

**Journal of Religion & Society (JR&S)**

Available Online:

<https://islamicreligious.com/index.php/Journal/index>

Print ISSN: 3006-1296 Online ISSN: 3006-130X

Platform & Workflow by: [Open Journal Systems](#)<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17259306>**Alien Eyes on Human Faith: A Critical Reading of Rajkumar Hirani's PK****Rehan Aslam Sahi**

University of Gujrat

[rehan.aslam@uog.edu.pk](mailto:rehan.aslam@uog.edu.pk)**Mudassar Ali**

University of Gujrat

[mudassar.ali@uog.edu.pk](mailto:mudassar.ali@uog.edu.pk)**Abstract**

*PK* by Rajkumar Hirani (2014) is not a simple Bollywood movie, it is a profound social satire, in which the author uses the alien stranger archetype to demonstrate the hypocrisy and absurdity of human life. In the character of PK who is played by Aamir Khan, the movie discloses the unstable pillars of trust, identity and cultural practice in the contemporary Indian society. This abstract brings PK to the level of being more than a visitor to this earth, he is more a mirror of contradictions of what human beings preach and what they actually project. Making himself innocent, honest and naive, PK disturbs what the society usually regards as the unquestionable truth, particularly the truth about the faith, social conventions, and inter human relationships. The significance of the outsider perspective in the film is that it has made the use of estrangement as a narrative element. The misconception of PK regarding the language, dress, rites, and gods emphasizes the extent to which the human culture is artificial instead of natural. The practices that have been naturalized over centuries are broken down by his constant questioning, which may seem childish. Through this, the character of PK makes the audience question the difference in the ideals and the twisted institutionalization of spirituality. Through the depiction of the alien as the most humane character in the film, the movie dismantles strict dichotomies, including self and other, believer and non-believer, and human and alien. This paper suggests that PK is a cultural critic whose naivety is his subversive weapon of choice. Although people in the movie are caught in the web of exploitation, manipulation, and blindness, the outsider position of PK provides him with the clear mind to reveal the absurdities without biases. His constant question, which is the wrong number, turns out to be a metaphor of miscommunication between humans and divine, as well as between people themselves. Moreover, being an alien makes him a complexity to the traditional identity politics: he is everywhere and nowhere at the same time, which enables him to point out the absurdity of the strict social terms and the universal necessity to lend a shoulder to lean on. Through the examination of PK as an outsider who redefines the definition of being human, this paper illustrates how the movie employs satire and humor to question some of the social practices entrenched in people. It places PK into a greater context of outsider characters in literature and movies who serve a truth-telling purpose precisely due to the fact that they do not follow the norms of the societies they are witnessing. In the end, the character of PK turns out to be the means of revealing the fact that the contradictions that humans are afraid to address is the most evident when we view them through the lens of the other. By so doing, not only does the film entertain, but it as well forces viewers to reflect on whether their lives are based on moral and cultural grounds.

**Keywords:** *Alien Eyes, Human Faith, Rajkumar Hirani's PK, Truth-Telling, Cultural Grounds.*

### **Introduction:**

The cinematic art has frequently resorted to the character of the outsider to disrupt what is commonplace and to get people to take notice of what is otherwise unknown, normalized, or unquestioned in human life. The PK (2014) by Rajkumar Hirani is one of the boldest studies of this trope in Indian cinematography, with the alien character in the center of the film, whose alien nature makes it possible to criticize the society piercingly.

