable teammates.	224
Plate 5.59	Ebrahim ordered the torture of those arrested people to confess their crimes. He was famous for torturing people.	224
Plate 5.60	Ebrahim was dismissed from the government services because of various corruptions. He does not want to reply journalists' questions properly for he is corrupted.	225
Plate 5.61	Ibrahim's life suddenly changed differently. He had sexual relations with a young lady when his family was away to see relatives. Then, debauchery was added to his mistakes.	225
Plate 5.62	Close-up images prohibited according to the film regulation announced by the MCIG in this film are more than those	226

found in many other Iranian films. (Clause No. 2 of the film regulations of 1983.)

- Plate 5.63 Ebrahim's former close friend blamed him for publishing anti-revolutionary articles. He said, "When I see a man like Mr Ebrahim is against our revolution I get upset." 227
- Plate 5.64 Ebrahim's another friend warned him of his unethical behavior in his life. 227
- Plate 5.65 Ebrahim's former comrade said that he was worried about Ebrahim's present condition. The commander understood that Ebrahim was in trouble because of his own actions. 227
- Plate 5.66 Ebrahim was fully compliant to Parisa; he was obedient to his temporary wife, but planned to get rid of her as soon as his permanent wife and his son returned from their visiting trip to the North. The image shows his obedience. 228
- Plate 5.67 Parisa forced Ebrahim to continue their relationship; she told him that she was pregnant. Ebrahim was doubtful as to whether the baby was his own or just a trap planned by Parisa. 228
- Plate 5.68 Parisa got closer to the family of Ebrahim; she came to their house to warn Ebrahim of next possible happenings. The two wives were sitting together in his terrace house when he returned home. 229
- Plate 5.69 Ebrahim threatened Parisa, warning her not to enter his family life. He put a kitchen knife to her neck, warning her that he would kill her if he decided to kill. 229
- Plate 5.70 An empty DVD was sent to Ebrahim's permanent wife, Ebrahim was scared and angry towards Parisa, and he intended to solve the problem with the help of a military chief. 230

Plate 5.71	Parisa chased Ebrahim and his family everywhere to implement her planned action at a right time.	230
Plate 5.72	Parisa ignited Ebrahim's car at midnight; this was a warning to Ebrahim that Parisa was serious in her desires.	230
Plate 5.73	Ebrahim is lying to the policemen who came for investigation; he did not want his family and others know Parisa as a convict.	231
Plate 5.74	In their last meeting planned by Ebrahim, Parisa was very happy; she thought Ebrahim had returned to her to remain, she did not know what was going to happen that day.	231
Plate 5.75	Parisa was killed by Ebrahim in the car; he fired a bullet in her head while she was very happy to be with him once again.	232
Plate 5.76	Ebrahim doesn't know what to do with the dead body of Parisa.	232
Plate 5.77	Ebrahim did the same thing as she has done to his car; he set fire on her body in a lonely place.	232
Plate 5.78	Ebrahim had a nightmare, where he talked with Parisa. He justified his criminal action, but he cried bitterly. He knew that all happenings were due to his own wrong doings. In his presence, Parisa was standing and asking for what sin their baby was killed by him.	233
Plate 5.79	An aggressive father at home shouting because he has lots of monetary limitations. He beat his daughter (Maryam) with a belt because she went out without his permission.	247
Plate 5.80	He shouted to his own mother, for supporting her granddaughter.	247

Plate 5.81	Maryam is addicted; she needs opium named “rock candy.” She ran away from home to be with a young boyfriend who served her. Showing these types of pictures is prohibited in Iranian films.	248
Plate 5.82	The grandmother took care of Maryam; she gave money and supported her everywhere inside and outside the house.	248
Plate 5.83	Maryam did not want the companion of her grandmother as she did not want her to be in danger.	249
Plate 5.84	The rock candy dealers were either doing business or they wanted to enjoy with the girls and make them victims. Addiction of girls and young ladies often leads either to prostitution or murder, not only in Iran, but also everywhere in our present world.	249
Plate 5.85	Cigarette smoking is prohibited in Iranian films according to the announced film regulations in the year 1983. Maryam wanted to live according to her wish; she smoked as an addicted girl in Iranian society.	250
Plate 5.86	Maryam refuges to her boyfriend Bardia who served her with buying her required opium.	250
Plate 5.87	While buying opium a boy suggested that Maryam be with him in a night’s party out of Tehran. Closeness of men and women is not allowed in Iranian films according to clause No. 10 of film regulation declared in 1983.	250
Plate 5.88	A group of boys came to Maryam to get close to her; the grandmother humiliated them on the spot.	251
Plate 5.89	Another group of boys came to support Maryam and her grandmother. The two groups argued, but they compromised without any clash.	251

Plate 5.90	The opium dealer gave the material to Maryam, he got the cash, and then he delivered the material.	252
Plate 5.91	Maryam's home partners take her to the north to find her boyfriend over there.	252
Plate 5.92	The supportive boy helped the old lady; he took her to the north where Maryam has gone along with her friends. The grandmother had a sister in north who she did not meet for ten years.	252
Plate 5.93	Come on, this is "rock candy," go to that corner and use it, soon I'll come to you to enjoy our life.	253
Plate 5.94	Reza saved Maryam, while she is scared of Siavash's wrong doings. She stopped Reza's car while escaping from Siavash who chased her. Reza threatened Siavash and to close his café for his wrong doings.	253
Plate 5.95	Reza knows his family's steward is not a trustworthy man, but he has no other alternative ways, but to ask him to provide a safe place to Maryam for a few days.	254
Plate 5.96	The broker being greedy for sex, offered lots of money to be with Maryam.	254
Plate 5.97	Showing close images of young ladies and girls in Iranian films are prohibited by the law.	255
Plate 5.98	Aziz's sister was a rich lady; she blamed her sister not to be so kind to the new generation. She advised her sister to take rest as she is already old.	255
Plate 5.99	The two sisters went to the city market, hoping they could find Maryam by chance.	256

