

Introduction to Cultural Studies
Dr. Avishek Parui
Department of Humanities & Social Sciences
Indian Institute of Technology-Madras

Lecture - 04
Homi Bhaba's The Other Question

Hello and welcome to the fourth lecture of this course Introduction to Cultural Studies. Now we just finished looking at Edward Said's Orientalism and looking at the way how that book is a magnificent document, a magnificent study of the politics of production of the other, the other identity and how is the other profoundly ideological, profoundly political, profoundly epistemic.

So the idea of producing the other is the idea of producing the consolidating the hegemonic identity of the colonised in the case of colonialism it is colonised in the case of patriarchy it is the male. In the case of caste system the superior caste etc. So the other must be produced incessantly, endlessly in order to consolidate, in order to prove, legitimize, sanction the authority that the agency, the supremacy of the hegemony you know hegemonic individual, hegemonic race, hegemonic condition.

Now, what we do in this particular lecture is we look at a more complicated essay. So what Said does very brilliantly and the reason why we look at Orientalism as a foundational text is he is probably the first philosopher, the first historian who comes up with his idea of looking at a gaze of the European, the Eurocentric gaze which sort of reifies, which measures, which contains, which exoticises, which essentializes the other, the non-European.

Now, when he come to someone like Homi Bhaba which the person whom the essay which was studied today is the essay by Homi Bhaba called the Other Question. When he come to someone like Homi Bhaba he you find that he takes in more complicated, more problematic stance when he comes to the idea of the other.

He looks at the other not just as a inferior person, as someone who is so strategically considered to be inferior, strategically produced as a inferior person not that but someone or something or certain sections, certain category which is incessantly produced over and over again to certain

stereotypes, to certain ambivalences and the keyword over here is ambivalence. So we will start the essay by looking at how Bhaba talks about ambivalence. So what is ambivalence in the politics of production of the other; the politics of the identity production of the other okay.

(Refer Slide Time: 02:38)

AN IMPORTANT FEATURE of colonial discourse is its dependence on the concept of 'fixity' in the ideological construction of otherness.¹ Fixity, as the sign of cultural/historical/racial difference in the discourse of colonialism, is a paradoxical mode of representation: it connotes rigidity and an unchanging order as well as disorder, degeneracy and daemonic repetition. Likewise the stereotype, which is its major discursive strategy, is a form of knowledge and identification that vacillates between what is always 'in place', already known, and something that must be anxiously repeated . . . as if the essential duplicity of the Asiatic or the bestial sexual license of the African that needs no proof, can never really, in discourse, be proved. It is this process of *ambivalence*, central to the stereotype, that my essay explores as it constructs a theory of colonial discourse. For it is the force of ambivalence that gives the colonial stereotype its currency: ensures its repeatability in changing historical and discursive conjunctures; informs its strategies of individuation and marginalisation; produces that effect of probabilistic truth and predictability which, for the stereotype, must always be in *excess* of what can be empirically proved or logically construed. Yet, the function of ambivalence as one of the most significant discursive and psychical strategies of

So this is Homi Bhaba's The Other Question. So at the very beginning of the essay we find, I have sort of highlighted the sections which we will study in details, the yellow highlights are the ones which are important for us for the purpose of this particular lecture. And he says quite clearly, an important feature of colonial discourse is its dependence on the concept of fixity in the ideological construction of otherness.

Fixity as a sign of cultural, historical, racial difference in the discourse of colonialism, is a paradoxical mode of representation. It connotes rigidity an unchanging order as well as disorder degeneracy and daemonic repetitions. I mean look at the adjectives, disorder, degeneracy, daemonic repetitions, these are very convenient attributes which are invested in the process of producing the other right.

So the other is degenerative by default, the other is daemonic by default, the other is disordered by default. Likewise, the stereotype which is its major discursive strategy, the stereotype as a strategy is very important, is a form of knowledge and identification that vacillates between what is always in place, already known and something that must be anxiously repeated as if the

essential duplicity of the Asiatic or the bestial sexual license of the African that needs no proof can never really in discourse be proved.

