

Anurag Kashyap's Sole Experiment with Animation: A Re-focus on *Return of Hanuman*

Abhishek Chowdhury

It was a terrible film ... want to see great animation, see Geetanjali Rao's films, see "Dhap", see the Japanese Ramayan co-collaborates by the creator of Hanuman ... anyways I am incapable of doing animation

This is how Anurag Kashyap replied in December 2019 to the thread of a fan (Anish Mohanty), who celebrated the twelve-year anniversary of Kashyap's fourth film (also his first and till now last animation film) *Return of Hanuman* in this way

12 years of #ReturnofHanuman. Arguably one of the best animated films made in India. Had so much of fun watching the film as a kid! @anuragkashyap72 merged mythology with new-age fiction effortlessly. He must make another animated film soon.

Though Kashyap did not make another animated film till date due to his embarrassment regarding his debut venture in the genre,

interestingly enough the Central Board of Film Certification (CBFC) let go of Kashyap scot-free with regards to his fourth film categorizing it as an “education film”. Kashyap, primarily known for his gritty, realistic, and often controversial Bollywood films like *Black Friday*, *Gangs of Wasseypur*, and *Dev D*, might seem an unlikely figure to helm an animated feature steeped in Hindu mythology. Yet, *Return of Hanuman* (2007) (henceforth RoH), stands as a unique and fascinating entry in Indian animation. It is a sequel to *Hanuman* (2005) and offers a modern retelling of the epic tale, using animation not just as a medium for entertainment but as a vehicle for cultural transmission, moral instruction, and visual spectacle. But before delving into the nitty-gritty of the film, it is imperative to assess the importance of the animated film movement in the context of neoliberal film project and thereby draw a historiography of animated films in India. Moreover, this article would also try to gauge the fathom of the cause behind the surge of religious and mythological iconographies in popular multimedia and television after 1990s.

Neoliberal economic reforms in India—from the 1990s onward—have reshaped the animation sector by embedding it in global market logics, foreign direct investment strategies, and export-oriented service provision; this has simultaneously enabled growth and constrained the autonomy of Indian animation cinema as a creative and socially critical form. Under neoliberalism, the state has stepped back from direct cultural patronage, pushing private studios and OTT platforms to define what kinds of animated content are viable, with investment often flowing toward commercially “safe,” family-oriented, or franchise-driven properties rather than experimental or politically alert work.

Liberalization opened India to global media and software markets, allowing domestic studios to position themselves as low-cost, high-volume suppliers of animation services for Western films, TV series, and games. While this brought technical upgrade, job creation, and international exposure, it also locked much of the industry into a

“service-provider” model: teams work for foreign clients whose scripts, design specs, and schedules dominate, leaving little room for original Indian narratives or aesthetics. Revenue data suggest that only a thin slice of the pie comes from original Indian animation projects, reinforcing dependence on unstable outsourcing contracts rather than a stable, home-grown feature-film tradition.

Neoliberal restructuring has intensified insecure employment patterns in animation, with short-term contracts, project-based hiring, and pressure to deliver fast outputs at low costs. Salaries for Indian animators often lag behind global benchmarks, prompting skilled workers to migrate to higher-pay environments abroad, which drains the domestic talent pool and further weakens the capacity for sustained, in-house productions. This precarity also shapes the labour culture within Indian studios, where “productivity” and meeting turnaround deadlines can eclipse creative experimentation or depth of storytelling, indirectly steering animation cinema toward formulaic, consumption-friendly content.

Neoliberal India has encouraged media forms that celebrate individual ambition, consumer aspiration, and entrepreneurial success, and Indian animation cinema often mirrors this ethos in its characters and narratives. Popular franchises and children’s series tend to foreground individual heroes, brand-like logos, and aspirational lifestyles, subtly reinforcing the neoliberal ideal of the self-made, market-oriented subject while marginalizing collective or socially critical themes. At the same time, the pressure to appeal to both domestic and global markets drives studios toward “safe,” de-politicized stories—often borrowed from myth or fantasy—thereby limiting the representation of caste, class, or regional inequality that might destabilize the status quo.

