

THE RHIZOMATIC FLOWS OF TRANSNATIONAL TAMIL CINEMA IN ASIA AND WEB 2.0

Gopalan Ravindran

This paper attempts to examine the rhizomatic flows of transnational Tamil cinema in Asia in the context of the growing influence of the agents of Web 2.0. The application of the concepts of flow and rhizome forms the theoretical backbone in this regard. The concept of television flow, as advanced by Raymond Williams, has had its transformations in the notion of the space of flows by Manuel Castells and the notion of rhizomatic line of flight of Deleuze and Guattari. Giddens' notion of structuration is the sociological attempt to capture the ephemerality of postmodern representations. In this paper, the rise of transnational Tamil cinema in Asia is juxtaposed with the rise of Web 2.0 in their intertwined contexts. This is to understand their implications for the members of the globalized homeland, who are increasingly connected in the rhizomatic networks of flows originated by the transnational Tamil cinema and Web 2.0

Keywords: transnational Tamil cinema, globalized homeland, rhizome, any-space-whatevers, Web 2.0 and Malaysian Tamils

RHIZOMATIC FLIGHTS, FLOWS, GLOBALIZED HOMELAND AND WEB 2.0

The iconic status of Raymond Williams in the history of cultural studies is well known. Also well known is his concept of flow. The concept of flow relates to the notion of television programming as an ongoing flow of experience for the television viewer. In his remarkable work in 1974, Raymond Williams said: "In all developed broadcasting systems, the characteristic organization, and therefore the characteristic experience, is one of sequence or flow. This phenomenon, of planned flow, is then perhaps the defining characteristic of broadcasting, simultaneously as a technology and as a

cultural form"(80). The cultural form of television, according to Raymond Williams, rests on the planned flow of programming. Before embarking on the task of defining his kind of flow in this work, he sought to deal with the problem head on. The surest and best way to define a concept is to define its anti thesis. Here Raymond Williams comes out succinctly when he sought to define the distribution of programming as static and immobile and flow of programming as mobile. The concept of flow has been able to outlive the heydays of television studies largely due to the visionary essence it embodies towards the notion of distribution it wanted to dethrone. Moreover, the idea of flow appears to have overshadowed the idea of television flow as it gets applied to the post-

television contexts, in particular the contexts of Web 2.0.

The idea of flow also has its detractors. These argue against the concept of flow because of the role of technologies of distribution like DVDs and flash memory cards. When flow is equated with distribution, any new technology of distribution is a threat to the conventional mode of distribution. But they are not a threat to the larger flow that seeks to go beyond distribution. Particularly, when the larger flow is like a Deleuzian line of flight, with all the trappings of a rhizomatic progression of participatory content creation networks. These networks are ubiquitous in Web 2.0. They range from discussion forums and blogs to social networking sites like *Orkut* and *Facebook* to online video sharing communities like *YouTube*.

These networks exist in the space of flows, as Manuel Castells unwittingly adapted the notion of Raymond Williams's television flow in the age of network societies. Coming 15 years after Raymond Williams's concept, the notion of space of flows was a much needed upgrade of the concept of flow. Castells (1955-1997) wrote in his 1989 work that the space of places gets dethroned for enthroning the space of flows. The space of places is what conventional distribution finds cozy and the space of flows is where it gets dethroned absolutely. The theoretical progression of flow as a concept only receives a remarkable boost when we seek to link it to the notions of flow, as advanced by Castells and Raymond Williams, and then

to the notion of rhizome formulated by Deleuze and Guattari.

