

Original Research Article

From Silver Screen to Secretariat: The Inseparable Nexus between Tamil Cinema and Tamil Politics

Dr. C. Maria Ugin Joseph^{1*}

Dean, School of Education, DMI-St. Eugene University, Zambia

***Corresponding Author:** Dr. C. Maria Ugin Joseph
Dean, School of Education, DMI-St. Eugene University, Zambia

Article History

Received: 19.08.2026

Accepted: 12.10.2026

Published: 14.10.2026

Abstract: Tamil cinema occupies a distinctive position in the political, cultural and social history of Tamil Nadu. Unlike the conventional understanding of cinema as primarily a form of entertainment, Tamil cinema has historically functioned as a powerful medium of ideological communication, identity formation, social criticism, celebrity construction and political mobilisation. The relationship became particularly significant with the rise of the Dravidian movement, which recognised the potential of theatre, literature, film scripts, dialogue and popular culture for reaching mass audiences. Political figures such as C. N. Annadurai and M. Karunanidhi used cinema as a vehicle for disseminating ideological messages, while M. G. Ramachandran (MGR) and J. Jayalalithaa demonstrated how cinematic celebrity could be converted into political authority. The contemporary emergence of actor Vijay as Chief Minister further demonstrates the continuing relevance of the cinema-politics nexus. This thematic article examines the relationship through interconnected themes of Dravidian ideology, cinematic constructions of leadership, Tamil identity, caste and social justice, fan culture, celebrity politics and digital communication. It argues that Tamil cinema and politics should not be understood as two independent spheres that occasionally intersect, but as mutually reinforcing institutions that have shaped political imagination and popular culture in Tamil Nadu. At the same time, the article critically examines the limitations of celebrity politics, particularly the assumption that cinematic popularity necessarily translates into political competence. The article concludes that the movement from the silver screen to the Secretariat represents not simply the political careers of individual film personalities but a deeper transformation of popular culture into an arena of political power.

Keywords: Tamil Cinema, Tamil Politics, Dravidian Movement, Political Communication, Celebrity Politics, MGR, Jayalalithaa, Vijay, Caste, Fan Clubs, Political Mobilisation.

1. INTRODUCTION

The relationship between cinema and politics in Tamil Nadu represents one of the most distinctive examples of the interaction between popular culture and political power in modern India. Cinema in Tamil Nadu has historically occupied a position extending far beyond entertainment. Film stars, characters, dialogues, songs, images and narratives have become embedded in everyday social life and have frequently intersected with questions of ideology, identity, social justice and political leadership. The political significance of Tamil cinema therefore cannot be adequately understood by examining films solely as commercial cultural products.

The development of this relationship was closely associated with the emergence of the Dravidian political movement. The Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (DMK), founded in 1949, represented an important transformation in Tamil political history and in the political use of cultural forms. Barnett (1976) identifies the rise of the DMK as a crucial stage in the development of Tamil cultural nationalism. The movement recognised that political ideas could be communicated not only through party meetings and newspapers but also through theatre, literature and cinema.

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

CITATION: Joseph, C. M. (2026). From Silver Screen to Secretariat: The Inseparable Nexus between Tamil Cinema and Tamil Politics. *South Asian Res J Art Lang Lit*, 8(5), 204-211. <https://doi.org/10.36346/sarjall.2026.v08i05.004>

Cinema subsequently became an important platform through which questions of caste, social hierarchy, rationalism, Tamil identity, poverty and social justice could be represented. C. N. Annadurai and M. Karunanidhi were particularly significant in developing political writing and dialogue for cinema. Later, M. G. Ramachandran transformed cinematic charisma into political authority, while J. Jayalalithaa demonstrated another pathway from film celebrity to political leadership. Scholarship identifies these developments as central to the symbiotic relationship between Tamil cinema and politics (Velayutham & Devadas, 2022).

The relationship has not remained confined to the twentieth century. The emergence of contemporary film personalities in politics demonstrates its continuing significance. Actor Vijay's transition from a major Tamil film star to political leader and, by 2026, Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu provides a contemporary illustration of how cinematic celebrity continues to interact with electoral politics. Current reporting shows Vijay functioning as head of the Tamilaga Vettri Kazhagam (TVK) government and participating directly in legislative debates, demonstrating that the movement from cinema to political office remains a living phenomenon rather than merely a historical legacy.