Plate 5.100	Maryam escaped from a trap which the broker and his friend set for her. Ultimately, she returned into the arms of her grandmother.	256
Plate 5.101	Close up Images of Ali Santouri are used by the filmmaker to attract audience. The filmmaker uses close up images.	271
Plate 5.102	These types of portraits are not usually accepted by film censorship committee in Iran, they depict a foreign culture.	271
Plate 5.103	In Iranian films, according to the film regulations, men are not allowed to touch women. Ali uses his own shawl to get closer to Hanieh.	272
Plate 5.104	In Iranian tradition, the clerics are not supposed to sit close to the bride. The image breaks the rules and it is against tradition.	272
Plate 5.105	These types of portraits are usually not accepted by film censorship committee in Iran. The young artists are not allowed to sit too close to remind audiences of artists' sexual relations.	273
Plate 5.106	Close up images of young girls in Iranian films are prohibited according to film regulations.	273
Plate 5.107	Ali and Hanieh touched each other which is extremely prohibited in Iranian films.	274
Plate 5.108	Ali as an active musician works hard days and nights for his concerts and musical albums.	274
Plate 5.109	Ali's concerts are successful in Tehran, but he cannot get permission from the MCIG.	275

Plate 5.110	Ali is forced to play the santour in marriage parties where prohibited dances are Inevitable and the hosts provide drugs instead of fees, then the musician falls into the clutches of addiction.	275
Plate 5.111	Ali, addicted to heroin, destroyed his marriage life; these types of images in Iranian films are prohibited for public showing.	275
Plate 5.112	Portraying images of injecting opium and delivering drugs are of non-written prohibitions in Iranian films.	276
Plate 5.113	Javeed, a vionolist, invites Hanieh to join their music group.	276
Plate 5.114	Ali neglects his responsibilities towards his wife because of his heavy addiction to heroin. The couple shout at each other because Ali is jealous of Javeed who formed a musical group with Hanieh. They even touch which is prohibited in Iranian films.	277
Plate 5.115	When Hanieh leaves Ali, his condition becomes worse; he destroys his life with his addiction. The prohibited scene in Films.	277
Plate 5.116	Ali cannot work anymore because of his addiction. He broke his hand. Without money to pay his rent, the landlord kicked him out of his house.	278
Plate 5.117	Being helpless Ali searched for food from garbage bins; he has no more money to buy drugs he required.	278
Plate 5.118	No one helped Ali, not even those he helped before. Ali hopelessly shouted to his destiny.	279
Plate 5.119	Addiction made him homeless	279

Plate 5.120	By chance the police found an addicted man in a very bad condition. Ali was admitted to a hospital. Then, he quit his addiction, His father took care of him after ignoring him for so long.	279
Plate 5.121	Ali quits from his heavy addiction. He requested the hospital authorities not to send him to the same society where there is a trap of addiction waiting for him. He started his job in the hospital teaching music to others.	280
Plate 5.122	These four young ladies intended to take revenge on men because they suffered because of them. The close up images of young ladies according to film regulations are prohibited.	293
Plate 5.123	The four jail mates would be released from the prison to actualize their plan in Tehran.	293
Plate 5.124	The four jail mates would be released from the prison to actualize their plan in Tehran.	294
Plate 5.125	The first victim was an ogle man whose profession was engineering; he was hunted by Sara and forced by Ziba to pay about USD 5000 as penalty because of his fault.	294
Plate 5.126	The second spoiled man who fell into the trap was a merchant who had to pay USD 6000	294
Plate 5.127	Another prey of the gang is a film director who cheats beautiful girls while asking them to act in his films.	295
Plate 5.128	This man was a bridegroom who wanted to have time with someone before he goes to his own marriage party.	295
Plate 5.129	A poet who considers beautiful girls as the styles of poems is captive in ladies' hands.	295

Plate 5.130 A poor old man wrongly stepped into the trap set by the ladies 296
as a rich man. However, he believes forbidding evils are the
responsibility of every Muslim. So he gave a ride to one of
them to advise her.

LIST OF ABBREVIATION

BBCP	British Broadcasting in Persian
BBFC	British Board of Film Classification
BCE	Before Common Era
CE	Common Era
CPJ	Committee to Protect Journalists
GCFE	Global Campaign for Free Expression
ICHR	The International Campaign for Human Rights in Iran
IHRV. ORG	Iran Human Rights Voice Organization
ISNA NEWS	Iranian Students' News Agency
MCIG	Ministry of Culture and Islamic Guidance
P.P.Gs	Political Pressure Groups
SAVAK	Pre-Islamic organization of intelligence and national security service of Iran.