In this context, Indian animation cinema becomes a site of contradiction: on one hand, it benefits from global integration, digital infrastructure, and streaming platforms that can distribute Indian voices more widely; on the other hand, it is repeatedly pulled toward

international standards of slickness, genre conventions, and commercial safety. Some scholars describe this as a “rebellion in progress,” pointing to emerging auteurs and independent projects that attempt to reclaim Indian myths, languages, and social realities in animated form, yet these efforts remain structurally disadvantaged by funding patterns that privilege scalability and profit over cultural specificity. In sum, neoliberalism has expanded the scale and reach of Indian animation, but at the cost of embedding it in circuits of global capital that often dilute its critical and culturally grounded potential.

Animated films play an important role in cultural, social, and economic contexts, especially in the framework of neoliberalism. This ideology promotes free markets and consumerism, making animated films appealing to families and young audiences. Such films often lead to extensive merchandising, aligning with neoliberal goals of profit maximization. While they often highlight themes of individualism and entrepreneurship, they also critique social issues like inequality and corporate greed. Animated films reflect and challenge dominant narratives by broadening their representation of race, gender, and sexuality, thereby promoting inclusivity while remaining commercially viable.

The animation industry has thrived due to technological advancements in CGI, virtual reality, and streaming platforms, reflecting a market-driven approach to production and consumption. Deregulation often shapes how these films are created and distributed, focusing on corporate interests at the expense of artistic expression. The demand for animated films has generated jobs, especially in countries where production costs are lower, but this raises concerns about labour practices and economic inequality. Thus, animated films serve as multifunctional cultural products, reflecting and critiquing capitalist dynamics while also offering potential for social commentary.

Animation in India began as experimental, artisanal work in the early decades of the twentieth century, anchored by pioneers who treated

moving images as an extension of established visual and theatrical traditions. Dadasaheb Phalke's ground-breaking experiments with cinema and trick photography in the 1910s and 1920s—most famously through his mythic storytelling and technical inventiveness—laid an early conceptual foundation for motion imagery in the subcontinent. In the 1930s and 1940s, a handful of animators and studios attempted short animations and title sequences, but the medium remained marginal compared with live-action cinema.

The post-independence decades saw sporadic achievements and growing technical competence but limited institutional support. In the 1950s and 1960s, the Films Division of India and independent artists produced educational and documentary shorts that occasionally used animation techniques, keeping a small, specialized practice alive. Yet for several decades, Indian animators often found more opportunities abroad than at home: many trained artists and technicians worked on overseas projects or in Western studios, where their strong technical skills were valued even as original creative storytelling by Indians remained constrained by domestic industry structures and financing concerns.

Two parallel developments in the late 20th century altered this trajectory. First, the emergence of formal education and training in animation—film schools, technical institutes, and private animation academies—began producing graduates fluent in both artistic fundamentals and evolving production pipelines. Institutes such as the Film and Television Institute of India (FTII) and later private animation schools introduced courses that nurtured storytelling as well as craft. Second, a growing television market for children's programming, regional content, and advertising created continuous demand for locally produced animation, enabling studios to survive and experiment.

The 1990s and early 2000s marked a visible expansion. Studios such as Pentamedia Graphics and Crest Animation Studios (formerly Crest

Communications) grew in scale, producing feature-length work, television series, and outsourcing projects for international clients. Pentamedia produced the ambitious feature *Hanuman* (1998) and other mythic and children's content, attempting to adapt indigenous narratives into long-form animation. Crest Animation, collaborating with international partners, showed that Indian studios could run larger production pipelines and aim for global markets.

Mainstream Indian cinema began to incorporate animation and visual effects in new ways, further normalizing the medium. Major crossover moments included films that blended live action with creatures, effects, or animated sequences. *Koi... Mil Gaya* (2003) is often cited for its successful integration of an extraterrestrial character and extensive visual effects, demonstrating to Bollywood producers that audiences would accept—and reward—sophisticated VFX and creature design when tied to emotionally engaging stories. Subsequent big-budget films (for example, the growing use of VFX in science-fiction and fantasy films) continued to expand the role and prestige of animation and effects houses.