In the first chapter of *A Thousand Plateaus*, Deleuze and Guattari (7-13) explain the six principles that govern the rhizome. These principles relate to "connection, heterogeneity, multiplicity, rupture, cartography and decalcomania." According to Deleuze and Guattari, rhizomatic connections do not follow any order, unlike in the case of the connections that flow between fixed and pre-determined points in a tree. According to them, "any point of a rhizome can be connected to anything other, and must be." Related to the characteristic of connection is the trait of heterogeneity rhizomes sport. A variety of points are connected in any rhizomatic situation. Deleuze and Guattari, while critiquing Chomsky's linguistic model, said: "A rhizome ceaselessly establishes connections between semiotic chains, organizations of power, and circumstances relative to the arts, sciences, and social struggles. A semiotic chain is like a tuber agglomerating very diverse acts, not only linguistic, but also perceptive, mimetic, gestural, and cognitive..." Rhizomes are not contained by any pivot, subject/object/unity positions or even points that act as nodes. These do not exist in a rhizome. Rhizome is more an assemblage that relies for its nature and expansion on its connections which are not only heterogeneous and free-flowing, but multiplicitous. According to Deleuze and Guattari, "An assemblage is precisely this increase in the dimensions of a multiplicity that necessarily changes in nature as it

expands its connections. There are no points or positions in a rhizome, such as those found in a structure, tree, or root. There are only lines. ... Multiplicities are defined by the outside: by the abstract line, the line of flight or deterritorialization according to which they change in nature and connect with other multiplicities. The plane of consistency (grid) is the outside of all multiplicities. The line of flight marks: the reality of a finite number of dimensions that the multiplicity effectively fills; the impossibility of a supplementary dimension, unless the multiplicity is transformed by the line of flight; the possibility and necessity of flattening all of the multiplicities on a single plane of consistency or exteriority, regardless of their number of dimensions."

The lines of flight in a rhizomatic structure are as significant as the 'lines of segmentarity,' which are governed by the old rules of territorialization and stratification. It is only when the rhizomatic structure encounters ruptures, one sees the transformation of the lines of segmentarity into the lines of flight. As Deleuze and Guattari say, "A rhizome may be broken, shattered at a given spot, but it will start up again on one of its old lines, or on new lines. You can never get rid of ants because they form an animal rhizome that can rebound time and again after most of it has been destroyed. Every rhizome contains lines of segmentarity according to which it is stratified, territorialized, organized, signified, attributed, etc., as well as lines of deterritorialization down which it constantly flees. There is a rupture in the

rhizome whenever segmentary lines explode into a line of flight, but the line of flight is part of a rhizome. These lines always tie back to one another..."

Lastly, Deleuze and Guattari label rhizome as a map. According to them, a map does not share the characteristics of a tracing. Tracings seek to reproduce the basic structure in all its constituting elements. Map lacks the quality to reproduce as it does not have a structure that seeks to grow into its constituents. According to Deleuze and Guattari, "The rhizome is altogether different, *a map and not a tracing*. Make a map, not a tracing. The orchid does not reproduce the tracing of the wasp; it forms a map with the wasp, in a rhizome. What distinguishes the map from the tracing is that it is entirely oriented toward experimentation in contact with the real. ...Perhaps one of the most important characteristics of the rhizome is that it always has multiple entryways; in this sense, the burrow is an animal rhizome, and sometimes maintains a clear distinction between the line of flight as passageway and storage or living strata (cf. the muskrat). A map has multiple entryways, as opposed to the tracing, which always comes back "to the same." The map has to do with performance, whereas the tracing always involves an alleged "competence."

Rhizome is an atypical network in so far as it defies the logic of a conventional tree (server) and branches (clients) network of hierarchies. There are no controlling servers or controlled nodes in a rhizomatic network. Anything connects to anything in any manner in the ongoing

processes of territorialization/deterritorialization and the collapse of segmentary lines/the emergence of lines of flight. There are as many exit points as there are entry points in a rhizome. There are also as many points of connections as there are points of disconnection. As rhizomatic networks are depended on connections that are in a flux because of either the lack of fixed points or moving points or even moving connections, they could be seen as similar in structure to the networks of Web 2.0. Web 2.0 personifies a site where flows are able to flow in directions not pre-determined. Here, as in any rhizomatic network, flows and their constituting connections make the rhizomatic network as dynamic as possible.