It is this process of ambivalence central to the stereotype that my essay explores and as it constructs the theory of colonial discourse. So you know what is this ambivalence that Bhaba talks about? It might sound a bit complicated but actually is a very simple, elegant theory and the theory is when we create the other, when we create the excessive daemonic, degenerate disordered other we assume 2 things.

A, that is the other is disordered by default, the other is degenerated by default and secondly the degeneracy that disordered quality or the daemonic quality of the other must be endlessly and anxiously repeated. So this is ambivalent. So on one hand you are saying is fixating, on one hand you are saying this is a stereotype this is something which is permanently a condition of the other. On the other hand you are anxiously repeating it over and over again.

So the point is you are repeating as if the sexual license of the African the bestiality of the African the duplicity of the Asiatic this very racist offensive categories or classification you know these things must be repeated in popular discourse over and over again because the ambivalences these things we need not prove.

But it can never really be proved so hence the repeatability hence the need to repeat these things over and over again right and therein lies the ambivalence. So on one hand is fixity that these things do not require any proof, these are known by default. These are like super epistemic knowledge super epistemic categories. On the other hand these things must be repeated over and over again right.

I mean there must be an endless circulation of the bestiality of the African of the duplicity of the Asiatic in order to prove or hammer home the point of the other formation. Therein lies the ambivalence. So it is very important to understand that the politics of ambivalence over here. So ambivalence over here is an affect, is an affective category, is also a political category.

And again we find this collusion between, this combination between affect and politics, a very handy, very convenient and very complex that comes into play in any study, in any serious study of culture and cultural identity formations. So and this is what Bhaba goes on to say that for it is the force of ambivalence that gives the colonial stereotype its currency. So the currency of the stereotype comes from ambivalence right; this idea of fixity and repeatability.

The two mutually, apparently contradictory ideas of fixity and repeatability but actually these are ontological complements of one another when it comes to a stereotype and shows its repeatability in changing historical and discursive conjunctures. So a historical conjuncture might change. The discursive conjuncture might change but then the repeatability of this stereotypes, repeatability of this signifiers must be retained right.

Informs its strategic the strategies of individuation and marginalization. Produces and the effect of probabilistic truth and predictability which for the stereotype must always be in excess of what can be empirically proved or logically construed right. So this is a very default mechanism of the stereotype that it must exist at an excess from what is empirically proved or what is empirically verifiable right. So the whole idea of the stereotype is this location in excess.

It is required to be located in an excessive condition where it is removed from the verifiability empirical evidence etc. and this is the whole point of having a stereotype okay. So this stereotype is both a recitation and a play, it is both a fixity and a play. So therein lies the ambivalence of a stereotype and this ambivalence gives the stereotype its currency; the currency of circulation and different stoical formations and different cultural formations and different discursive formations okay.

So this is the beginning of the essay. So we find this is a very impactful essay. It tells about impact and in many ways is very original as well because what Bhaba does he looks at the way how this ambivalence becomes a very essential category, a very essential condition of the circulation of the stereotype right okay.

(Refer Slide Time: 08:10)

reflexivity, or to indulge its liberatory 'excess'. In order to understand the productivity of colonial power it is crucial to construct its regime of 'truth', not to subject its representations to a normalising judgement. Only then does it become possible to understand the *productive ambivalence* of the object of colonial discourse—that 'otherness' which is at once an object of desire and derision, an articulation of difference contained within the fantasy of origin and identity. What such a reading reveals are the boundaries of colonial discourse and it enables a transgression of these limits from the space of that otherness.

Next we come to the idea of the productive ambivalence that Bhaba talks about. The productive ambivalence of the object of the colonial discourse that otherness which is at once an object of desire and derision an articulation of difference contained within the fantasy of origin and identity. So you know it sounds an oxymoron in terms right, productive ambivalence but that is exactly Bhaba is saying that this ambivalence is productive.