The personality of PK, which Aamir Khan portrays in the most naive manner, does not solely serve the story as a science-fiction riddle, on the contrary, it is the role of a social commentator, without which the contradictions and paradoxes of human behavior would remain unseen. Making Hirani put the film into the perspective of an alien to the planet, he creates a story in which the audience can perceive their practices, rituals, and relationships estrange them. The choice of an alien as the main character is not a coincidence because PK is an individual who is not obsessed by any human values, cultural beliefs and prejudices. He has no historical burden, caste, religion and political ideology like the humans that he encounters. His opinions are therefore innocent and are able to raise questions that are regarded as a norm by others. Through the obscurity of language learning by the hand-grasping, to his astonishment at the multiplicity of the gods in India, all the contacts of PK indicate the craziness of the systems that people hardly ever doubt. The fact that he is an outsider is not merely a plot device to laugh at but a much deeper commentary on the hypocrisy of human beings: it is a declaration of how human beings are actually hypocritical, who profess to believe in compassion and in fact are willing to be exploited, and who are interested in finding the truth but who blindly follow the teachings of so-called god men. The fact that his innocence becomes resistance is one of the most remarkable aspects of the character of PK. His weaker knowledge of lies, greediness, and hypocrisy is what enables him to look beyond the illusion that other humans create.

He does not ridicule religious faith but only its perversions when PK asks why people address various deities to assist them, or why faith ceremonies require the sacrifice of money. This is essential since his criticism does not come out of cynicism but rather because of curiosity and sincerity. In this respect, PK is in a moral stance that is higher than that of the humans surrounding him, and even though he is regarded as the *Other*. The irony of the movie is that the alien seems to be more humane than humans are, as it has the traits of honesty, empathy and courage that reveal the weakness of the human institutions. The character of an outsider is not a new tradition of world literature and cinema. Shakespearean Caliban in *The Tempest*, Camusian Meursault in *The Stranger*, E.T. in the classic by Spielberg, the alien flaneurs of the postcolonial fiction, the outsiders have had to serve as mirror through which societies have had to confront their contradictions. One of such lines is PK that does not differ with it either. The majority of the outsider characters in the films underline the theme of alienation or hopelessness, but PK uses satire, humor and childish curiosity to reveal inconvenient truths. It is his outcast mannerism, whether of challenge to religious ceremony, of ignorance of social graces, of an inquiry into the paradoxes of man that brings comic effect, which, nevertheless, possesses an acute underlying sub-text of judgment. Through the very fact that PK is located

within this broader tradition, the film lays stress on the perennial applicability of the outsider as a character who shakes up existing systems and causes one to take a moment. The social significance of PK can hardly be overestimated. The movie was released in 2014, when the problem of the religious identity, nationalism and cultural pluralism became a burning topic in India. Its radical attack on institutionalized religion was controversial matter, which led to agitations, banning and hot-tempered controversies. The immense success of the film that made it become listed among the highest grossing Bollywood films of all time is however a testament to the fact that the message of the film touched people despite the lines.

This two-fold reception shows the main conflict, which the character of PK represents, he is the one who breaks the comfort zones, but he is also the one to offer an understanding of what is right and wrong. The fact that it has been an alien who has highlighted what the human beings are not comfortable with tells a lot about defensive systems that societies establish around their faith and identity. This paper presents the arguments that PK is an alien in discussing his alienness by arguing that it is a narrative tool to reveal the contradictions of human life. The film challenges binaries in terms of faith and doubt, belonging and exclusion, humanity and alienness through his gaze. PK does not merely exist beyond human society, he is part of it and not all of it, becoming involved in human life and never being lost in it. This intermediate status allows him to be critical, but not complicit, to challenge, but not to have inherited prejudice, and to expose contradictions, but not to be able to provide uncomplicated solutions. The laugh that he brings is such that could not possibly be separated of the uncomfortable sensation that he creates and this very combination is what makes his character a powerful social weapon. This manner, makes the character study of PK as an outsider not to be pegged on the exploration of his role in the story of the movie. It also ponders on how movies can be dependent on estrangement as a method of criticizing society. Hirani challenges the viewers to realize themselves by introducing an alien to the Earth to challenge the humanity. Through such an approach PK passes beyond the confines of a commercial Bollywood movie to become a cultural text which questions the most fundamental contradictions of human existence. This introduction preconditions a more detailed discussion of the role of PK in his outsider point of view in breaking down the facades of human society and inviting the audience to think more about their beliefs and practices.