Web 2.0

Web 2.0 is generally seen as the successor of Web 1.0 But what does this mean to the uninitiated? Web 1.0 refers to Internet scenarios of content, users and delivery models that were in common use until the onset of the infamous *dot com* bubble of early 2000s. Web 2.0 refers to the entrance of new scenarios of content, users and delivery models during the last five years. The agents of Web 2.0 are seen as allowing the users to wield more control over what they are doing with the Internet. The emergence of blogs, social networking sites, *P2P* sites and the likes of YouTube have heightened the participatory and social networking activities of Internet users greatly. In short, Web 2.0 represents the second great leap forward by the Internet since its entry into the civilian domain during early 1990s.

The Web 2.0 also exists as a social web. The notion of social web implies a host of innumerable platforms which facilitate individuals and their social peers to congregate and enact diverse social roles. Web 2.0 provides an expanding social space where Giddens's logic of structuration is very suitable. In his theory of structuration, Giddens^a (1979: 69) said that "the structural properties of social systems are both the medium and the outcome of the practices that constitute those systems." Web 2.0 is not only the medium that causes the interactions of millions of users in different social networking sites, but is also shaped by the actions and interactions of individuals who tag, flag, blog, *twitter*, *jaiku*, comment, upload, download, post scraps and do a range of other activities in the planes of the social web. These practices are both structural and structuring.

Besides the aspect of structuration, Web 2.0 has other sociological dimensions. One such important dimension of Web 2.0 is its ability to cause and accommodate the self-reflexive projects of individuals in late modernity. According to Giddens, the age of late modernity is an age of crises and risks. Individuals in this period resolve questions of their self-identity on their own, unlike their counterparts in the age of tradition. This practice of self reflexivity is continuous and is like an 'ongoing biography.' Giddens (54) says that "a person's identity is not to be found in behavior, nor—important though this is—in the reactions of others, but in the capacity to keep a particular narrative going. The individual's biography, if she

is to maintain regular interaction with others in the day-to-day world, cannot be wholly fictive. It must continually integrate events which occur in the external world, and sort them into the ongoing 'story' about the self." The social web is a place where the reflexive projects of individuals acquire unique dimensions in the narratives of the bloggers, the video clips of YouTube users, the scraps and posts of social network sites, the raves and rants of discussion forums and the micro blogs of Twitter and Jaiku.

WEB 2.0 AND TRANSNATIONAL TAMIL CINEMA: THE YOUTUBING OF 'LITTLE SUPERSTAR'

In its use of the concepts of flow and rhizome, this paper examines the rhizomatic flows of transnational Tamil cinema in the context of three widely used domains of Web 2.0. They are: 1) YouTube 2) blogs and 3) forums. These domains have been selected in this study as they provide ample scope for examining them in relation to the six principles of rhizomatic structures Deleuze and Guattari outlined. This paper examines two seemingly independent developments concerning transnational Tamil cinema and its audience (Tamil diaspora), in the contexts defined by the domains of Web 2.0. They are: 1) the growing phenomenon of the 'little super star' video on YouTube and 2) the interesting encounters of the Malaysian Tamils on Web 2.0.

The phenomenon of 'little super star' refers to the rhizomatic flows of a short

video clip featuring Tamil cinema's reigning superstar, Rajinikanth and a midget. In this video, the midget dances to the music played from a tape player by Rajinikanth in the company of his young friends. The genre of dance the midget performs is a native version of break dancing. This clip is from a Rajinikanth starrer, *Athisaya Piravi*, a long forgotten film even by hardcore fans. The clip was uploaded nearly a year ago on YouTube and quickly became a rage among Tamil as well as non-Tamil users of YouTube. Recently, the video became the first ever Indian originated film content on YouTube to become part of the top 100 YouTube videos. Having clocked more than seven million views at last count, the 'little super star' has spawned his own multiplicities and rhizomatic connections as well as ruptures, as Deleuze and Guattari outlined. There are numerous versions of the 'little super star' and one of the popular remixes even goes by the mocking title, 'nobody is watching the little superstar.'