The central argument of this article is therefore that Tamil cinema and Tamil politics are inseparable not simply because several actors have entered politics, but because cinema has contributed to the production of political identities, ideological narratives, leadership images, emotional attachments and organisational networks. Politics, in turn, has influenced the themes and representations produced by Tamil cinema.

2. Historical Foundations: From Dravidian Ideology to Political Cinema

The political use of cinema in Tamil Nadu developed from a broader cultural environment involving theatre, literature, public speaking and political activism. Before cinema became a dominant mass medium, political movements used drama and public performance to reach wider audiences. The arrival and expansion of Tamil-language cinema created an even larger cultural platform.

The Dravidian movement was central to this transformation. The ideological environment associated with the Self-Respect Movement and subsequently the Dravidian political organisations emphasised social equality, opposition to caste hierarchy, rationalism, Tamil cultural identity and social reform. When the DMK emerged in 1949, cultural communication became an important component of its political strategy (Barnett, 1976).

Cinema offered several advantages. It could reach audiences across geographical and social boundaries, transform political ideas into stories and characters, and create memorable dialogues and songs. Instead of presenting ideology as abstract political theory, cinema could dramatise injustice through the experiences of individual characters.

The importance of political writing in Tamil cinema is particularly evident in the work of C. N. Annadurai and M. Karunanidhi. Their screenplays and dialogues provided a means of connecting political thought with popular entertainment. Baskaran (1996) identifies the political importance of Tamil cinema and the role of politically engaged writers in transforming film into a medium of social commentary.

Films such as *Velaikkari* (1949) and *Parasakthi* (1952) illustrate this development. Later scholarship notes that these films questioned caste hierarchy, social exploitation and irrationality and used cinematic narratives to challenge established social assumptions (Eswaran, 2024). Cinema thus became a space where political ideas could be dramatised and emotionally experienced.

This historical foundation is crucial because it demonstrates that Tamil political cinema did not originate with the phenomenon of actors becoming politicians. Politics entered cinema before cinema personalities entered formal politics. The movement initially involved political ideas using cinema as a communicative medium. Subsequently, cinema generated personalities whose public recognition could itself become politically significant.

3. From Screen Heroes to Political Leaders

The movement of individuals from cinema into politics is perhaps the most visible expression of the cinema-politics nexus. However, different political personalities followed different pathways.

3.1 M. G. Ramachandran: The Screen Hero as Political Leader

M. G. Ramachandran, popularly known as MGR, represents one of the clearest examples of cinematic charisma being transformed into political authority.

His screen persona was frequently associated with justice, generosity, courage and protection of ordinary people. His characters often represented the interests of the poor and challenged powerful or exploitative figures. Repeated cinematic representations consequently contributed to a recognisable moral persona.

The significance of MGR's cinematic identity was that political recognition was built upon an already established relationship between star and audience. Viewers did not encounter an unknown political candidate; they encountered a familiar figure whose cinematic roles had repeatedly associated him with particular moral values.

This illustrates the conversion of symbolic capital into political capital. Recognition gained through cinema could become an electoral resource. The political meaning of MGR therefore cannot be reduced to his popularity as an actor; it lies in the ability of cinematic narratives to provide an interpretive framework through which political leadership could be understood.

3.2 M. Karunanidhi: Politics through Writing and Cinema

M. Karunanidhi demonstrates a different pathway. He was not primarily an actor who subsequently entered politics. His importance lay in the interaction of political activism, writing, oratory and screenwriting.

His career illustrates a reverse process:

Political ideology → writing → cinema → mass communication → political leadership.

Through screenwriting and dialogue, political arguments could be incorporated into popular narratives. Cinema thus became an extension of political communication.

Karunanidhi's contribution is important because it prevents the history of Tamil cinematic politics from being reduced to celebrity culture. Political writers and ideologues were equally important in creating the relationship between cinema and politics.