### **Literature Review:**

Outsider is an inherently critical aspect of literature and cinema that has been used to examine human society through the outsider lens. The Scholars of various fields have understood that the view of the stranger, foreigner or alien overturns the conventional norms in putting the norms in the new terms. It is in this section where the main strands of scholarship that can be used in the understanding of PK (2014) as an outsider figure whose alien identity brings contradictions in human behavior and positions the film in the broader discussion of cultural studies, postcolonial theory, religious critique, and film studies.

### **Outsiders Literature and Cultural Theory.**

The outsider as an estranged character has been discussed so broadly in literary and cultural theory. The classic essay of Georg Simmel, *The Stranger* (1908/1950) describes the fact of the stranger being so close and distant at the

same time, as he is a part of society and still will never be a part of it. This dual standoff gives the outsider a critical point of view and thus they can view the contradictions clearly. In a similar manner, the exile thoughts of Edward Said imply that the exiled character tends to see the truths that are distorted to the individual in the safe position of the cultural standards. Both these views are present in PK: his alienness helps him to remain beyond human ways, whereas his active life in the society helps him to point out contradictions in the religious sphere, the language, and the social interaction.

The carnivalesque concept by Mikhail Bakhtin contributes to this discussion even more. Norms are turned inside out, hierarchies undermined, and truth is revealed in the form of laughter and parody in carnival environments. The humorous misconceptions about the rituals that PK has and his naive, yet piercing questions create a sense of the carnivalesque inversion: the sacred is ridiculed in order to show that it is abused, the figures of authority are unveiled as exploiters. This satire of the alien, in turn, reminds Bakhtinian concepts of the liberatory power of humor in revealing fixed power arrangements.

### **Critique of the Indian Cinema through Religion.**

Religion studies in Indian cinema have noted that in Indian films, negotiations between devotion and criticism are often the order of the day. Rachel Dwyer (2006) states that Bollywood movies tend to employ religious themes not just to endorse the faith but also challenge institutionalized religions. Movies like OMG: Oh My God! (2012) and PK are the extension of this tendency, the prefiguration of clash of spirituality and formalized religion. A number of detractors point out that these movies caused an uproar precisely due to the fact that they questioned godmen, commercialization and exploitation of rituals, and sensitivity of faith in a pluralistic and diverse country such as India.

The wider context of religious narratives is given through Ashish Rajadhyaksha and Paul Willemen In *Encyclopaedia of Indian Cinema* (1999), the authors place religious narratives in the trajectory of the history of Indian cinema. Although the previous films tended to show gods and mythological characters, modern films such as PK break the conventions of this by showing the absurdity of their human perversions. The outsider lens used by PK helps the audience to see what the insiders are unable to admit: that divine faith is often used politically and in the pursuit of material gains.

### **Outsider Figures in Cinema**

The outsider as the cinematographic device has been researched. Such authors as Hamid Naficy (2001) discuss the way in which exilic and diasporic characters disrupt cultural borders in cinema. Although not a migrant per se, PK shares the same traits of being displaced. The fact that he is not used to human traditions is similar to those of migrants negotiating in new cultural spaces, which reveal alienation and seeking a place to belong.

The alien in Western cinemas has taken two forms, one of fear of invasion (War of the Worlds), the other of childlike wonder (E.T.), and differences in culture (District 9). According to scholars, the aliens can be viewed as metaphors of the Other since they represent fears and desires that the human cultures cast (Telotte, 2001). PK puts this trope into a specifically South Asian setting and has the alien not as a threat but as a moral guide revealing the inconsistencies and revealing them through humour instead of violence. This reversal is in line with the tradition of the Bollywood that employed melodrama and satire to solve burning social problems.

### **Postcolonial Perspectives**

Another approach that can be helpful in explaining the role of outsider of PK is the postcolonial theory. The concept of the subaltern by Gayatri Spivak is that the voices of the marginalized are never heard in the main structures. PK is not a human, but he is similar to the subaltern in that his voice is either ignored, ridiculed, or wrongly understood by the general society. However, through his perseverance, one is forced to acknowledge them, disrupting the hegemonic accounts. In the same way, the idea of hybridity created by Homi Bhabha enlightens the audience about the identity of PK, who is neither completely alien nor a human. His intermediate status disrupts rigid belonging categories so that he can flawlessly criticize the contradiction but not be confined to it.