Rhizomatic structures expand because of the multiplicities they engender and the lines of flight they take. The line of flight, according to Deleuze and Guattari, is born of the exploding nature of the lines of segmentarity. When the lines of segmentarity are no longer in place, connections flow on the axis of the line of flight, which could also be likened as the crucial element that differentiates non-hierarchical networks from hierarchical networks. In the case of the 'little super star' phenomenon, what is at work is what is not possible in the hierarchical networking structures of

transnational Tamil cinema. The conventional logic of film distribution holds a clear view about the nature of the content to be distributed, the mode of distribution and the geographical location of the audience. In the case of all the three parameters, what reigns supreme is the physicality of the tasks at hand. A film exists on a physical plane for a physical network to carry it forward to the physically distributed individuals in pre-determined geographical locations. A film can not be distributed in terms of the divisions of its physical whole. A song or scene can not be distributed independent of the whole they represent. They simply do not exist on their own—just as the leaves can not exist independent of the physical tree. In the case of the 'little super star' on YouTube, it exists not only independent of the whole, the film *Athisaya Piravi*, but it also exists as the new whole, as an entirely new entity. Very few of the admirers of the 'little super star' video relate it as a part of the long forgotten film, *Athisaya Piravi*. A clear majority of viewers of the video only see 'little super star' as the original whole, and not as a part of the original film of yesteryear.

With every attempt by the admirers and detractors of the new original whole to clone the 'little super star' in their own ways, the logic of its existence as a part of a physical whole in a physically existing network of transnational film distribution for a geographically segregated transnational audience is only erased. The clones are about the multiplicities, heterogeneity and segmentarity as well as the lines of flight

the new rhizomatic whole nurtures even as they become increasingly alienated from the film from which the new original whole itself sprang. The phenomenon of the 'little super star' is a good example of a rhizomatic structure spawned by Web 2.0, another rhizomatic structure.

In more ways than one, the phenomenon of the 'little super star' is also a good example of Raymond Williams's notion of flow in its rhizomatic *avatar*. Rhizomes are about connections that follow no pre-determined paths of flows. The concept of flow pertains to the emergence of a new whole, an entirely different entity from the whole that is made up by the sum of its parts, the individual programmes. Flows in the conception of Raymond Williams is not a sequential ordering of one television programme after another but a whole new experience with television. In the conventional logic of television content distribution, programmes ought to follow one another in a pre-determined order. And when programmes follow their logical order of progression, what does not emerge is a sense of mobility. The sense of mobility is made possible only with our identification of the sense of television flow, a unique experience that has little to do with the physicality of the progression of programmes. It is more rhizomatic. Because of the unique experiences of individual television viewers, what becomes of television flow in its entirety is a changing/expanding structures of several flows in several cognitive/emotional directions. It is not only one kind of a television flow in a pre-determined order. Flows are

subjective experiences and are remarkably different from the objective segmentary lines in which programmes are made to run in a pre-determined path. In this context, it would be useful to slightly fuse the theoretical construct of flow, as advanced by Raymond Williams, with Deleuze and Guattari's concept of rhizome. What emerges out of such a fusion is the concept of a rhizomatic flow. Rhizomatic flows harbor the traits of an experience that gives us a sense of the whole that is not physical and does not evolve from the constitution of its parts. It is a whole that emerges from the connections that flow in a non-hierarchical networking space. The phenomenon of the 'little super star' video is fairly illustrative of the concept of rhizomatic flows. The experience of the whole in this case hinges not on the progression of an innocuous clip from an innocuous film of a film industry that is not well known outside the diasporic world of Tamils and the geographical marker of Tamil Nadu/India. The experience of the whole hinges on the rhizomatic nature of the flow of an innocuous clip in a terrain where it becomes more than its origins as a part of an unrecognizable whole (Athisaya Piravi). It becomes a recognizable whole, more recognizable than what constituted it as a part. The recognizable whole of 'little super star' only expanded wildly over the last one year in the network of the connections it spawned in the form of more clones, imitations and spoofs.