KAWALAN DAN PENAPISAN FILEM TERPILIH IRAN DARI TAHUN 2005 - 2012

ABSTRAK

Penapisan filem di negara Iran telah menjadi satu isu kontroversi sejak kewujudan pawagam di negara ini. Oleh itu, tesis ini berusaha untuk meningkatkan pengetahuan dan pemahaman terhadap pelaksanaan penapisan filem di Iran, terutamanya dari tahun 2005 hingga 2012. Tesis ini meneliti kaedah tipikal yang digunakan dalam penapisan filem-filem dalam era ini untuk menangani masalah keserasian "pelaksanaan hegemoni dan bukannya penapisan undang-undang" pada filem-filem dan "pelanggaran peraturan-peraturan filem" oleh pihak berkuasa dan pembikin filem. Objektif kajian ini adalah untuk mengenal pasti sejauh mana pelanggaran peraturan-peraturan filem oleh pembikin filem, jenis-jenis hegemoni dan bukannya penapisan undang-undang yang dilaksanakan terhadap filem-filem, dan kesan hegemoni kepada pembikin filem. Kajian ini bertujuan untuk memahami kuasa hegemoni sedia ada yang cuba untuk mengehadkan filem-filem melalui pengharaman dan penapisan, di dalam dan di luar kuasa Kementerian berkaitan yang bertanggungjawab terhadap kawalan filem di Iran. Tesis ini menggunakan kaedah kualitatif untuk mencapai matlamat dan objektif kajian yang telah dirancang. Tesis ini menggunakan kajian kes untuk menganalisis lapan filem yang telah dipilih secara rawak dimana kesemuanya berada di bawah penguasaan pihak berkuasa untuk penapisan atau pengharaman sepanjang lapan tahun dari tahun 2005 hingga 2012 yang merupakan tahun kemuncak bagi pengehadan yang dikenakan terhadap pawagam-pawagan di Iran. Analisis kandungan sinopsis bagi setiap filem, lebih daripada 65 dialog, dan 130 imej dari semua adegan yang terdapat di dalam filem-filem tersebut

telah dijalankan secara terperinci dan dibandingkan dengan 15 fasal peraturan filem tahun 1983 dan 9 fasal pindaan tahun 1996. Di samping itu, untuk menyokong hasil kajian, pandangan pembikin filem, pengkritik filem, pihak berkuasa, dan pihak-pihak yang tidak berkaitan telah dikaji. Keputusan kajian menunjukkan bahawa kesemua lapan filem yang telah dianalisis telah melanggar peraturan-peraturan filem dari aspek sinopsis, imej dan dialog yang terdapat di dalam filem-filem tersebut. Walau bagaimanapun, tiada sebarang tapisan yang telah dilakukan oleh jawatankuasa penapisan terhadap filem-filem tersebut dan lima daripada lapan filem tersebut telah menerima permit tayangan daripada Kementerian Kebudayaan dan Bimbingan Islam. Larangan yang dikenakan ke atas filem-filem tersebut tidak dilakukan oleh jawatankuasa penapisan filem yang dilantik, tetapi kerana mendapat tentangan pihak-pihak lain. Apabila jawatankuasa tersebut tidak mengendahkan undang-undang peraturan-peraturan filem maka pelbagai pihak berkuasa lain mula melaksanakan hegemoni ke atas filem-filem tersebut. Hegemoni politik, ideologi dan ekonomi telah dikenakan ke atas hampir semua filem dan seterusnya menyebabkan pengharaman filem-filem tersebut, walaupun selepas menerima kebenaran tayangan awam dari MCIG. Selain itu, hegemoni Badan Kehakiman turut dikenakan ke atas pembikin filem yang boleh mengakibatkan penjara dan penghadan aktiviti pembikinan filem. Berdasarkan hasil penyelidikan terhadap filem-filem yang terpilih, kewujudan kuasa hegemoni telah menguasai pawagam-pawagam di Iran dari tahun 2005 hingga 2012. Hasil kajian menunjukkan lima daripada lapan filem yang dianalisis telah ditayangkan di pawagam, namun tiga daripada filem tersebut telah diharamkan hanya selepas beberapa hari tayangan awam. Dua lagi berada di bawah penguasaan dan kawalan timbalan menteri sinematik MCIG dan dibenarkan tayangan terhad. Sebuah filem lain telah diharamkan tanpa notis selama tiga tahun manakala tiga lagi filem telah

