

12. Earlier in this essay, Brecht states, 'Why is Mahogany an opera? Because its best attitude is that of an opera: that is to say, culinary. Does Mahogany adopt a hedonistic approach? It does. Is Mahogany an experience? It is an experience. For ... Mahogany is a piece of fun' (Brecht 1957: 35).
13. As Bhabha subsequently notes, 'This kind of disjunctive temporality is of the utmost importance for the politics of cultural difference' and, to continue in this character reading, in each of these 'interruptive' moments, 'there is a doubling and splitting of the temporal and spatial dimensions in the very act of signification' (Bhabha 1994: 177, 182).
14. Naturally, Feuer claims that 'random' (as opposed to 'deliberate') pastiche 'makes the film pleasurable in all the ways that Brecht would have disapproved of', thus interpellating the author, i.e., deploying the 'author function', in precisely the manner delineated by Foucault and also, in the process, 'impeding the free circulation ... and recomposition' of such strategies (Foucault 1998: 92-94, 221).
15. Hardy describes this complicity as 'the current finely tuned Bollywood formula' that has 'evolved to give the audience maximum escapism and minimum reality' (Hardy 2002: 16).
16. Here I have been primarily concerned with Feuer's use of Brecht and Godard. As Foucault notes in his delineation of the 'transdiscursive':

It is easy to see that in the sphere of discourse one can be the author of much more than a book—one can be the author of a theory, tradition, or discipline in which other books and authors will in turn find their place. (1998: 216-17)



Can the Bollywood Film Speak to the Subaltern?

Go and see a Hindu film ... and see ten of them while you are about it, so as to make no mistake. Here, the still water begins to move, and you will see everything. Henri Michaux (1986: 59)

In Chapter 2, we saw how media ethnographers such as Justine Hardy invoke 'the people in the dust' as comprising the 'core' Bollywood audience. This invocation is subsequently used to relegate the Bollywood film's implied viewers to an antediluvian frame and, by implication, the Bollywood film itself. In this chapter, I would like to delve further into this 'locating' of the implied viewers of Bollywood within a subaltern frame as a way of both re-evaluating the cultural axiomatics of this implied subject-position and its previous and continuing theorization by postcolonial scholars. In this way, this chapter will continue to develop the ideas raised in the previous two chapters, concerning the theorization of the implied viewer of Bollywood as well as his/her presumed capacity to 'make meaning' of what he/she sees unfolding upon the screen.

Implicit in the identification of Bollywood's 'core' audience as 'the people in the dust' is this cinema's widespread dispersal. From its inception in 1896, as Roy Armes notes, cinema in India has been a travelling cinema—'traveling showmen established the first popular audience by taking films from place to place with their tent shows'