The digital revolution profoundly accelerated this shift. Affordable computing power, accessible software (from early CGI packages to modern pipelines), and broadband distribution transformed production and dissemination. Studios like Reliance Animation and Green Gold Animation emerged as significant players in the 2010s. Green Gold's *Chhota Bheem* franchise became a cultural phenomenon, proving that homegrown characters could drive merchandise, television ratings, and feature films. Reliance Animation invested in both domestic projects and international co-productions, showing an appetite for scale. Parallely, a host of smaller boutique studios and independent makers—such as Plexus, Red Chillies VFX (anchored to Bollywood's major production houses), and Mumbai's Toonz Animation (which later merged into larger international entities)—helped build technical depth and creative diversity. Outsourcing also played a complex role. For many years Indian studios and artists served as outsourcing partners for Western animation and

VFX, honing high standards in areas like compositing, digital paint, and CG animation. This work built technical capacity and professional pipelines but sometimes limited opportunities for original IP. Over time, as skills matured and financing pathways diversified (including television deals, theatrical distribution, and later streaming platforms), studios increasingly invested in original content rooted in South Asian narratives.

Streaming platforms and digital distribution in the late 2010s and early 2020s created fresh opportunities. Platforms such as Netflix, Amazon Prime, and regional OTT services commissioned animated series and films, widening audiences and budgets for experimental and adult animation as well as children's programming. Independent creators found new channels to showcase shorts and series, while cross-border co-productions allowed creative teams to access international talent, funding, and markets.

Today India's animation landscape balances technical excellence with a growing confidence in culturally specific storytelling. The industry is far from monolithic: high-end VFX houses work on global blockbusters, television studios churn out popular children's series, indie animators produce festival-ready shorts, and streaming platforms fund a widening array of genres. Challenges remain—sustainable financing for original IP, stronger distribution for independent projects, and ongoing skill development in narrative design—but the arc of development points to a mature ecosystem capable of both serving global production needs and producing distinct Indian stories through animation.

The current surge of mythological animated films in India can be attributed to cultural values, technological advances, and market demand. These films resonate deeply with audiences, providing familiar narratives while teaching moral lessons. The success of mythological TV shows paved the way for animated adaptations, as studios recognize the commercial viability of such content. Moreover, government support and the rise of streaming platforms have enabled these films to reach broader audiences, contributing to their appeal.

The increased presence of religious iconography in Indian media since the 1990s reflects changes in society, culture, and economics. The revival of traditional and religious themes has coincided with the liberalization of the economy and the expansion of television networks, creating a market for mythological storytelling. This mixture of modern and traditional narratives engages audiences and reflects India's complex cultural identity against rapid modernization.

Looking forward, animated films' relationship with mythology and the representation of cultural icons like Hanuman raises important questions about the evolving landscape of Indian animation and storytelling, balancing local narratives with global influences. Against the backdrop of this discussion, the article would try to examine the multifaceted ways in which animation functions within *RoH*, analysing its visual style, narrative strategies, its engagement with Hindu mythology and its place in the landscape of Indian animation. The article would also try to address the issue of Hanuman as an indigenized superhero negotiating tensions between the national and global, and between cultural homogenization and indigenization in the secularized and modernized mythic universe of the film. Alongside that some light should be thrown on the reason behind choosing Hanuman as the protagonist by Kashyap.

In *Hanuman's Tale: The Messages of a Divine Monkey*, Philip Lutgendorf (2007) classifies Hanuman as “the pan-Indian ‘middle-class’ god par excellence” since he is perceived as a powerful, energetic resourceful god who repeatedly delivers the help needed by his devotees in the face of difficult challenges (374). He notes that Hanuman is the center of “a growing body of narrative that selectively edits, suggestively encompasses, and ambitiously expands on the Rama story to become... an emerging “epic” in its own right” (28). The *Hanumayana*, as Lutgendorf calls it, contains a huge variety of stories in oral and written forms, in different languages, that deal with various episodes in his life (122). Kashyap's endeavour is a part of that.

The portrayal of Hanuman in *ROH* mirrors the impulse of Indian superhero comics towards cultural indigenization. In fact, Hanuman is not the first mythological hero who has been refashioned as a superhero; many Indian comic books (including *Amar Chitra Katha* comics) have drawn on Hindu mythology to create uniquely Indian content competing with American comics. Indian comics adopted the superhero genre in the mid-1980s (Chandra 2012, 58). Suchitra Mathur (2010, 176) notes that the “distinctly indigenous superhero tradition” was marked by “a self-conscious distancing from the Anglo-American comic tradition” but was also influenced by it. Nagraj has a divine origin that accounts for his superhuman powers, but “at the same time, he is proudly proclaimed as the Indian Spiderman” (Chandra 2012, 69). Shaktiman had mythological associations, as did the more recent Spider-Man India (Dave 2013: 134). Liquid Comics/Graphic India has (re-)created several superheroes having a basis in Hindu mythology.