3.3 J. Jayalithaa: From Actress to Political Authority

J. Jayalithaa represents another important pathway from cinematic celebrity to political leadership. Her political career was strongly connected with MGR and the AIADMK, but her subsequent leadership developed into a political identity that extended beyond her earlier cinematic career.

Her case demonstrates how cinematic recognition can be transformed and reconstructed. The actress became a political leader, and eventually a powerful symbol of governance and welfare politics.

Jayalithaa also adds an important gender dimension. Tamil cinematic politics was initially dominated by male political personalities, but her emergence demonstrated that female celebrity could also be converted into political authority.

3.4 M. K. Stalin: The Political Leader in a Cinematic Culture

M. K. Stalin represents a different relationship between politics and cinema. Unlike MGR and Jayalithaa, his political authority was not fundamentally based on film stardom. Nevertheless, his brief engagement with acting and television illustrates the broader permeability between political and popular-cultural spheres.

His case demonstrates that the relationship is not simply:

Actor → politician.

It can also involve:

Politician → popular culture → media visibility → political communication.

This distinction is important because it shows that Tamil politics has historically developed within a cultural environment heavily influenced by cinema.

3.5 Vijay: The Contemporary Continuation of the Cinema–Politics Nexus

The emergence of Vijay provides the most contemporary example of the continuing relationship between Tamil cinema and politics.

After decades as one of Tamil cinema's most prominent stars, Vijay entered organised politics through the Tamilaga Vettri Kazhagam. His transition is especially significant because his political identity emerged after a long cinematic career in which he developed a powerful public persona.

Several of his films engaged with themes of corruption, inequality, education, public welfare and social responsibility. Although cinematic narratives should not automatically be equated with political programmes, such themes contributed to the broader social meanings associated with his public image.

His political emergence demonstrates that celebrity politics has not disappeared with the passing of the MGR and Jayalalithaa eras. Instead, it has entered a new technological and political environment.

As of September 2026, Vijay is serving as Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu, making his case particularly significant for an article examining the continuing journey from the silver screen to political office. Recent reporting records his participation in Assembly debates and his government's ongoing political and administrative activities.

Vijay's case therefore provides a powerful contemporary test of the celebrity-politics hypothesis. His political position demonstrates that cinematic popularity can still be converted into electoral and institutional power. At the same time, it raises the critical question of whether cinematic charisma is sufficient for effective governance.

The distinction is important. A film hero operates within a scripted narrative in which problems can be resolved through individual action. A Chief Minister operates within constitutional institutions, administrative systems, economic constraints and democratic accountability. Consequently, the transition from cinema to governance requires more than popularity.

The Vijay phenomenon therefore demonstrates both the power and the limitations of cinematic celebrity in politics.

4. Cinema, Tamil Identity and Political Consciousness

Tamil cinema has played an important role in constructing and circulating ideas of Tamil identity. Language, cultural history, regional belonging and Tamil pride have frequently appeared in film narratives.

The political significance of this development is connected to the broader history of Tamil cultural nationalism. Barnett (1976) demonstrates the importance of cultural nationalism in the emergence of the DMK and Tamil political identity.

Cinema contributed to this process by making language and culture emotionally accessible. Tamil songs, dialogues, historical narratives and representations of Tamil social life could contribute to a shared cultural consciousness.

Velayutham and Devadas (2022) argue that the relationship between Tamil cinema and politics has included the dissemination of ideas about Tamil cultural and linguistic identity. At the same time, they emphasise that these representations can involve tensions concerning broader Indian identity and belonging.

Cinema is therefore not simply a mirror reflecting an already existing Tamil identity. It also participates in producing and reproducing cultural identity.

The political significance of cinema emerges because cultural identity can become political identity. When language, culture and regional belonging become associated with questions of rights, representation and political autonomy, cultural narratives acquire political meaning.

Tamil cinema has consequently served as a space in which the meaning of being Tamil is repeatedly imagined, negotiated and contested.

5. Cinema, Caste and Social Justice

One of the most important developments in Tamil cinema concerns its representation of caste.