Indian critics such as Bhaskar Sarkar (2009) highlight the problem of the fact that Bollywood tends to serve as a cultural arena, a playground of national apprehensions. The outsider view of PK shows the conflict of India between secularism and strong religious convictions, thus placing the film in the context of the general arguments of modernity, pluralism, and identity.

### **Social Critique, Humor and Satire.**

Humor has been examined as a very strong instrument of criticism. Northrup Frye is the mode of literature known to reveal the folly of human beings by ridiculing. The misunderstandings with which PK laughs represent this mode: the alien gaze transforms the familiar into the strange, and the comic effect brings out contradictions that are otherwise normalized. Modernists of Indian cinema (Mehta, 2012) point out that the satire in Bollywood frequently dilutes the criticism and renders disputable issues less harsh. PK is no exception to this trend as it combines humor with social commentary in it so that the people who are criticized by it do not feel estranged by it.

### **Synthesis**

Combined, these points of study shed light on the ambiguity of the outsider role of PK. The character of PK is a representation of several theoretical strands that originate with Simmel and Bakhtin as well as Spivak and the religious critique of Bollywood. He is a stranger, a reflection, a critic, and a fool at the same time, but in all these aspects he reveals the contradictions about which people do not want to say. It is proposed by the literature that outsider characters tend to reflect the most accurate mirrors to the society, and PK is not an exception in terms of the modern Indian culture.

### **Analysis**

The persona of PK in PK (2014) by Rajkumar Hirani is not only a protagonist who moves the plot forward, but a literary technique with which we see the contradictions of the human society in the foreground. The film creates a veil of alienation by placing PK as an outsider who has no prior knowledge of the language structures, religion, culture, and social life, which generates humor and at the same time creates a prompt to criticism. It is what this outsider sees in his unveiled vision of the human contradictions, of the contradictions between faith and practice, between compassion and exploitation, between truth and hypocrisy. This discussion focuses on the nature of PK as an outsider into a specific culture, his relations with religion, his revelations of social and political systems, and his symbolic position as a moral reflector.

### **Estrangement as a Lens**

The fact that PK is an alien places him in a perspective of alienness to human systems of meaning and this enables him to have an exclusive viewpoint where to view contradictions. At the beginning of the movie, PK finds it difficult to cope with the simplest human life, including how to wear clothes and speak a language. His mode of learning elements like holding hands to pass information mocks the pain-taking cultural and linguistic conditioning that human beings go through. Although this brings out comic effect, it also disrupts what viewers assume to be the case. The language, ritualistic aspect, and clothing which are usually naturalized as universal seem arbitrary and even absurd to someone who is not already familiar with them.

This estrangement technique is the focus of PK character study. It enables the film to bring out the fact that human institutions are not self-evident truths but social practices. PK makes these practices look bizarre hence forcing the audiences to revisit these practices to the drawing board. The outsider status therefore comes as a de-familiarizing device as an allusion to the alienation effect in Bertolt Brecht instances when the audience is presented to the familiar in a new perspective.

### **The Critique of Religion.**

The PK is not in any way an outsider the way he is with regard to his treatment of religion. The failure to comprehend the fact that there are multiple deities, with each one of them demanding a number of rituals, costumes, and languages, turns out to be one of the central themes of the narrative. The innocent question, What God shall I serve? is the rattling rod of centuries of religious tradition, and the uncovers the inconsistencies of ideals of religion and their institutional falsification.

The same criticism is supported by the fact that PK always uses the image of a wrong number. He realizes that the man is not addressing God, but he trusts in the mediums such as godmen who are exploiting religious faith to make profits. This metaphor explains the human dilemma of attainment of genuine spiritual relationship and intentions of adopting methods of manipulation. The god man in the movie is a hypocrite; he is preaching good morals and earns money out of the fear. With the alien gaze of PK the audience can observe that even religion, which is supposed to be used to promote compassion and truth, is the means to perpetuate hierarchies of power and create wealth.