In *RoH*, Hanuman is presented as a cosmopolitan, globe-trotting Indian superhero. In a playful song sequence at the beginning of the film, the god flies across the world, visiting the Statue of Liberty, Leaning Tower of Pisa, Eiffel Tower, Sidney Opera House and the Egyptian pyramids and other famous landmarks. In an instance that displays a self-conscious, playful subversion of American cultural and political dominance, Hanuman captures and hands over to brown policemen a group of people that includes Osama bin Laden and George Bush, while the lyrics identify the men as thieves and dacoits. Hanuman also replaces the sculptures of the four presidents on Mount Rushmore with those of Rama, Sita, Lakshmana and himself, and transposes his own facsimile onto the Statue of Liberty. In a meta-textual move that perhaps hints at the producers’ fantasy of wish-fulfilment, Hanuman, as he flies across the cityscape, cuts Spiderman’s web making him fall from tall buildings. While these moves may lead us to wonder whether Hanuman is projected as a subaltern superhero of the global south contesting the hegemony of the white, male, American superheroes who uphold American values and world order, the film does not offer revisionary narratives that could warrant such a reading.

ROH reinforces the dominant national imaginary of India as a liberalized nation. *Swarg* (heaven) is contemporized—the gods use touch screen technology, speak Hinglish and obey traffic signals. Moreover, the language of capitalism permeates the mythological universe. Brahma, the Hindu god of creation, actively dissuades Hanuman from attempting to help humans by showing him bloodied and bandaged men who had been sent as emissaries to earth. One of these men requests the god to “transfer” him to another planet, even if it is at a reduced salary, since he doesn’t want to go to earth again. When Hanuman persists in going to Bajrangpur, Brahma has him sign a lengthy contract and his powers are locked away to hold him to his end of the deal. There is an analogy here with what Nandini Chandra identifies in the earlier superhero comics: arguing that the battlefields are equivalent to “reconstructed corporate boardrooms,” she highlights the “coincidence of the superhero genre and the neoliberal state” since they share a “hyper-security consciousness” and everyone is a wage slave (2012, 70). Here too, the affinity of heaven to the neoliberal state is apparent—divine emissaries are mercenaries working in the business of rescuing humankind.

In this de-sacralized and commodified heaven, Brahma keeps his panoptical gaze on Maruti’s adventures not through his divine sight, but through the computer. The eagle Garuda, lord Vishnu’s mode of transport, has transformed into an airplane. Heavenly beings participate in a culture of consumption—Brahma enjoys cocktails on a sundeck brought to him by a curvaceous *apsara* (heavenly nymph) while his “secretary” Chitragupta is caught browsing the website of Menaka, the famously beautiful *apsara*, who is overtly sexualized.

In her reading of Indian advertisements as visual cultural texts, Leela Fernandes (2006, 53) argues that the “aesthetic of the commodity does not merely serve as a passive reflector of wider social and cultural processes but instead becomes a central site in which the Indian nation is reimagined.” She observes that some advertisements employ religious

imagery to suggest that the “the core of Indian tradition...can be retained even as the material context of that tradition is modernized and improved” (43). According to her, “the ability of multinational capital to combine the national and the global within a singular narrative of commodity fetishism” appeals to a new middle class that has become the “embodiment of the liberalizing nation-state” in dominant public representations (32).

RoH goes a step further in modernizing the entire mythological universe to reinforce the values of consumerism. As many scholars have noted, Hindu mythology, especially the *Ramayana*, has been crucial in establishing a nationalist imagination. By linking the mythic world with technological progress and material wealth, the film fetishizes hybridity between the traditional and the modern, the ancient and the contemporary, the sacred and the secular, the national and the global—a hybridity which serves the consumerist ethos. The secularization of the divine world entails making it more akin to the values of a consumer audience. Gods become consumers, and embody the idealized lifestyle that the new middle class symbolizes and aspires towards. The “sacrilegious” portrayal of gods may be one factor for the film’s dismal performance at the box office. Moreover, *RoH* has had almost 2.5 million views on YouTube as of December 2016, and the English, Tamil, Telugu and Malayalam versions of the film have also been viewed hundreds of thousands of times, testifying to its popularity in the digital realm.

