

roughly representing a British Asia menaced by an uncertain future. But phenomenology, without denying that this may be a true and authoritative interpretation, brackets such objective possibilities and considers the object or phenomenon as presented to and perceived by the individual. In other words, on first seeing and working through that particular sequence of Woo's film, this was all I was able to come up with.<sup>48</sup>

This is not to say that a phenomenological reading can justify indulgence or sloppiness, but it does mean that these readings are perceptual, perspectival, and do not claim completeness. As we consider individual acts of perception, we are aware that they are transitory and contingent, and that they are also valid and important.

When Andrew reintroduced these terms to film debates, the body of theory was perhaps not particularly amenable to them.<sup>49</sup> This was Andrew's point; discussions of ideology, after Benjamin and Althusser, and of subject formation through and by language, through Lacan and Baudry, though dominant in authority and influence, had brought the field to a joyless impasse. There was for Andrew too much systematizing, too much ideological and/or psychological determinism. These things of course deserved attention, but Andrew held that this attention came at the expense of the human, the precious and poignant considerations which are finally the reason and justification for scholarly pursuit. "If life and reality lie beyond human experience or our consciousness of it, as certain recent structuralists have avowed, then let's forget it anyway."<sup>50</sup>

Since Andrew's writing, however, there have been numerous developments along the more human lines that he advocated. The rise of spectator studies in film allowed for an investigation, by quantitative means and otherwise, of the place of the individual receiver in the whole equation. Since individuals also reside within larger social groups, as well as parts of subcommunities within those larger groups, spectator studies also considered how a plurality of meaning in texts could speak polyglossically to those various constituencies.<sup>51</sup> Reception theory emphasized the spectator as the active site of meaning, and not just a passive or neutral husk.<sup>52</sup> In support, theorists like Mikhail Bakhtin were