Caste has long been present in Tamil cinema, although its representation has changed considerably over time. Early socially conscious films associated with the Dravidian movement challenged caste hierarchy and social exploitation. Eswaran (2024) notes the significance of films such as *Velaikkari* and *Parasakthi* in questioning caste hierarchy, irrationality and exploitation.

However, cinema can both challenge and reproduce caste structures. Damodaran and Gorringer (2017) demonstrate how certain Tamil film narratives associated with the "Madurai formula" have contributed to representations of caste pride and dominance. This illustrates the contradiction inherent in cinema: the screen can become a site of resistance while simultaneously reproducing social hierarchies.

Contemporary Tamil cinema has witnessed an important expansion of Dalit representation. Filmmakers such as Pa. Ranjith have placed Dalit experiences, Ambedkarite ideas and caste oppression at the centre of mainstream cinematic narratives. Recent scholarship describes Ranjith's work as part of a significant transformation in the representational politics

of Tamil cinema and argues for understanding this development as a form of Dalit cinema rather than merely generic anti-caste cinema (Bharatvaraj, 2026).

Films such as *Madras*, *Kabali* and *Kaala* demonstrate how questions of caste, space, dignity, political power and cultural identity can become central cinematic themes.

Recent scholarship further identifies the emergence of Dalit-centred and subaltern representations as a significant feature of post-2000 Tamil commercial cinema (Devi & Augustine, 2026). Leonard (2026) similarly examines the emergence of the "Dalit heroic" in contemporary Tamil cinema.

This development expands the meaning of political cinema. Political cinema is no longer restricted to explicit party propaganda or speeches. Representation itself can be political.

Questions such as who is represented as a hero? Whose history is remembered? Whose culture is celebrated? Whose suffering becomes visible? are questions of political power.

Tamil cinema has therefore become an important arena in which caste, class, identity and social justice are negotiated.

6. Fan Clubs, Celebrity Culture and Political Mobilisation

The relationship between cinema and politics also operates through fan culture.

Tamil film fandom has historically been highly organised. Fan clubs are not merely informal groups of admirers; they can become social networks through which members participate in public activities and construct collective identities.

Dickey's (1993) ethnographic study of cinema in Madurai demonstrates the importance of film culture in everyday life. Cinema permeates conversations, public spaces, celebrations and social relationships. Her work also specifically examines the relationship between fan clubs and politics.

Fan clubs create an important bridge between the individual star and the political organisation:

Film star → fan club → social service → collective identity → political mobilisation.

The political importance of fan clubs lies partly in their organisational structure. A celebrity who enters politics may already possess networks of supporters, local organisers and community contacts.

However, it would be incorrect to assume that every fan automatically becomes a political supporter. Film fandom and political commitment are not identical. Rogers (2009) emphasises the complexity of the relationship between fan clubs, political economy and political participation.

This distinction is crucial for understanding celebrity politics. A fan may admire an actor's performance without supporting the actor's political programme. Political mobilisation therefore requires additional processes of persuasion, organisation and ideological identification.

Nevertheless, fan clubs demonstrate that cinema can create forms of social organisation that political movements may subsequently utilise.

7. The Politics of the Cinematic Hero

The political influence of Tamil cinema is also connected to the recurring representation of the hero.

The Tamil cinematic hero has often been portrayed as courageous, morally upright, protective of the poor and capable of confronting powerful forces. Such narratives create an image of leadership centred on individual moral authority.

When an actor with such a persona enters politics, audiences may interpret the political figure through the memory of cinematic roles.

This creates a potential chain:

Cinematic character → emotional attachment → star identity → political identification → electoral support.

The process is particularly powerful because political communication is not exclusively rational. Political choices can involve emotion, identity, memory and symbolic recognition.

However, this also presents a democratic challenge. Cinematic leadership is fundamentally different from democratic governance. A film can construct a world in which one heroic individual solves a major social problem. Real political systems require institutions, consultation, legislation, budgets, bureaucracy and accountability.

Therefore, cinematic charisma can create political opportunity but cannot by itself guarantee administrative competence.