Maruti’s divine heroism is inextricably tied to the needs and prayers of his devotees, and the film thus reinforces Hanuman’s status as a deity who embodies power and protection. But despite Hanuman’s toddler persona, his role as protector is almost entirely cast within a masculinist paradigm of helping the ‘weak’ women and children. Maruti compensates for the loss of patriarchal authority not only in the lives of his friends, but also in his mother’s life. After his father is abducted and the villagers force his mother to leave the village, he carries away a

house for them to live in. The main soundtrack of the film is the popular devotional hymn *Hanuman Chalisa* and is used often during the film.

Shailendra Singh has said that Percept's presentation of Hanuman is that of a superhero rather than a religious figure. Similarly, in a media report, a Percept Pictures executive mentioned: "*For all of us*, Hanuman is a remarkably special character and we have taken that into account. He will...[be] someone like superman, and he fights for the triumph of good over evil. We are not presenting him in a context based on any religion." (*The Hindu*, July 6, 2007; emphasis added). Yet the instances outlined above indicate that Hanuman is not in fact a secular superhero. *RoH* quite deliberately showcases Hanuman as a god. The collapse between Indian and Hindu was evident in Shailendra Singh's statement that he was sure of the icon's success since "every Indian home is aware of Hanuman". The belief in Hanuman's universal appeal in a multi-religious society betrays the dominant construction of India as a Hindu nation-state.

The last few decades have witnessed the resurgence of Hindutva – the notion that India should be a Hindu nation, and that India's Hindu culture is its defining characteristic. Lutgendorf (2007, 367) notes that Hanuman was co-opted by Hindutva groups during the Ayodhya "liberation" movement.⁴ A youth wing of the movement was named Bajrang Dal, loosely translated as "army of Hanuman"; it invoked Hanuman's folksy Hindi epithet of *Bajrangbali* or "iron-limbed hero." The Bajrang Dal's role in the violence and riots that accompanied the Ayodhya movement was widely noted in the press. According to Lutgendorf, the association of Hanuman with militant Hinduism rested on Hanuman's embodiment of some recurring tropes of Hindutva ideology:

its glorification of physical and military strength, its insistence that Hindu men "prove" their manliness through violent encounters with the demonized members of minority

communities, and its implicit agenda for the subordination of lower classes and religious minorities to ... a primordial and monolithic Hindu nation-state ruled largely by upper-caste leaders (361).

Percept's child Hanuman is not a martial, muscular god, but he reaffirms the emphasis of Hindutva discourse on physical strength, and on the "sons of the land" needing to protect "an explicitly feminized familial and national body." (Bannerjee 2013, 125). At the end of *ROH*, earth is not only feminized through the epithet "mother earth" but also Hinduized when she appears in the form of a sari-clad goddess and thanks Hanuman for saving her. Thus, a potentially global, secular mission of saving the planet from the effects of pollution is laden with the symbolism of Hindu nationalism. *RoH* also enacts the erasure of minorities—Bajrangpur is almost entirely composed of Hindus. Moreover, Maruti's high Brahmin caste is emphasized in the film on multiple occasions.

In her analysis of the trend of baby-gods in calendar art, Patricia Uberoi (2006, 100) postulates that the "recent multiplication" of baby-gods may be read as "a gesture of reconciliation in our communally polarized world, post Ayodhya" since, for example, "the sleeping baby-Ram is surely a benign image when compared to the militant adult Ram" [and] "the adorable baby Hanuman is a far cry from the aggressive, humanoid body-builder Hanuman iconography." While *Bal* Hanuman does not evoke militant Hinduism in the same way, the perpetuation of Hindu majoritarian ideologies in the franchise is insidious precisely because the "adorable" boy-god has a disarming effect on receptive spectators. The dynamics of identification for adult viewers are grounded in the sentimentalized, emotional bond between mother and son or devotee and deity, while the affective category of friendship becomes central to the child audience's identification with Hanuman. In *RoH*, Maruti's admiring friends transform into *Bal* Hanuman's devotees when the toddler reveals his true form.