It is important to note that faith itself is not mocked by PK. Instead, it differentiates spirituality as a true human desire and the institutionalized exploitation of the same desire. His inquiries show the hypocrisy of religion: although its intentions may be to bring peace, their actions have a tendency of creating chaos and segregation. The outsider innocence of PK is therefore an eye opener to the fact that religion can at the same time bind and separate it liberate and suppress.

### **Social and Political Contradictions**

In addition to religion, contradictions in the larger social and political organizations are also revealed in the interactions of PK. The fact that he is naive shows how mankind despite the importance they put on honesty, also finds itself in constant use of deception in day to day life. To illustrate, the arbitrariness of social conventions is emphasized by his difficulties with social etiquette, including his poor grasp of gender norms or his inability to perceive the relationship. The natural or the things that seem necessary to humankind are shown to be conditional, paradoxical, even oppressive.

The connection with Jaggu (Anushka Sharma) by PK predetermines another paradox love as an emotion of all human beings and the obstacles created by the social boundaries. Their friendship proves tolerance and solidarity over boundaries but it also shows the way in which any interfaith relationship is limited by strict social codes. The alien identity of PK is a manifestation of this contradiction in the most radical form: he can be deeply emphatic and loving, but is always outsider because of his foreignness.

The film places PK in a politically troubled country that struggles with the concept of pluralism and nationalism. His existence disrupts the small-scale identity politics since he cannot be classified by religion, caste and nationality. Rather, he disrupts these same categories by demonstrating their arbitrariness. The aggression he undergoes is comparable to the aggression directed at the actual outsiders of the real world, the migrants, the minorities and the dissenters whose otherness poses a threat to the established structures of belonging. PK, therefore, reveals not only contradictions in individual conduct, but also in collective personalities that say they appreciate inclusivity and pursue exclusion.

### **Humor as a Mode of Critique**

One of the main peculiarities of PK as a personality is the application of humor. His misconceptions create a comedy, which cannot be separated with uneasiness. The use of satire and comedy enables the movie to touch on highly sensitive issues like religion and politics without causing any estrangement to the audience. Enveloping critique in humor, the character of PK puts a hand on the opposition, thus, enabling the viewers to be more open to reflection.

This reminds the concept of the carnivalesque, in which the laughter of Mikhail Bakhtin breaks the authority and opens concealed secrets. The comic naiveté of PK reverses the hierarchies: god men are mocked, politicians are pointed out and audiences are encouraged to laugh at themselves. But there is also the sting in the laughter, which provokes the realization of human contradictions. The entertainer and criticizing side of humor is one of the characteristic aspects of the outsider role of PK.

### **PK as a Moral Mirror**

The most notable aspect of the nature of the PK is that, being a foreigner, he becomes the most humanistic character of the story. His honesty, genuineness and compassion are compared to hypocrisy, manipulations and violence of the human beings he encounters. This is the turn of the tables, where the alien is more human than the human being itself is a very efficient commentary upon human contradictions.

This is because PK is an outsider and he can therefore act as a mirror in which people can see their strengths and their weak points. His questions on love, faith, and truth are not accusative yet genuine enough so that the audience is not likely to stare at contradictions on the defensive. PK also changes the definition of the human being by incorporating the things that people desire but tend to overlook and not apply in real life. His alienness, ironically, is the yardstick against humanity.

### **Symbolism and Universality**

Lastly, the character of PK has symbolic meaning outside of the context of the film. Being a stranger who cannot fit anywhere, he is the symbol of displacement that is experienced by a globalized world where migration, exile, or culture clash is a daily occurrence. His difficulties in comprehending and fitting in are reminiscent of those faced by the marginalized groups who have to

find their way in the hostile environments. The experience of contradiction and alienation is universalized in the film by bringing in an alien as a metaphor of these struggles.