It produces certain knowledge, it produces certain discursive knowledge formation. It produces the other identity formation. The identity of the other is produced through this ambivalence, hence is productive right. So it literally produces something and hence it has a constructed quality to it. Now the otherness which is at once the object of desire and derision. So it is something which is desired the other is desired. It is exotic. It is essentialized.

It is romantic as we say when we looked at Edward Said but at the same time it is something which can be derided at. Something which can be ridiculed, something which can be mocked at. Something which can be challenged and questioned because of its inadequacy. So again look at there is a degree of ambivalence here as well. So it is excessive as well as inadequate. So the excessive is a desired bit. So you decide excessive bit.

It is excessive, it is romantic, it is exoticised, it is essentialized and all of that. But at the same time what is derided at is its insufficiency. It is to a great extent insufficient, inadequate. So this

play between inadequacy and excess is something which gives currency to the other you know the identity of the other.

(Refer Slide Time: 09:52)

The difference of colonial discourse as an apparatus of power⁵ will emerge more fully as the paper develops. At this stage, however, I shall provide what I take to be the minimum conditions and specifications of such a discourse. It is an apparatus that turns on the recognition and disavowal of racial/cultural/historical differences. Its predominant strategic function is the creation of a space for a 'subject peoples' through the production of knowledges in terms of which surveillance is exercised and a complex form of pleasure/unpleasure is incited. It seeks authorisation for its strategies by the production of knowledges of coloniser and colonised which are stereotypical but antithetically evaluated. The objective of colonial discourse is to construe the colonised as a population of degenerate types on the basis of racial origin, in order to justify conquest and to establish systems of administration and instruction. Despite the play of

So when he come to this and next we move on to another important section the colonial discourse as an apparatus of power. Now we have already seen how Said talks about power as a very important tool for identity production. So whoever has power I mean I am just talking about military power or physical or corporeal power but also discursive power. Who controls the discourse? Who controls the dominant discourse?

What is the currency of the dominant discourse? So where does hegemony lie at the discursive level, at an epistemic level; who controls knowledge in other words. So this is what I mean when I say epistemic by who controls knowledge, who produces knowledge, who is the producer of knowledge, who is the manipulator of knowledge, who is the representator of knowledge. So who ensures you know just represent it in a particular discursive way.

So that is what Bhaba talks about when he says that colonial apparatus as an discourse as an apparatus of power right. The entire machinery, the entire arsenal of knowledge formation, knowledge containment, knowledge dissemination is a very important arsenal when it comes to colonial subject formation, colonial identity formation right. So what is this apparatus? What is the function of this apparatus that Bhaba describes or looks at.

And I am reading from the highlighted section over here up in the screen, it is an apparatus that turns on the recognition and disavowal of racial, cultural, historical difference. Its predominant strategic function is the creation of a space for a subject peoples through the production of knowledges in terms of which surveillance is exercised and a complex form of pleasure, unpleasure is incited.

It seeks authorization for its strategies by the production of knowledges of coloniser and colonised which are stereotypical but antithetically evaluated. The objective of colonial discourse is to construe the colonised as a population of degenerate types on the basis of racial origin in order to justify the conquest and to establish systems of administration and instruction. Now, it is a very loaded definition as you can see but certain keywords are very important.

Knowledge in which through which surveillances exercise and what kind of knowledge is that through which surveillances exercise. So that is a knowledge which is a very coded knowledge which is something which through which the other is subjugated, through which the other is colonised and not just physically or bodily or corporally but also epistemically also you know ontologically also discursively right.

And this surveillance it generates its own pleasure, unpleasure principle right. So we contain the colonial subject, the colonial other and through a surveillance system that generates a pleasure in its own right, a very voyeuristic, narcissistic pleasure from the coloniser. Also unpleasure because there is always a threat of the break of surveillance. There is always a threat of the subversion of surveillance and that is unpleasure bit.