Lutgendorf (2015) observes that Indian public and political discourse has regularly struggled with the “foreignness” of the post-liberalization visual and consumption regime, and this unease is reflected in, for example, sometimes violent protests against Valentine’s Day celebrations and multinational fast food outlets. He claims that *Roh* must be read as a response to the “anxieties over the erosion and potential loss of “Indian” cultural identity, especially among the youth.” (258). In a similar vein, John Lent observes that “Indian parents like these ‘mytho-cartoons’ because they introduce ancient tales to a generation they believe is losing touch with its 5000-year heritage, and because they supplant what existed before—U.S. animation and Japanese anime” (110-11). In his interviews with parents about mythological animation films, Vamsee Juluri (2010, 67) found that they had expectations that these stories would reflect certain values. Most contemporary mythological animations and picture-books cater to such expectations of religious didacticism (Madan 2010). Mythological animations such as *ROH* aim not only to inform children about the leonine deeds of mythological figures, but also attempt to impart values considered important for children to possess, such as bravery, honesty, hard work and obedience to parents.

Juluri (2010, 67) claims that “if, indeed, the new mythologies demand from viewers a discursive identification with definitions and labels (as Hindus, or as Hindu superheroes, for example)[,] then perhaps the political dangers are imminent. However, if these stories remain narrated in non-normative fashions, as ideals for values like ‘devotion’ and ‘valor,’ as participants believe, then their use may remain politically unmotivated, and perhaps culturally desirable.” One parent in Juluri’s reception study had this to say about the Hanuman soft toy—

I think it is rather cute. No problem with this...children adore Hanuman and I’m sure he is better to have as a security blanket than a teddy bear. My daughters, in any case, have a small god picture under their pillows when they sleep (67)

This statement suggests that the boy-god may be cute but is hardly harmless since he upholds hegemonic ideas of nation, gender relations, Hindu majoritarianism, patriarchy and neoliberalism for an impressionable child audience.

Return of Hanuman can be read as a critique of neoliberal development and consumerist harms rather than an endorsement of neoliberalism; the film uses a mythic hero to expose environmental damage, privatizing/industrial powers, and commodified culture while also offering limited techno-optimist solutions that sometimes mirror market logics. The film foregrounds global warming, pollution, and a monster made of plastic waste as central threats, which frames industrial-consumer damage as the core social problem the hero must address. Threats in the film are primarily the result of human industrial activity and consumer waste rather than explicit villains like accountable corporations or regulatory failure; this narrative tendency can obscure how neoliberal policies (deregulation, privatization, growth-first development) structurally produce ecological harm even when the film doesn't name them. Modern technology, urban scenes, and consumer products are shown as pervasive and sometimes foolish or harmful; these images signal the spread of market culture into everyday life, a hallmark of neoliberal social change, even if the film treats those images as backdrops rather than explicit institutions. Hanuman's role as a single saviour who fixes the problem aligns with neoliberal cultural forms that valorize individual agency and solutions (a heroic fixer) over systemic, collective political responses—this can depoliticize environmental problems by making them moral/individual rather than structural. The film shows devas and beings as “techno-geeks” and uses gadgets in plot resolution, which can read as a limited endorsement of technological fixes; this mirrors neoliberal faith in market-driven tech solutions rather than transformative social policy. The CBFC's classification of the film as an “educational” film about climate change frames ecological crisis as a pedagogical problem for individuals/children, which can align with neoliberal approaches that prefer awareness-raising and behavioral change over regulatory or

redistributive measures. The plastic-waste monster dramatizes consumer waste's visible damage; because the narrative locates the solution in Hanuman's courage and action (and occasional technical help), viewers are invited to see the fix as a matter of moral choice and heroism rather than a demand for policy/regulatory change or corporate accountability.

The animation style of *RoH* is a blend of traditional 2D animation with subtle 3D elements. This choice reflects the film's overall approach of merging the ancient and the modern. The character designs are stylized and expressive, drawing inspiration from Indian comic books and folk art. Hanuman himself is depicted as a powerful yet benevolent figure, his iconic features – the monkey face, the gada (mace), and the orange dhoti – instantly recognizable.