In addition, what PK goes through highlights the potential of change. Although he cannot solve the paradoxes of human society, he is present and makes it think and discuss and transform. His personality can be used as a metaphor of hope that, despite contradictions, people can struggle to be more empathetic and true.

The postcolonial theory can be applied fruitfully to the character of PK in the PK (2014) by Rajkumar Hirani when it comes to the questions of identity and belonging. Although PK is physically an alien, his experiences strike well with the postcolonial subject who is pushed into the world of the complexities of history, religion, politics, as well as culture, where identity is never fixed but is always negotiated. The fact that PK goes in search of his lost communication device, which he requires so that he can go back to his planet, is allegorically the same as the human in general struggling to find his or her identity in the disjointed postcolonial world. Like the displaced, the migrant, the subaltern subject, PK finds himself in a land where he lacks the codes, languages, or rituals, but he has to use them to make a living. His naive misunderstanding when he faces the plurality of gods in India is part of the bigger issue of identity in the postcolonial countries, where religious pluralism is exalted in discourse and disintegrated in reality.

The failure of PK to find a single and coherent truth and a universal body of beliefs in a postcolonial position depicts the disorganizing effect of postcolonial modernity where different traditions, colonial past and the will of modernism coexisted in tension. The notion of hybridity by Homi Bhabha would come handy particularly in the position of PK. He is in this intermediary state between not quite a human being and being greatly engaged with humanity; being a member of none of the religions, and being forced to engage with all of them; not of the Indian culture, but being established in its day-to-day anomalies. Such hybridity implies that PK disrupts fixed identities limits that are religious, cultural, and national showing their arbitrariness. The way he is always questioning rituals and practices indicates the artificial world of identity where the categories of belonging are not as natural as it might appear. The fact that PK is an alien is in itself a paradox of alienation that is characterized as a universal condition of lack of belonging in the everyday lives of many postcolonial subjects trying to deal with the legacies of colonial past and the contemporary pressures of modernity and globalization. Thus, PK is the figure of the diaspora, the one who is neither here nor there, but at the same time is very alien, and this alienness is the metaphor of dislocation experienced by the negotiators of fractured identities in the postcolonial situations.

Besides, the question of Gayatri Spivak on whether the subaltern can speak also reverberates on the efforts by PK to be heard. His language is broken and his actions are mocked, but his voice continues to disrupt hegemonic discourses. Similar to the subaltern, PK does not possess the capacity to express his identity in hegemonic systems, but his tenacity makes him be heard. His interrogatives on the question of who the real god is and why the love should be subdued by the religion disrupt the hegemonic speech of faith and social structure, enabling the marginalized voice to gain the attention of the mass media. Of course, the irony is that an alien has the things to say that are true but insiders are not

willing or able to say it, a strong metaphor of silencing and marginalizing some groups of people in the postcolonial societies.

The politics of nationalism in postcolonial India also overlap with the issue of identity that PK seeks. Being an outsider, he is always labeled as other being not able to assert his belonging to the categories nation, religion, or culture. However, the very exclusion also reveals the contradictions of national identity per se: a country that purports to be plural and inclusive turns out to be exclusionary of those who do not fit in pre-established stereotypes. The setting of PK grasps the dilemmas of the minorities and migrants who bargain the matters of citizenship and belongingness in the postcolonial states and demonstrates the contradiction between the principles of secular inclusiveness and the activities of exclusions. Through such contradictory elements, the film places PK as a symbolic character whose identity quest cuts across his biography and in response to the society, in general, in postcolonial societies, which are wrestling with the legacy of colonial segregation, religious differentiation and cultural mottling.

Finally, the character of PK shows how identity in the postcolonial world cannot be fixed and rather be a matter of bargaining, communication, and blending. His alienness is used to highlight the instability of all the markers of identity pointing the viewer to the fact that the contradictions that they are grappling with between tradition and modernity, between faith and reason, between self and other are not exceptions but the order of being postcolonial. The journey of an outsider by PK, therefore, serves as a reflection through which the postcolonial societies could observe themselves with broken identities and the hope of reconstructing themselves in a more embracing and understanding manner.