Besides Deleuze and Guattari's concept of rhizome, the sociological concepts of structuration and self-

reflexivity, as advanced by Giddens, can also be gainfully employed to relate to phenomenon such as the 'little super star.' For instance, it is possible to read the continuous recursive journeys of the 'little super star' as the reflexive projects of YouTube users who seek to express their ongoing biographies through the mutations of the "little super star."

TRANSNATIONAL TAMIL CINEMA AND GLOBALIZED HOMELAND: THE RHIZOMATIC ENCOUNTERS OF MALAYSIAN TAMILS

Malaysia is home to the largest Tamil population outside India and has remained the *numero uno* market for the transnational Tamil cinema for decades. The transnational character of Tamil cinema was largely shaped by the enthusiastic support of fans in Malaysia, Singapore and Sri Lanka (the traditional diasporic locations) decades before Tamil cinema made its entry into other countries.

No other Tamil diasporic setting evokes a deeply polarized audience relationship with transnational Tamil cinema as Malaysia. And no other diasporic setting resembles the original homeland (Tamil Nadu) as Malaysia in terms of the stars-fans relationship. Not surprisingly, this is the setting where Tamil film audience can cause riots because of delays in the release of a film like *Sivaji: The Boss* (2007). Not surprisingly, this is also the setting where transnational Tamil cinema bears the brunt of strident criticisms from the leaders of the Tamil community, political

parties and government functionaries for contributing to the moral depravity of Malaysian Tamils in general and Tamil youth in particular.

Malaysian media stories on the growing rate of crimes and suicides among Malaysian Tamils routinely cast the blame on the Tamil films imported from India. Eventhough, it is very difficult to prove a connection between Tamil films and the social ills faced by Malaysian Tamils, as pointed out by Ravindran (252-253) and Natarajah (2000), the antipathy held by the Tamil opinion leaders and government functionaries towards transnational Tamil cinema is as strong as ever. In fact, it seems to grow with the rising curve of widespread support transnational Tamil cinema evokes in Malaysian Tamil cinema audience following every new release.

The rhizomatic flows of transnational Tamil cinema bear the imprints of these divergent tendencies in the encounters found on Web 2.0 by Malaysian Tamils. One of the important Web 2.0 sites for negotiations of Tamil diasporal identities is a forum called *The Hub*. This portal seems massive in its structure in so far as the number of threads, archives, views and comments is concerned. Here is a thread on *The Hub* indicating a view against Tamil cinema. The thread starts with a report by BBC on the concerns evoked by Tamil cinema in Malaysia. "A Malaysian minister has called for suicide scenes to be cut from imported Indian films, amidst concerns that they are leading to copycat incidents. His remarks

came days after a young Tamil mother threw herself and two of her children under a train. Sadly, suicides among Malaysia's Tamil minority are reported all too regularly in the local media. The Tamil community is the poorest of the three main ethnic groups here, and many Tamils face severe hardship. But G Palanivel, deputy leader of the Tamil-dominated political party, the Malaysian Indian Congress, thinks movies are partly to blame. Suicides are said to be a common dramatic feature in Indian films, especially those made for Tamil audiences." The thread had responses from different diasporic locations such as UK, Canada, USA, Malaysia and India. The responses clearly disagreed with the perception of the Minister that Tamil films drive people to commit suicide. The responses clearly see the elements of blame played by politicians to escape responsibility for social ills. The moderator of the thread, who is located in Malaysia, quickly saw the strategy and instead blamed the politician. "It is just the typical sweeping-under-the-carpet syndrome of politicians. Since he was newly elected at the recent dubious elections, the politician probably wanted to be recognized." Another respondent said: "Actually, on the train from London today the conductor told me that four people had killed themselves on that line in the past six months. I do not think it is likely that English people are being influenced by Tamil cinema, so as we all seem to agree, it is probably the minister kicking up a fuss just for the sake of doing it. HOWEVER... I wandered into the Tamil Films section of the Hub today and

read some of the threads. I now think that even if Tamil Films do not increase the chance of suicide, it is highly probable that they (or discussions about them) increase the chance of MURDER.”