diharamkan di bawah hegemoni politik dan ideologi. Kaedah menjalankan analisis kandungan dalam kajian ini terbahagi kepada tiga fasa, seperti berikut. 1. Kesemua 24 fasal peraturan filem yang diumumkan tahun 1983 dan 1996 akan dikaji secara kritis. 2. Filem-filem yang dipilih akan ditonton untuk mengenalpasti dialog-dialog dan imej-imej yang mempunyai kontroversi. Dialog-dialog dan imej-imej yang penuh kontroversi ini telah melanggar undang-undang dan peraturan perfileman. 3. Wawancara bersama pembikin filem, pengkritik filem, pihak berkuasa filem, dan kumpulan pendesak akan dikaji untuk mengenalpasti sebarang kuasa hegemoni yang terlibat dalam melakukan tindakan di sebalik penapisan undang-undang. Dalam erti kata lain, bagi menangani masalah hegemoni, kaedah mengumpul sudut pandangan pembikin filem, pengkritik filem, pihak berkuasa filem, dan lain-lain pihak telah dijalankan dan instrumen hegemoni beserta fungsi-fungsinya telah digunakan. Lebih penting lagi, kaedah analisis kandungan filem dan sudut pandangan pihak-pihak yang dinyatakan di atas telah dijalankan berpandukan kepada peraturan-peraturan filem tahun 1983 dan 1996. Maka, instrumen hegemoni memainkan peranan dalam membendung masalah di mana jawatankuasa penapis filem yang berkenaan tidak dapat mengawal filem berdasarkan peraturan filem yang telah diisytiharkan. Kajian ini menyimpulkan bahawa kuasa hegemoni berlaku dan bukannya disebabkan oleh jawatankuasa penapisan filem dan tidak berdasarkan kepada peraturan-peraturan filem tahun 1983 dan pindaan penapisan filem tahun 1996. Pelaksanaan hegemoni pada filem-filem adalah tidak menentu dan menyebabkan kerugian yang besar kepada pendapatan box office dan pembikin-pembikin filem turut terjejas akibat kuasa badan kehakiman selepas melabur masa, tenaga, dan wang pada filem-filem mereka. Hasil kajian ini akan menyumbang kepada kesedaran pembikin filem terhadap penapisan

filem yang sedia ada dan jenis-jenis hegemoni yang boleh dijangkakan dan kesan-kesan hegemoni terhadap pembikin filem dan filem-filem mereka.

CONTROL AND CENSORSHIP ON SELECTED FILMS

IN IRAN FROM 2005 TO 2012

ABSTRACT

Film censorship in Iran has been a controversial issue from the birth of cinema in this country. Hence, this thesis strives to increase the knowledge and understanding of imposing film censorship in Iran, especially from the years 2005 to 2012. It investigates the typical method behind censorship on films in this era to address the problem of compatibility of “imposing hegemony instead of legal censorships” on films and the “violation of film regulations” by the authorities and filmmakers. The objectives of this study are to identify the extent of film regulations violation by filmmakers, the types of hegemonies imposed on films instead of legal censorship, and the impact of hegemony on filmmakers. This study seeks to understand existing hegemonic powers that attempt to limit the films through banning and censorship, both inside and out of the relevant Ministry which is in charge of film control in Iran. This thesis uses qualitative method to achieve the outlined aims and objectives of the research. It deploys case study to analyze eight random selected films which were majorly under the domination of authorities for censorship or ban during eight years from 2005 to 2012 which are the peak years of limitations imposed on Iranian cinema. The content analysis of the synopsis of each film, more than 65 dialogues, and 130 images from all the viewed scenes of the films is carried out in detail and is compared with 15 clauses of film regulations of 1983 and 9 clauses of the amendments of 1996. The clauses of announced film regulations of 1983 and 1996 is critically studied. Besides, eight selected films are scrutinized to choose the existing controversial

dialogues and images which violate the laws and regulations. Furthermore, the available online interviews of the filmmakers, film critics, film authorities, and the pressure groups are studied to find out hegemonic forces acting instead of legal censorship. In other words to address hegemony, the method of collecting the viewpoint of filmmakers, film critics, film authorities, and non-related forces are specified along with the instruments of hegemony and their functions. More importantly, the method of content analysis of films and the aforementioned viewpoints respectively, is based on the film regulations of 1983 and 1996, then it can be considered that instrument of hegemony takes role when the relevant censor committees are not able to control films based on the declared film regulations. The results of the study indicates that all the eight analyzed films had violated the film regulations in the synopsis, images and dialogues of the films. However, none of those is censored by the censorship committee and five out of eight even received show permit by the ministry of culture and Islamic guidance. The ban imposed on films is not by the appointed film censorship committee, but due to being against. When the committee ignored the law of film regulations supremacy of different kinds started to impose hegemony on films. Political, ideological, economic hegemony was imposed on almost all the films that caused the ban of films, even after receiving public show permission from MCIG. Besides, Judiciary hegemony is imposed on filmmakers that causes imprisonment and limitation of filmmaking activities. Based on research findings of selected films the existence of hegemonic powers controlled Iranian cinema in 2005 to 2012. The output of the study shows five films out of eight analyzed films were released for wide screen, but three of them were banned just after few days' public shows. The remaining two were under supremacy and control of the cinematic deputy minister of MCIG and had limited showing. One other film was banned for

three years without notice and three more films were banned under the political and ideological hegemony. The study concludes that hegemonic powers act instead of film censorship committees and not based on film regulations of 1983 and the amendment of film censorship of 1996. The act of hegemony on films are unpredictable and result in major loss of box office revenue and filmmakers are suffered by judiciary forces after investing time, energy, and money on their films. The findings of this research will contribute to filmmakers' awareness on the existing film censorship and the type of hegemony that can be expected and the impacts they might have on them and their films.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

“Censorship in any form is the enemy of creativity, since it cuts off the life blood of creativity: ideas” (Jenkins, 2005). Authorities mostly use this tool to suppress the communication of information of any type which is in conflict with their interest. Hence, censorship is often associated with anything that confronts democracy, such as totalitarianism, socialism (Mentis, 2009). There are various types of censorship referred to by different terms, namely; religious, moral, military, corporate, ideological, political, and economic. In spite of the global defense against the problem of censorship since 1920, still there are countries which have a very high level of censorship such as Eritrea, North Korea, Iran, China, Russia and etc. (CPJ, 2015).