This distinction is particularly relevant to the contemporary political role of Vijay. His rise demonstrates the continuing electoral potential of celebrity, but his performance in government must ultimately be evaluated through public policy, institutional accountability and governance outcomes rather than cinematic popularity.

8. Contemporary Transformation: From Fan Clubs to Digital Fandom

The relationship between cinema and politics has also been transformed by digital technology.

The traditional model could be represented as:

Cinema → fan clubs → public meetings → political mobilisation → elections.

The contemporary model increasingly involves:

Cinema → social media → digital fandom → political communication → online mobilisation → electoral politics.

Social media allows celebrities to communicate directly with audiences without relying exclusively on newspapers, television or party organisations.

Digital platforms also enable fans to produce political content themselves. Film clips, interviews, speeches, memes, photographs and fan-created videos can circulate rapidly, creating a continuous political presence around a celebrity.

This represents a major transformation because the cinematic image is no longer confined to the cinema hall. It can remain permanently present within everyday digital life.

At the same time, digital celebrity politics presents challenges. Social media can encourage personality-centred politics, emotional polarisation and political communication based on short-form messages rather than detailed policy discussion.

The contemporary cinema-politics nexus should therefore be understood as a hybrid system involving film, television, fan clubs, news media and social media.

Vijay's political career is especially relevant to this transformation. Unlike the political careers of earlier film stars, his rise has taken place within a highly digitised media environment. His cinematic image can circulate continuously through online communities, enabling supporters to construct and reproduce political meanings beyond the theatre.

9. Cinema, Politics and the Question of Democratic Power

The inseparability of cinema and politics raises broader questions concerning democracy.

On one hand, cinema can democratise political communication by making political ideas accessible to large audiences. It can give visibility to marginalised communities, challenge social hierarchies and encourage public discussion.

On the other hand, celebrity politics can potentially personalise political authority. When political loyalty becomes closely associated with an individual personality, institutional and ideological considerations may become secondary.

This creates a tension between personality-centred politics and institution-centred democracy.

Tamil Nadu's cinematic political history provides examples of both possibilities. Cinema has helped communicate ideas about social justice, language and equality, while celebrity has also created powerful personality-based political movements.

The challenge is therefore not to dismiss celebrity politics simply because it originates in entertainment, but to examine the conditions under which celebrity becomes democratic political authority.

The crucial questions are:

Does celebrity encourage political participation?

Does it create greater public engagement?

Does it strengthen or weaken political institutions?

Does cinematic charisma encourage voters to focus on personality rather than policy?

Can celebrity politicians develop sustainable political organisations?

Can cinematic popularity be transformed into effective governance?

These questions become increasingly important as new generations of actors enter political life.

10. Why Tamil Cinema and Tamil Politics Remain Inseparable

The historical and contemporary evidence suggests several reasons for the enduring relationship.

10.1 Mass Reach

Cinema reaches audiences across geographical and social boundaries. Its accessibility makes it an effective medium for political communication.

10.2 Emotional Identification

Film characters and stars can generate emotional relationships that conventional political communication may find difficult to reproduce.

10.3 Ideological Communication

The Dravidian movement demonstrated how cinema could transform political ideology into stories, characters and dialogue (Barnett, 1976; Baskaran, 1996).

10.4 Celebrity Capital

Actors enter politics with existing name recognition. MGR, Jayalalithaa and Vijay illustrate how cinematic recognition can become political capital.

10.5 Fan Networks

Fan clubs provide organisational structures capable of connecting celebrity culture with grassroots activity (Dickey, 1993; Rogers, 2009).

10.6 Identity Formation

Tamil cinema participates in the construction and negotiation of Tamil linguistic and cultural identity (Velayutham & Devadas, 2022).

10.7 Social Justice

Cinema provides a space for representing caste, class, gender and marginalised communities. Contemporary Dalit cinema demonstrates the continuing political significance of representation (Bharatvaraj, 2026; Leonard, 2026).

10.8 Digital Communication

Social media has extended cinematic celebrity into continuous political communication.

These factors demonstrate that the cinema-politics relationship is not dependent on a single actor or political party. It is embedded within the wider cultural and political structure of Tamil Nadu.