The above is an example of a repeated topic in Malaysia on the negative implications of transnational Tamil cinema. Ravindran (252-253) indicates the reasons for the divergent tendencies transnational Tamil cinema elicits from Malaysian Tamils. Ravindran (252) says, “Malaysian Tamils seek to negotiate their identities primarily in the contexts defined by Giddens’s ‘time-space distanciation.’ They are equally divided in their longing for inputs from the cultural homeland and in their dismissal of what comes to them through homeland films. There is a clear division in time and space in their negotiations of identities borne of the two important locations, the settled homeland and the cultural homeland.”

It is but inevitable to locate the flows of diasporic people not only alongside the flows of the transnational media and Internet, but as contingent upon them. In this paper, these multiple flows are seen responsible for the constitution of the globalized homeland. The globalized homeland exists as much in the countries of origin of Tamils in Asia as in the countries of their diasporic dispersals in Asia and elsewhere. The notion of globalized homeland negates the binary logic of homeland and settled homeland in many ways. The globalized homeland seeks to supplant the binary relationship between homeland and settled homeland

by locating itself in the Deleuzian any-space-whatever plane which is marked by disconnected and emptied spaces. This paper seeks to conceptualize globalized homeland as a space no different from the any-space-whatever defined by Deleuze (123). It is national, transnational and any-where as its members are latching on to the rhizomatic flows and connectivities made possible by the agents of Web 2.0 such as YouTube. In such a notion, the flows of the transnational are seen as contingent upon the diasporic flows of people in a globalized homeland. According to Deleuze, any-space-whatever are spaces that are constituted by indeterminate and deterritorializing parts. The ways in which these parts may connect are not determined in advance. The number of connections is also not known before. We have to remember here the similarity between these connections and the connections attributed to rhizomatic structures. In both cases, connections are not predetermined in advance and they flow in multiple directions in a non-hierarchical manner. Referring to the cinema of Antonioni, Deleuze (123) wrote, “...it seems that any-space-whatever takes on a new nature here. It is no longer, as before, a space which is defined by parts whose linking up and orientation are not determined in advance, and can be done in an infinite number of ways. It is now an amorphous set which has eliminated that which happened and acted in it. It is an extinction or a disappearing, but one which is not opposed to the genetic element. It is clear that the two aspects

are complementary, and reciprocally presupposing each other: the amorphous set in fact is a collection of locations or positions which coexist independently of the temporal order which moves from one part to the other, independently of the connections and orientations which the vanished characters and situations gave to them. There are therefore two states of the any-space-whatever, or two kinds of 'qualisigns', qualisigns of disconnection and of emptiness. These two states are always implied in each other, and we can only say that the one is 'before' and the other 'after.' According to Rodowick (63-64), 'any-space-whatever' is a "space that does not yet appear as a real setting or is abstracted from the spatial and temporal determinations of a real setting. ...the idea of 'any-space-whatever' expresses the quality of deterritorialization and indeterminacy..."

Nothing serves the task of illustrating the rhizomatic nature of the globalized homeland of Malaysian Tamils better than the phenomenon of Tamil Hiphop music and its echoes in the psyche of the Malaysian Tamils and in the original homeland (Tamil Nadu). The phenomenon of Tamil Hiphop represents one of the several rhizomatic encounters of Malaysian Tamils with transnational Tamil cinema. Among the several Tamil Hiphop groups in Malaysia, *Yogi B* and *Natchatra* enjoy a large following even beyond Malaysia. As a popular culture musical genre, Hiphop has its roots in the 1970s popular culture of USA. While nurturing the original elements of Hiphop, leading Malaysian Tamil Hiphop practitioners like Yogi B also seek to