Films as the most influential type of media informs people about the existing issues in the society and it may even change the lifestyle of the audience (BBFC, 2014). Hence, Hegemony, which is a form of dominance over the general public (Marxis-glossary 2015) has been exercised by the ruling class to censor and control films. Amongst all types of hegemony the military, economic, political and ideological are the most commonly practiced ones (Florig, 2014). Göçmen, (2013) believes that the contemporary hegemony is more cultural than ‘geopolitical dominance’. Therefore, the power of media, and in specific films that alter and direct people’s thoughts are the reason behind the sensitivity of the authorities and the use of supremacy instead of legal censorship based on announced laws and regulations’.

There are various examples of International hegemonic censorship over films throughout the history of cinema. Films in United States of America until 1952 went under various types of censorship (Ward, 2002). The evident Influence of Church on Hollywood (Horowitz, 1997) and 'production code' declared by self-policing agency censor board were seen in the US. So the problem of censorship existed even in the countries that claimed to be a democrat, however, after the defense against censorship the hegemony has been reduced internally.

Films in Iran have undergone various levels of Hegemony in the place of censorship throughout the history of cinema. Imposing supremacy on films started from 1916, in the form of political censorship of international films (Mehrabi, 2006) and was continued to the extent of complete prohibition of watching films in 1920 which was hegemony from religious clerics (Dabashi, 2011). The first censored local film was in the year 1933 which was in the form of political hegemony.

The first film regulation package was released during II Pahlavi king in 1950 with 9 chapters and 77 clauses by the ministry of culture and art. The censorships were mostly based on the political and security of the country, not disrespecting religions and kingdom, laws morality and government. However, even in this era the censorship was not completely based on regulations; security officers (SAVAK) censored films instead of the responsible ministry (Alaie, 2013). At least three political film regulations were imposed on films during the II Pahlavi reign.

The Islamic revolution of 1979 emphasized on Islamic cinema through various organizations. The aim was to mold media in Islamic fashion to create ideological hegemony (Sreberny-Mohammad and Mohammad, 1990). The absence of women,

love and social critiques are the features of films in the early post-Islamic revolution. The role of cinema in the following years of the Iran- Iraq war (1980-1988) was to promote war (Bahar, 2010). In 1983 the first film regulation package based by the ministry of culture and Islamic guidance was announced consisting of 15 clauses. Soon these rules were shelved as they were not applicable and practical.

The country experienced the peak of film censorship and bans over local cinema from 2005 to 2012. The responsibility to control films were delegated to the Ministry of Culture and Islamic Guidance (MCIG); Mr Shamaghdari, the deputy minister and the head of cinematic formation in Iran and his assistant director, Mr Sajaadpur started their harmful control on films. In spite of their order to the filmmakers that the films had to follow 24 announced clauses of film regulations; they imposed the most severe types of censorship beyond the announced rules. Many filmmakers claimed that the censorship during these eight years were not based on the regulations, but by the outer dominant forces (Mirbakhtiar, 2006; Kosari, 2015).

Van-der-pol (2014) started the study on ‘Transnational comparison’ of film censorship rules. He believes that the complexities of film censorship must be explored further at the local level. In specific, the exploration of “film production ban and censorship” in Iran was strongly recommended by him in the book ‘slicing cinema’.

1.2 Problem Statement

Always there has been a perception that the censorship of films in Iran is the result of the hegemony of religious organizations, similar to the Nigerian implementation of Sharia’s law studied by McCain (2013). However, the factors

behind the censorship of films and the types of hegemony imposed on Iranian cinema remains largely unexplored (Van-der-pol, 2014). There are few studies which have examined the censorship of Iranian media in the post-Islamic revolution (Sreberny-Mohammadi and Mohammadi, 1990). However, no study has been conducted to determine whether the censorship of films has been based on the regulations, hegemony or the mixture of both.

Years of 2005 to 2012 were called as the most pressurizing period for the Iranian cinema. Based on a noted filmmaker Rakhshan Banietemad, film authorities tried to expand their limitations on films. Mr. Shamaghdari, the Deputy Minister and the head of cinematic formation in Iran and his assistant director, Mr. Sajaadpur, imposed the most severe film censorship during the mentioned years. Hence, the restrictions on film making was called nothing but the most tragic (Dabashi, 2012).

During those eight years, invisible forces who were not related to the culture, art and cinema were interfering, banning or censoring films; just to prove their hegemony over Iranian cinema (Kosari, 2015). In addition, some illegal groups and irrelevant individuals criticized the produced films, demanded to stop their public shows, and even their ban. These dominant forces came to the scene, even after the films have received various permissions from the responsible ministry.

The application of censorship and regulations on films seemed inconsistent (Nottingham, 2004b). Based on Mirbakhtiar (2006) filmmakers did not know if “the censorships were in the form of law.” Hence, there is an ambiguity about the regulations and the types of hegemony on films during the aforementioned years. The continuous debate on Iranian film making was due to the imposition of censorship on

films based on hegemonic desires, rather than the existence of the declared film regulations. Some Iranian films are antithetical with film regulations and really controversial.

Severe actions against the cinema communities such as shutting down the ‘house of cinema’ an independent film association with 6000 members in 2012 by the ministry of culture, and Islamic guidance (MCIG), and Imprisonment of several filmmakers (Akrami, 2013) showed the seriousness of hegemony on cinema in these 8 years. However, the types of hegemony imposed on the cinema and the influence of these controlling forces on the industry needs to be investigated as follows.