Now that knowledge, the colonial knowledge of domination control hegemony and seeks authorization for its strategies by the production of knowledges of coloniser and colonised which is stereotypical but antithetically evaluated. Now what do I mean what does Bhaba mean by this. It is essentially a knowledge of stereotype. So the coloniser and colonised they create it to stereotype.

So the coloniser is always superior, why the coloniser is supreme, the coloniser has agency, its civilization is superior etc. versus the colonised is just the opposite right. It is inferior, deprived, degenerate, disordered, insane, hysterical, irrational, anarchy and all of that. Now you can see from this very definition that these are stereotyped but is antithetically evaluated. So the tools of evaluation, the measures of evaluation are completely different right.

So this is a precondition. The result is you know preconditioned. The inference is preconditioned and the apparatus now is manipulated in order to arrive at a inference the discursive inference or the superiority of the coloniser okay. So the objective of colonial discourse, what does colonial discourse want essentially is to construe the colonised as a population of degenerate types. So this is not very hard to understand.

It is very important for the colonial program for the colonial machinery to construct a machinery to construct or produce a knowledge which will you know keep confirming that degeneracy of the colonised. That will obviously legitimize the territorialization of the coloniser. It will legitimize the supremacy of the coloniser, the supposed supremacy of the coloniser. It will legitimize the control, the domination of the coloniser.

And you know more importantly it will describe it will help sanction colonialism as some kind of a grand rescuing machine because the colonised people are so degenerated they need to be rescued from themselves and therein lies the nobility of the coloniser who come in with the you know entire colonial apparatus of education, reformation, emancipation etc. okay. So you know this is the long and short of how colonial knowledge formation operates.

This is the long and short of how colonial knowledge formation you know becomes political and how it colludes with military with medicine with law with all kinds of other parameters of control and we talked about if you remember when we mentioned Althusser in the previous lecture we talked about ISA and RSA, Ideological State Apparatus and Repressive State Apparatus and this is a very good example of that. Knowledge over here becomes ideology.

It is produced out of the ideological state apparatus like the church, like the court, like the prison you know like the school etc. The prison of course is RSA, Repressive State Apparatus and you know they go hand in hand okay in terms of how knowledge is controlled and contained. So not only is the colonisers supremacy protected at the level of the body, the body of the coloniser must be protected.

But also more importantly the knowledge of the coloniser supremacy must be protected as well and now if cannot protect that then that you know that completely crashes the entire machinery of colonialism because the entire machinery of colonialism is dependent is reliant on a discursive difference between the coloniser and the colonised; the supposed supremacy of the coloniser as against the supposed degeneracy of the colonised.

And this binary this antithetical evaluation is maintained, is manipulated, is engineered through a very discursively constructed apparatus of knowledge and this is what Bhaba mentions when he means when he says apparatus of recognition okay.

(Refer Slide Time: 16:22)

governmentality that in marking out a 'subject nation', appropriates, directs and dominates its various spheres of activity. Therefore, despite the 'play' in the colonial system which is crucial to its exercise of power, colonial discourse produces the colonised as a fixed reality which is at once an 'other' and yet entirely knowable and visible. It resembles a form of narrative whereby the productivity and circulation of subjects and signs are bound in a reformed and recognisable totality. It employs a system of representation, a regime of truth, that is structurally similar to Realism. And it is in order to intervene within that system of representation that Edward Said proposes a semiotic of 'Orientalist' power, examining the varied European discourses which constitute 'the Orient' as an unified racial, geographical, political and cultural zone of the world. Said's analysis is revealing of, and relevant to, colonial discourse:

So now when you come to the next section despite the play in the colonial system which is crucial to its exercise of power, colonial discourse produces the colonised as a fixed reality which is at once an other and yet entirely knowable and visible. Now look at the ambivalence over here. There is a play in the colonial system. There is a continuous movement in the colonial system.