render it with diasporic cultural layers. The recent addition to these layers is the one given by Malaysian Hiphop's first encounter with the transnational Tamil cinema. Eventhough, there were several attempts in the past to introduce Hiphop into the production schemes of Tamil cinema, they were not well received. The attempt by Yogi B succeeded largely because of the rhizomatic character of the present encounter of Malaysian Tamil Hiphop with Tamil cinema. And this has been made possible by the push given by the YouTube to Malaysian Tamil Hiphop. In particular, Yogi B's memorable number, 'Madai Thiranthu' has been creating waves in Tamil diasporic circles on the Web 2.0 through the ever expanding multiplicitous connections the fans of the song foster by embedding the YouTube links in their blogs and forums. Yogi B must be credited with the introduction of the Hiphop subtext to the transnational Tamil cinema with his remix number 'Engayum Eppothum' for the film *Pollathavan* (2007). He pioneered the hiphop musical tradition in Malaysia and shot to fame with his album *Vallavan*. This album has an interesting diasporic text in the song 'Madai Thiranthu,' a remix of the song from a Tamil film, *Nizhalgal* (1980). Interestingly, but not surprisingly, the original song has so far attracted only 117,092 views on the single YouTube version, whereas the remix song has garnered nearly 8,000,000 views for the three versions uploaded on YouTube. Attesting to the role of YouTube in the popularity registered by his Hiphop music, Yogi B remarked, "When I first

visited Chennai, I was going around a temple when a young fan patted me on the back and asked, "Are you Yogi B Natchatra?" I was pleasantly surprised as we have not yet released the album in India. I asked him, "How did you know about my album? He said he saw it on YouTube. YouTube has been greatly responsible for the promotion of my albums."

Yogi B attracts as many calls from his fans in the original homeland as from Malaysia and other diasporic locations. These fans convey the dominant impression that the notion of homeland that is situational and real exists alongside the abstracted space of the globalized homeland, that is still in the making and exists on the deterritorialized any-space-whatever of the Web 2.0 and transnational Tamil cinema. Many Malaysian Tamils, particularly youngsters, see themselves as proud Malaysians in the globalized homeland that is being created by their encounters through Web 2.0 and the transnational Tamil cinema. The following comments from some of the fans of Yogi B indicate this.

prusothman:

ain't no big fan of hiphop..but tis is serious good stuff. proud to be a msian indian. full respect to their determination to succeed and pursue their interest, despite the stereotyping within our own society. keep it up ! n lets keep supporting good stuff!

MANNAN76:

hey brother, we are malaysian born INDIANS, we still inherit the language & culture even it has been decades of

migration frm the motherland! respect MALAYSIAN INDIANS still surviving in foreign land with pride!

advimz27:

a pure fact 100% super duper V-Clip...Yogi B should get more and more chances in Indian Cinema songs and also in International fields..Yogi B - may god bless u with all the good lucks...

The remix has also been attracting brickbats in the views attracted by the original film song on YouTube. These views consider the original as the best. Yogi B is derided in these views for spoiling the original song of the Tamil film music director, Ilayaraja. Here is a sample of such views.

yogen82 (6 months ago)
nice song ilayaraja the best

Cphari (6 months ago)
awesome song thanx for posting.
such a nice song destroyed in that rapboy's video.

Going by the words of Deleuze and Rodowick in our examination of the encounters between the Malaysian Tamils and the transnational Tamil cinema, it is apparent from the above that the globalized homeland of Malaysian Tamils is no doubt a any-space-whatever. But it is not yet part of the reality as it is only abstracted from reality. It is constituted by the elements of indeterminacy and deterritorialization even as the transnational Tamil cinema seeks to promote these elements for its own benefits. The globalized homeland is also a disconnected and emptied space, in so far as the specific diasporic location and negotiations of Malaysian Tamils are

concerned. But it is also a space connected by the rhizomatic connections flowing from within and afar through the mediation of the agents of Web 2.0 and transnational Tamil cinema.