1. The declared film regulations are not tools of film control from 2005-2012.
2. Dominant forces act instead of legal censorship if censor committees fail.
3. Invasion by dominants cause loss of money and filmmakers imprisonment.

Therefore, this research focuses on the problem of control on Iranian cinema during 2005 to 2012. This study aims to explore the nature of supremacies imposed on films which resulted in censorship or both censorship and ban of the films during the aforementioned years. The investigation of the problem could end the ambiguity and suspicions on whether films censorship and banns were completely based on the declared film regulations or the hegemony imposed over cinema.

1.3 Research Questions

In order to provide a systematic perspective on the issue of imposing film censorship in Iran based on Hegemonic Dimensions and to find a correct response to

the bottlenecks of cinema the following questions have to be answered as the main research questions:

Q1. To what extend the announced film regulations are applicable to control films?

Q2. How dominant forces act instead of legal censorship if censor committees fail?

Q3. Why dominants' invasion causes loss of money and filmmakers imprisonment.

1.4 Research Objectives

To address the indicated research problem three objectives should be achieved:

1. To identify extend of film regulations' violations by films from 2005-2012.
2. To investigate dominant forces acting instead of legal film censorship in Iran.
3. To recognize the role of dominant forces in loss of money investment and filmmakers imprisonment.

1.5 Research Methodology

This thesis employs qualitative research techniques to address research objectives and research questions. Eight controversial films which were majorly censored or censored and banned were selected from the films produced during the peak time of hegemony over cinema, 2005 to 2012. The selected film genres as case studies are all dramas as they are the most common type of films in Iran with a serious story. Hence, the authorities are more sensitive towards these types of films.

This research conducted content analysis on the synopsis, dialogues and images of these films. Content analysis of synopsis of each film is the starting point to recognize whether the central idea of the films violates existing film regulations or not. Besides, the images of the films were studied frame to frame and dialogues were analyzed line by line. Simultaneously, the films' contents were compared with the "film regulations" declared by MCIG to find the controversial dialogues and violated images of each film. The explained approach could determine which 'clauses of film regulations' were violated by the studied films.

Hegemony over each film is separately studied to identify the types of hegemonies viz., political, ideological, judicial, and economic which impacted the censor or banning of the films. The viewpoints of filmmakers, film critics, non-related forces, and film authorities obtained through online interviews were analyzed. Moreover, through mentioned methods the impact of hegemony on the filmmakers and cinema were determined. A more detailed discussion of the research methodology is provided in Chapter 4 of this thesis.

1.6 Limitations of the Research

Obtaining direct viewpoint of filmmakers and film critics was not possible; even several attempts and request for face to face interview or online interview about the eight selected films was rejected. Hence the study conducted the content analysis of the viewpoint through available and relevant interviews on social networks with official film critics, journalists and other official persons. Moreover, the investigation of opinions about the censored or banned films from the authorities such as judicial

forces, political pressure groups, Friday prayers' leaders and the parliament members was not possible.

The content analysis of film censorship from 2005 to 2012 was limited to eight randomly selected films not only due to the special situation and period that the film was made in but also the limitation of access to complete synopsis and videos of more than 64 investigated films to select eight films among them. Another limitation in this regard was to get possible answer on the questions from filmmakers, film critics, film authorities, and the political pressure groups about the films. Besides due to special political situation in Iran doing face to face interviews were not possible as none of the above mentioned groups dare to talk about film censorship and its tools in Iran. This is the reason why social network and available interview are used to collect data

1.7 Dimensions of Hegemony

Exertion of power has many forms such as domination, all of which aim to impose 'one's own will' on others. In this case, Hegemony is the "indirect form of domination" (Göçmen, 2013). For instance, at the present time, the US is the point of condensation that pressurizes the dominant groups for solving the issues with global capitalism. America attempted to solve the global capitalism crisis through hegemonic forces by using political-military responses (Talshir et al., 2005). Although, there were many debates on the choice of types of hegemony deployed by the States as there are many other types of hegemony. In total, hegemony has five main dimensions, namely the military hegemony, economic hegemony, political hegemony, institutional hegemony and ideological hegemony (Florig, 2014).

1.7.1 Political Hegemony

“Hegemony is the difficult emergence of a new political logic” (Laclau and Mouffe, 2015). Political hegemony is the dominant influence, of a state, region, or group, over another, China's position of dominance in East Asia for most of its history is a good example of the political domination. “Any attempt to pursue hegemony as a policy is open to political and bureaucratic maneuvering, ideological manipulation, and serious miscalculations, and potential opportunity costs” (Haugaard and Lentner, 2006).

1.7.2 Ideological Hegemony

The concept of Hegemony is fulfilled when those in power maintain” their domination over a society (Wallis, 2012). Interpretation of hegemony in a broader sense shows that the domination by hegemony is different from other types of dominance as it is mostly achieved by means of ideology (Göçmen, 2013). According to the ideas of Gramsci (1971) the concept of "hegemony," or ideological domination could provide such aforementioned controls. “When one ideology, or world view, dominates, it suppresses or stamps out, often cruelly, any other ways of explaining reality.

Hegemony contains various types of ideologies. The ‘organic ideologies’ which come from the common people’s lived experiences are real. On the other hand, there are “artificial theoretical explanations created by academics or political activists or philosophers” (Bachus, 2015). Dominant ideologies are considered as the hegemonic powers in society. Hence, by constructing such ideologies the domination

over the people is maintained which are “usually promoted by the mass media” (Wallis, 2012). The following lines show how religious and ideological hegemony support rulers to conduct their policies.