The backgrounds are detailed and vibrant, showcasing the diversity of India's landscapes and cityscapes. The animators effectively use colour to create mood and atmosphere. Bright, warm colours are used to depict scenes of harmony and devotion, while darker, cooler colors are employed during moments of conflict and tension.

The integration of 3D elements, though subtle, adds depth and dynamism to the animation. Fight sequences and scenes involving Hanuman's supernatural abilities often incorporate 3D effects to enhance the visual impact. However, the film avoids excessive use of 3D, maintaining a predominantly 2D aesthetic that aligns with the tradition of Indian animation and visual storytelling. Hanuman's powers – his ability to fly, grow to enormous sizes, and wield supernatural weapons – are brought to life through animation in ways that would be impossible in live-action cinema without relying heavily on CGI. The film showcases Hanuman's feats of strength and agility in dynamic and visually arresting sequences. Hanuman's fight against the villains is choreographed with a sense of energy and fluidity that captivates the viewer. The animators use a variety of techniques, such

as slow motion, speed lines, and dynamic camera angles, to heighten the impact of the action.

Beyond the action sequences, animation is also used to depict Hanuman's divine nature. His aura, his ability to transform, and the manifestations of his power are all rendered through animation in a way that emphasizes his otherworldly origins. This visual representation reinforces his status as a deity and enhances the sense of awe and reverence that he inspires.

The soundtrack of *RoH* plays a crucial role in enhancing the animated experience. The music, composed by Tapas Relia and Daler Mehndi, blends traditional Indian melodies with contemporary sounds. The songs are catchy and upbeat, adding energy and excitement to the film. The use of sound effects is also noteworthy. The sound designers create a rich and immersive soundscape that brings the animated world to life. The sounds of Hanuman's flight, the clash of weapons, and the roar of the villains all contribute to the overall sensory experience. The voice acting is another important element of the soundtrack. The voice actors bring the characters to life with their expressive performances. The dialogue is clear and engaging, and the voice actors effectively convey the emotions and motivations of their characters.

To conclude, Kashyap's involvement in *RoH* served as a case study for the evolution of animation in India. Despite initial challenges, including unfinished reels, the film has grown to hold a special place among young adults. Kashyap's journey underscored the transformative potential of animation, moving from a niche to a recognized genre, yet he noted the struggle in fully elevating animated films beyond their cartoonish image.

Works Cited

- Animation Resources. 2020. "Animation History: Clair Weeks—Pioneer of Indian Animation." November 6, 2020. <https://animationresources.org/history-clair-weeks-pioneer-of-indian-animation-2/>.
- Banerjee, Anindita. 2011. "A Higher Narrative in Pictures: Iconography, Intermediality and Contemporary Uses of the Epic in India." In *Epic and Other Higher Narratives: Essays in Intercultural Studies*, edited by Steven Shankman and Amiya Dev, 112–27. New Delhi: Pearson Education.
- Bendazzi, Giannalberto. 2016. *Animation: A World History. Vol. 2, The Birth of a Style—The Three Markets*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Breckenridge, Carol A., and Arjun Appadurai. 1995. "Public Modernity in India." In *Consuming Modernity: Public Culture in a South Asian World*, edited by Carol A. Breckenridge, 1–20. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Chandra, Nandini. 2012. "The Prehistory of the Superhero Comics in India (1976–1986)." *Thesis Eleven* 113 (1): 57–77.
- Coogan, Peter. 2009. "The Definition of a Superhero." In *A Comic Studies Reader*, edited by Jeet Heer and Kent Worcester, 77–93. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi.
- D'Source. n.d. "The Story of Indian Animation." Accessed April 21, 2025. <http://www.dsource.in/course/story-indian-animation/long-ago>.