From another perspective, it is also possible to see the globalized homeland itself as a line of flight. This line of flight emerges from the encounters between Malaysian Tamils and the agents of Web 2.0 and transnational Tamil cinema. The line of flight is a breakaway point in the rhizomatic network of connections and this emerges when the lines of segmentarity explode and disappear. The traditional hierarchical connections that bounded Tamil cinema with its Malaysian audience are the lines of segmentarity which are exploding and disappearing, thanks to the mediation of the agents of Web 2.0. This globalized homeland of Malaysia exists not only in terms of the Deleuzian principles of rhizome, but also in terms of Deleuze's any-space-whatever logic. Seen as a globalized homeland, the diasporic world as mediated by the transnational Tamil cinema and the agents of Web 2.0 has within itself interesting trajectories which are rhizomatic in nature. This can also be seen as an invisible ideological strategy by the Malaysian Tamils to express their denial of difference with the original homeland, even as they both accept and reject differences between the settled and original homeland.

CONCLUSION

The rhizomatic flows of transnational Tamil cinema are testimony to the growing possibilities of the globalized homeland and the expanding influence of Web 2.0. The rhizomatic flows of the 'little super star' and the Malaysian Hiphop point to the opportunities and challenges before the transnational Tamil cinema in the age of Web 2.0. This paper has demonstrated the relevance and applications of Deleuze and Guattari's notions of rhizome, and Deleuze's concept of any-space-whatever. It also applied Giddens concept of structuration and Raymond Williams' notion of flow in understanding the complex interface between Web 2.0 applications, transnational Tamil cinema and members of Tamil diaspora.

REFERENCES

Castells, Manuel

- 2001 "Informationalism and the Network Society." In Pekka Himanen (ed.) *The Hacker Ethic and the Spirit of the Information Age*. New York: Random House. 155-178.

Deleuze, Gilles

- 2005 *Cinema 1 The Movement-Image*. London: Continuum. 123.

Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari

- 1987 *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 7-13.

Giddens, Anthony^a

- 1979 *Central Problems in Social Theory*. Berkeley: University of California. 69.

Giddens, Anthony^b

- 1991 *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Cambridge: Polity Press. 54.

Ravindran, Gopalan

- 2006 "Negotiating Identities in the Diasporic Space: Transnational Tamil Cinema and Malaysian Tamils." Proceedings of the Cultural Space and Public Sphere in Asia: An International Conference. 15-16 March. Seoul: Asia's Future Initiative. 240:256.

Raymond, Williams

- 1992 *Television: Technology and Cultural Form*. Hanover NH: Wesleyan University Press, 1974/1992.80.

Rodowick, D.N.

- 1997 *Gilles Deleuze's Time Machine*. Durham: Duke University Press. 63-64.

Online resources

Nadarajah, M.

- 2000 "Marginalisation, not Tamil Movies, the Cause of Violence." < http://www.geocities.com/sounvx/violence_tamil_movies.htm > . Accessed 10 September 2006.

Indiaglitz

- n.d. "Natchatras Flying High." < <http://www.indiaglitz.com/channels/tamil/article/34380.html> > . 30 October 2007.

YouTube (Accessed 30 October 2007)

"Tamil Films Encourage Suicide: Malaysian Minister." < <http://www.mayyam.comhub/viewtopic.php?t=7405> > .

"Comments on *Yogi B.*" < http://www.youtube.comcomment_servlet?all_comments&v=ZHG6FJTcJR8&fromurl=/watch%3Fv%3DZHG6FJTcJR8 > .

"Comments on Madai Thiranthu Original." < http://www.youtube.com/comment_servlet?all_comments&v=PucI_AZLaA0&fromurl=/watch%3Fv%3DPucI_AZLaA0 > .

"Little Super Star." < http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gx-NLPH8JeM_ > .

"Madai Thiranthu." < <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uQSDr4609BU> > .

"Madai Thiranthu Original." < http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PucI_AZLaA0 > .

YouTube (Accessed 8 March 2008)

"Comments on Engheyum Eppodhum - Pollathavan." < http://www.youtube.comcomment_servlet?all_comments&v=vrGAlYaGpio&fromurl=watch%3Fv%3DvrGAlYaGpio%26feature%3Drelated > .