The state believes its policies are the best for all members of society. Members of government therefore seek to attain and maintain popular support and political power so that policies can be implemented with minimal resistance. To do so, the state cannot afford to alienate any social group, including religious groups. Indeed, the state seeks political support from religious groups and individuals by being ideologically hegemonic, so that it has the power to shape social lives. In the context of Singapore, the state has the power to influence people’s private lives, specifically religious lives, through its policies and actions. It then seeks to persuade people that these policies and actions are the most natural and reasonable courses of action. The symbolic use of religious buildings is one way of exercising such hegemony. In other words, religious buildings play an ideological role in supporting a set of ideas and values, in this case the state’s ideas and values. These buildings are therefore not neutral backdrops to human action (Duncan and Duncan, 1988:123).

Islam is a political system with its own body of laws called ‘Sharia’ which are based on entirely different principles than non-Muslim laws. Although, the basis for the political, cultural and religious life of all Muslims is the sharia law; many of these laws concern the non-Muslims such as there is no freedom of artistic expression such as Film (Warner, 2010). Warner’s expression shows that Islamic laws are fundamentally against cinema and other visual arts. But he does not know the reasons of Islamic laws and cannot understand its spirit culture.

1.7.3 Judiciary Hegemony

Iran has an official religion, her political regime changed to Islamic in 1979. The new constitution acknowledges committee legislation and features a religious supreme leader as well as a head of judiciary under his supervision. The head of the Judiciary is appointed by the Supreme Leader, who in turn appoints the head of the Supreme Court and the chief public prosecutor. Public courts deal with civil and criminal cases. Revolutionary courts trial certain categories of offenses, including crimes against national security, narcotics smuggling, and acts that undermine the Islamic Republic. Decisions rendered in revolutionary courts are final and cannot be appealed. Article 156 of the Constitution provides for an independent judiciary (Omar Sial, 2006).

Disobedient artists including filmmakers arrest by security forces and trial in revolutionary courts as accused to acting against national security interests and disturbing public opinion.

1.7.4 Military Hegemony

Gerge Fritzer in his book *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology* says during the German occupation of France in World War II, American films had been banned, but in the immediate aftermath of the war hundreds of heretofore unseen films flooded in. p.218. The military hegemony is seen in the form of war hegemony and counter hegemony. Past military events are the example of how this type of hegemony is imposed on nations. For instance, in the seventeenth century, France has had the control of Indochina since 1883 and attempted recolonization in the post-World War

II. Hence, US who feared the spread of communism, supported the anti-communist government of South Vietnam. The reasons of war hegemony and counter hegemony was very clear in the case of Vietnam desire for freedom and reuniting the nation under communist rule (Hallin, 1984). However, the outer military hegemony imposed to control this movement. As Iran was involved in Second World War and also in eight years' deposed war against Iraq. From the time Reza shah was exiled up to the end of the II.W.W. in 1944 local films were banned in Iran. Besides Iran /Iraq war influenced Iranian cinema very much.

According to Patrick and Thrall (2007) propaganda as a form of communication tries to influence the attitude of the community. It is not ideological, but essentially a pragmatic and situational phenomenon. However, the classical situational propaganda “concerns its relative independence from ideology.” The comparison between the predictions of the Hegemony traditions with classical propaganda tradition was clearly seen during the Iraq post-invasion. The war news increased the pressures on the previously outlines given by the Bush administration, which gave them “the political force that pressured them into a defensive propaganda posture (Patrick and Thrall, 2007).

Besides all the given examples, media plays a big role in military hegemony. “War films are used as tool to create hegemony and counter-hegemony both at infra-national and international arena. Often war films are created to serve the purpose of the dictators. The same hegemonic tool can be used by dominant groups and other groups simultaneously to create hegemony and counter-hegemony” (Bari, 2014).

1.7.5 Economic Hegemony

Based on Gramsci, substructures or the economic forces of production affect the development of the state. Capitalism collapses when “proletariat achieves its own hegemony as means of production” (Belen, 2008). In fact, the economic classes are made as the result of social forces that create dialectical materialism in action.

A nation’s ability to determine the terms and conditions on which cross-border exchanges of goods, services, and financial assets are made. A global Hegemon can dictate these terms and conditions globally. A nation that achieves economic hegemony over a given sphere must stand ready to stabilize financial flows in that sphere when these become disorganized. Hegemony is not responsible for maintaining prosperity in its sphere of influence; but to continue as Hegemon it must at least prevent other nations from replacing it-and this depends largely on military power (Dymski, 2002). In addition according to Hyman Minsky (1975), three factors cause financial fragility. These factors are terms and conditions of financing, the riskiness of the project being financed, and the balance- sheet obligation of the borrowers unit. Post-Hegemonic U.S. Economic Hegemony: Minskian and Kaleckian Dynamics in the Neoliberal Era by: Gary A. Dymski economics.ucr.edu/papers/papers02/02-13.pdf University of California, Riverside by GA Dymski - Cited by 14 - Related articles

In case of situation for filmmaking in Iran, terms and conditions of granting loans to a filmmaker or film producer is very difficult even after introducing the filmmaker to the banks by the ministry of culture and Islamic guidance. As the destiny of produced films are not known the project of making films are usually risky. Therefore no one can guaranty if money investment on films is returnable. That is why

filmmaking in Iran experiences a hidden type of economic hegemony imposed by forces who tend to control films. Some film critics believe that nobody is able to make films in Iran without monetary help of government (Ferasati, M. 2015)

Gerge Fritzer argues that human rights and the market – and their worldwide diffusion under US hegemony. Finally, Callon (1998) and others have investigated the performativity nature of the knowledge forms that sustain the development of capitalism, mainly economics and accounting. Kohli (2005) in his article argues ‘Generational change’ says that in the sequence of generations, families and societies create continuity and change with regard to parents and children, economic resources, political power, and cultural hegemony.