- Davé, Shilpa. 2013. "Spiderman India: Comic Books and the Translating/Transcreating of American Cultural Narratives." In *Transnational Perspectives on Graphic Narratives: Comics at the Crossroads*, edited by Shane Denson, Christina Meyer, and Daniel Stein, 127–44. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Fernandes, Leela. 2006. *India's New Middle Class: Democratic Politics in an Era of Economic Reform*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Forgacs, David. 1992. "Disney Animation and the Business of Childhood." *Screen* 33 (4): 361–74.
- Gaatha. n.d. "Leather Puppets of Andhra Pradesh." Accessed April 21, 2025. <http://gaatha.com/leather-puppets-of-andhra-pradesh/>.
- Gupta, Shruti. 2023. "Return of Hanuman, That Time When Anurag Kashyap Made an Animated Movie for Kids." *DailyO*, April 5, 2023. <https://www.dailyo.in/entertainment/return-of-hanuman-that-time-when-anurag-kashyap-made-an-animated-movie-for-kids-39393>.
- Hanuman. 2005. Directed by V. G. Samant and Milind Ulkey. Mumbai: Sahara Motion Pictures, Percept Pictures, and Silvertoons.
- iPixio. n.d. "Animation Industry in India—Past, Present, Future." Accessed April 21, 2025. <https://www.ipixio.in/animation-industry-in-india-past-present-future/>.

Jacobsen, Knut A. 2004. "The Child Manifestation of Śiva in Contemporary Hindu Popular Prints." *Numen* 51 (3): 237–64.

Jamuura. n.d. "The History of Indian Animation: From Dadasaheb Phalke to Ram Mohan & Beyond." Accessed April 21, 2025. <http://www.jamuura.com/blog/the-complete-history-of-indian-animation/>.

Juluri, Vamsee. 2010. "Reimagining Tradition: Globalization in India from MTV to Hanuman." In *Media Consumption and Everyday Life in Asia*, edited by Youna Kim, 59–69. New York: Routledge.

Kashyap, Anurag (@anuragkashyap72). 2019. "It was a terrible film ... want to see great animation, see Geetanjali Rao's films, see 'Dhap,' see the Japanese Ramayan." X (formerly Twitter). December 28, 2019. <https://x.com/anuragkashyap72/status/1210847026080030720>.

———. 2007. *Return of Hanuman*. Directed by Anurag Kashyap. Mumbai: Percept Pictures Company.

Lent, John A. 1998. "Ram Mohan and RM-USL: India's Change Agents of Animation." *Animation World Magazine* 3 (5). <https://www.awn.com/mag/issue3.5/3.5pages/3.5lent.html>.

———. 2009. "Animation in South Asia." *Studies in South Asian Film and Media* 1 (1): 101–17.

Lutgendorf, Philip. 2007. *Hanuman's Tale: The Messages of a Divine Monkey*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- . 2015. “Bringing Up Hanuman: Hanuman and the Changing Imagination of Childhood.” In *Ramkatha in Narrative, Performance and Pictorial Traditions*, edited by Molly Kaushal, Alok Bhalla, and Ramakar Pant, 251–62. New Delhi: Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts.
- Madan, Anuja. 2010. “Construction of Morality in Contemporary English Adaptations of Mahabharata for Children.” *The Journal of Children's Literature Studies* 7 (3): 80–97.
- . n.d. “Bal Hanuman and the Politics of Being a Superhero.” Academia.edu. Accessed April 21, 2025. <https://www.academia.edu/resource/work/50273151>.
- Mathur, Suchitra. 2010. “From Capes to Snakes: The Indianization of the American Superhero.” In *Comics as a Nexus of Cultures: Essays on the Interplay of Media, Disciplines and International Perspectives*, edited by Mark Berninger, Jochen Ecke, and Gideon Haberkorn, 175–86. Jefferson, NC: McFarland.
- Mohanty, Anish (@anishmohanty). 2019. “12 Years of #ReturnofHanuman. Arguably One of the Best Animated Films Made in India.” X (formerly Twitter). December 28, 2019. <https://x.com/anishmohanty/status/1210843483709198336>.
- Ramaswamy, Sumathi, ed. 2003. *Beyond Appearances? Visual Practices and Ideologies in Modern India*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Sen, Jayanti. 1999. "The Neglected Queen of Indian Animation." *Animation World Magazine*. <https://www.awn.com/animationworld/neglected-queen-indian-animation>.

The New Adventures of Hanuman. 2010. Season 1. Television series. POGO.

The New Adventures of Hanuman. 2011. Season 2. Television series. POGO.

Uberoi, Patricia. 2006. *Freedom and Destiny: Gender, Family, and Popular Culture in India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.