11. CONCLUSION

The journey from the Silver Screen to the Secretariat represents far more than the movement of individual film stars into politics. It represents the historical transformation of popular culture into a significant arena of political communication, identity formation and political power.

The relationship began with the recognition by the Dravidian movement that cinema could communicate ideological ideas to mass audiences. Political writers such as C. N. Annadurai and M. Karunanidhi used cinema to communicate ideas concerning social justice, rationalism, caste and Tamil identity. MGR subsequently demonstrated how cinematic heroism could be transformed into political leadership. Jayalalithaa demonstrated another form of conversion of celebrity into political authority, while the career of M. K. Stalin illustrates the broader cultural environment in which Tamil politics and cinema continue to intersect.

The contemporary emergence of Vijay provides evidence that the phenomenon has not disappeared. Instead, it has entered a new phase. His transition from major film star to political leader and his position as Chief Minister in 2026

demonstrate that cinematic celebrity continues to possess political significance. Current political developments, including his participation in Assembly debates, show that the relationship between cinema and governance has entered a new institutional stage.

At the same time, the contemporary cinema-politics relationship cannot be romanticised. Cinematic popularity does not automatically equal political competence. A successful actor may possess extraordinary communication skills and public recognition but still face the complex demands of democratic governance. The ultimate test of a celebrity politician is therefore not popularity but policy performance, institutional responsibility, accountability and the ability to govern within democratic structures.

Tamil cinema's political significance also extends beyond celebrity politicians. Contemporary films increasingly address caste, social inequality, Dalit identity, gender and questions of power. This indicates that cinema remains a contested cultural space in which different visions of Tamil society are negotiated.

The evolution can therefore be represented as:

Dravidian ideology → political cinema → cinematic heroism → celebrity politics → fan mobilisation → electoral power → digital political communication → governance.

This cycle demonstrates the depth of the relationship between cinema and politics in Tamil Nadu.

Ultimately, Tamil cinema and Tamil politics are inseparable because they have developed together as overlapping systems of culture, communication, identity and power. Cinema has given politics characters, symbols, narratives and emotional connections, while politics has given cinema themes, conflicts and ideological meaning. The journey from the silver screen to the Secretariat is therefore not merely a journey undertaken by actors. It is a reflection of how popular culture can become political culture—and how political culture can, in turn, reshape popular imagination.

REFERENCES

- Barnett, M. R. (1976). *The politics of cultural nationalism in South India*. Princeton University Press. (JSTOR)
- Baskaran, T. S. (1996). *The eye of the serpent: An introduction to Tamil cinema*. East West Books.
- Bharatvaraj, S. G. (2026). Contemporary anti-caste cinema: Pa. Ranjith, Dalit movements, cultural assertion and the politics of representation in mainstream Tamil cinema. *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, 49(1), 167–187. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00856401.2025.2592504> (Taylor & Francis Online)
- Damodaran, K., & Gorringe, H. (2017). Madurai formula films: Caste pride and politics in Tamil cinema. *South Asia Multidisciplinary Academic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.4000/samaj.4359>
- Devi, G., & Augustine, A. K. (2026). Cinematic renditions of the subaltern: The role of aestheticization in the post-2000s Tamil commercial films. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 13, Article 417. (Nature)
- Dickey, S. (1993). *Cinema and the urban poor in South India*. Cambridge University Press. (Cambridge University Press)
- Eswaran, S. (2024). Challenging caste hierarchies in Tamil cinema. In S. Ramasubramanian & O. O. Banjo (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of media and social justice* (pp. 166–175). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780197744345.013.18> (OUP Academic)
- Leonard, D. (2026). Casting the historical: The Dalit heroic in contemporary Tamil cinema. *South Asian Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02759527.2026.2659405> (Taylor & Francis Online)
- Rogers, M. (2009). Between fantasy and "reality": Tamil film star fan club networks and the political economy of film fandom. *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, 32(1), 63–85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00856400802709284>
- Velayutham, S., & Devadas, V. (2022). Tamil Nadu politics and Tamil cinema: A symbiotic relationship? *Society and Culture in South Asia*, 8(1), 96–117. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23938617211054160> (Macquarie University)