1.7.6 Cultural Hegemony

The term ‘cultural hegemony’ in Marxist philosophy exists when the ruling class manipulates the culture of a society by controlling and dominating the “culturally diverse society (Bullock and Stallybrass, 1999).” This kind of cultural imperialism was formed to replace the classical colonialism since the end of World War second; which is in fact an indirect way of ruling or controlling a society in the light of new developments (Göçmen, 2013). According to an article by ‘The New York Times’, (2008) “rather than using force or explicit coercion, hegemonic power rested on the successful manipulation of cultural and social institutions -- such as the media -- to shape the limits of economic and political opportunities for citizens.” Therefore cultural hegemony has that much of ability to control political and economic powers with its dominant powers in the society.

1.7.7 Corporate Hegemony

Levis (1999) explains how the hegemony of corporate, center-right interests that dominate U.S. government sustained? The answer cannot be found in any simple sense at the ideological level-opinion surveys reveal substantial areas of popular resistance to dominant agendas. The question then becomes: how is consent achieved for a system in which most popular social democratic ideas are suppressed? The solution lies less in any direct form of media persuasion than in garnering support for the system in general, whereby government is seen to be broadly representative of a wide range of political positions. The article explores the discursive character of this support, drawing upon a “discursive survey “conducted in February 1998. From the book “Reproducing political hegemony in the United States” (Levis J. 1999). Then corporate hegemony is strong tools or leverage to promote direct marketing, sex advertising and so on. Corporate hegemony forces rival companies to consider benefits of hegemonic powers in market. Corporate hegemony can be considered as corporate propaganda to safeguard profits of powerful companies. Corporate hegemony forces rival companies to consider benefits of hegemonic powers in market. Corporate hegemony can be considered as corporate propaganda to safeguard profits of powerful companies. It directly and indirectly forces people to buy more and more.

1.8 Significance of the Research

Without overestimating, Iranian cinema is a unique cinema in some very special cases; that is why this study is significant and rational. The following points clearly show the logics behind the significance of the present thesis.

- 1) This research has adopted a unique approach in addressing film censorship considering all perpetrators of political censorship for the first time in Iran.
- 2) This research is one of the few attempts that provides evidence to prove that ineffable judicial pressure through judicial forces on filmmakers decreases their films' productivity (creativity) and their sense of making films. (In Iran judicial forces containing different courts are under the Supreme Leader's supervision then as the leader is the highest religious Islamic cleric the activities of judicial forces can be considered as ideological functions.)
- 3) This study has provided extensive information on different dimensions of hegemony imposed on films from the time when cinema was introduced in Iran. In addition, the dimensions of supremacy are conducted in the years 2005 to 2012.
- 4) The case study in this research is real and has utilized content analysis to reach the optimum achievement to answer the research questions and to obtain the research objectives.

1.9 Definitions of Key Terms

Keywords act like the vehicle by which people search to fulfil a need, they must then inform a broader content strategy (King, 2014). In this section of the thesis the main keywords of the study have been defined and briefly explained. These include the key concepts of the research which represent the main ideas of the study. Through these definitions the main components of the content and form which are what and how of every concept were provided.

Films: Films are produced by recording images from the universe by a device called the camera. Films are artistry products based on a specific culture to provide

information about that culture. They entertain the audiences and may educate them to review their knowledge on certain issues. The films may change life styles of the audiences (BBFC, 2014). According to Kellner (2003) from the beginning, cinema was bound up with the alteration of modernity. Film was a modern, technologically mediated art form, and it captured the novelties of modern life.

Hegemony: (Duncombe, 2002) in his article ‘Cultural Resistance’ argues that power resides not only in institutions, but also in the ways people make sense of their world; hegemony is a political and cultural process. Armed with culture instead of guns, one fights a different type of battle. According to The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology, Dominance over others; the ideas of the ruling class are the ruling ideas, and they have the power to control the production and distribution of materials. In fact, they even have control over the mental production of the society (Durham and Kellner, 2009). Mouffe (2000) believes that consensus might be the very expression of hegemony and “the crystallization of (asymmetric) power relations”.

Power relations are an important variable in the production of a hybrid culture. Tomlinson (1999) argues that hybridity is not a “simple form of anarchic, unregulated culture.” Instead, hybrid culture is conditioned by a set of unequal power relationships (Kraidy, 2002). Power struggles occur at the point at which imported cultural resources come into contact with local cultures. In response to globalisation, the Malaysian government enforced hybridity in popular culture to produce such a “third space” (Bhabha 1994).

According to Frank (1987) says that hegemony allows us to remember that the power of the dominant interests is never total, nor entirely secure. Hegemony is a