### **Conclusion of the Analysis**

The PK analysis as a foreigner shows how complicated his role in PK is. By means of estrangement, the revelation of social and political contradictions, the exposure of social and political hypocrisies, and an application of humor, PK acts as a cultural commentator the innocence of which discloses hypocrisies and contradictions. His alien position does not alienate him but it gives him a vision, it gives him a reflection upon humanity back to itself. The alien that is even more humane than human's turns into a reflection of themselves and a role model, reminding the viewers of the contradictions in which they live and encouraging them to look inwards. In this regard, PK crosses the line between science fiction or satire to become a very human story about how one needs to be honest and caring and to reflect on themselves.

### **Conclusion:**

The application of PK in the PK (2014) by Rajkumar Hirani is evidence of the perennial outsider in literature and movie. The movie is an attempt to recreate the alienation trope by placing an alien in the center of a social satire. PK remains an outsider which makes him indicate what the insiders cannot see or listen to: the contradictions that make people human. His speech impairments, ritualistic and social conventions describe arbitrariness of practices which appear intuitive to the system members. More importantly his simple yet curious inquiries of faith, morality and place shatter the institutions of a religious travesty and show the contrast between the spiritual ideals and the practice of man.

The contradiction of a nonhuman person becoming the most human is prefigured by the purpose of PK as an alien. It is a strong contrast to hypocrisy and manipulation that defines most human institutions since his sincerity, compassion and lack of manipulation to exploit others. This reversal makes it obvious that the major irony of the movie is that it requires a stranger to demonstrate people the values that they claim to have. PK is a critic and a mirror it makes viewers confront the hypocrisy of their lives, either the blind faith and the exclusionary efforts or the opposition between the universal love and the rigid social boundaries.

The definition of PK is not exclusive to the story. The cultural text of the film is more broad-based about identity, secularism and pluralism in the contemporary India. It is the alienness of PK that can make the classes of belonging stiff and make the viewer's rethink what are the building blocks of their moral and cultural lives. By this the movie has demonstrated how the application of humor and estrangement in the cinema can not only be utilized to entertain but to provoke a viewer to think and discuss.

Lastly, the alienness of PK is what contributes to making him very human. His attitude reminds us of how the contradictions of human existence can be seen to be external and that the initial move to imagining the possibilities of a kinder and more honest existence can be achieved through overcoming the contradictions.

#### References:

- Bakhtin, M. M. (1984). *Rabelais and his world* (H. Iswolsky, Trans.). Indiana University Press. (Original work published 1965)
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. Routledge.
- Brecht, E. (1964). *Brecht on theatre: The development of an aesthetic* (J. Willett, Ed. & Trans.). Hill and Wang.
- Dwyer, R. (2006). *Filming the gods: Religion and Indian cinema*. Routledge.
- Mehta, R. (2012). Bollywood and the aesthetics of satire. *South Asian Popular Culture*, 10(2), 123–136. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14746689.2012.682448>
- Naficy, H. (2001). *An accented cinema: Exilic and diasporic filmmaking*. Princeton University Press.
- Rajadhyaksha, A., & Willemen, P. (1999). *Encyclopaedia of Indian cinema* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Said, E. W. (2000). *Reflections on exile and other essays*. Harvard University Press.
- Sarkar, B. (2009). *Mourning the nation: Indian cinema in the wake of Partition*. Duke University Press.
- Simmel, G. (1950). The stranger. In K. H. Wolff (Ed. & Trans.), *The sociology of Georg Simmel* (pp. 402–408). Free Press. (Original work published 1908)
- Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271–313). University of Illinois Press.
- Telotte, J. P. (2001). *Science fiction film*. Cambridge University Press.
- Virdi, J. (2003). *The cinematic imagination: Indian popular films as social history*. Rutgers University Press.