But despite the movement what is fixated what never changes in a colonial machinery is the fixated quality of the colonised right and you know the colonised as a fixed reality of depravity, degeneracy, disorder, inferiority etc. which is at once an other and yet entirely knowable and visible. This is another level of ambivalence over here. The other the colonised over here is someone who is you know depraved and someone who should be one should be fearful of etc.

But at the same time that colonised subject is entirely knowable, is entirely known you know we can know we know everything about him. We know everything about the colonised subject and then is entirely visible as well. So it becomes and the whole idea is a desire to classify, the desire to codify, the desire to put the colonised subject into a code, a very convenient code of depravity, degeneracy, inferiority etc.

It resembles a form of narrative whereby the productivity and circulation of subjects and science are bound in a reformed and recognizable totality. It employs a system of representation, a regime of truth that is structurally similar to realism. Now this is a very important section. I will spend some time on this. What is realism. Realism is a kind of narrative strategy those of you from literary background would know, realism is a kind of narrative strategy which is totalizing.

What do I mean by totalizing? The realist narrator is an all-knowing narrator; someone who knows everything about what is happening in the characters heads what is happening in the characters life. Is an overseeing, omnipresent, omniscient presence right. The narrator of a realist novel is omniscient, omnipresent, omnipotent; is a God-like narrator. It is no unreliability, no uncertainty in the narrator at all. Now that becomes a totalizing technique.

By totalizing I mean you know the technique through which everyone is known, everything is known, everything that passes in the brains, the heads of the subjects or characters are entirely known to the narrator and if you replace the narrator with the coloniser over here we find this is exactly how colonial machinery operates. It operates through a realist process, by a totalizing process what is no uncertainty, what is no unknowability about the other.

The other is entirely known. The other is entirely recognized or recognizable despite the depravity, despite the degeneracy, despite the inferiority okay. So this is again the, it is a kind of narrative as Bhaba says it resembles it is a form of narrative whereby the productivity and circulation of subjects and science are bound in a reformed and recognizable totality.

Recognizable totality is a totality which is entirely recognizable because why recognizable. Because it is created of a Eurocentric system, a Eurocentric system of classification. So it is obviously it is definitely recognizable okay. And it employs a system of representation. It is a kind of representation, it is a kind of narrative which includes certain things which excludes certain things. And representation has a norm, is a form of inclusion as well as exclusion right.

You include certain things, you also exclude certain things and inclusion exclusion is a very political processes right. And now and it is an order to intervene within the system of representation that Edward Said proposes a semiotic of Orientalist power examining the varied European discourses which constitute the Orient as an unified racial, geographical, political and cultural zone of the world.

Now this is an illusion to Said, a tribute to Said, a tribute to the monumental world that Said created through Orientalism. Now what Bhaba does is this is exactly what Said uses in order to understand how the West created the Orient. The West created the Orient through a process of production through a process of discursive production through which the Orient becomes something which is romantic, excessive, you know exotic, essentialized.

But at the same time entirely knowable, entirely recognizable through a totalizing technique you know the exoticisation the exotic quality the romantic quality of the Orient is something which can be completely contained within a totalizing grand narrative that European is using in order to understand the Orient. So you know you can see how this particular essay and I have very carefully chosen these works how they are dialoguing with each other right.

So how Bhaba over here he gives a tribute to Said. There is a certain critic of Said as well but he obviously acknowledges Said's massive profound work of Orientalism which is used very

effectively to study the process of identity formation of the other which is what we are talking about in this lecture.

(Refer Slide Time: 21:27)

the dominated subject without the dominant being strategically placed within it too. There is always, in Said, the suggestion that colonial power and discourse is possessed entirely by the coloniser, which is a historical and theoretical simplification. The terms in which Said's Orientalism is unified – the intentionality and unidirectionality of colonial power – also unify the subject of colonial enunciation.

Now, again he then moves on to critic Said to a certain extent. He says that Said's idea of Orientalism is a simple idea which needs to be complicated right and he says there is always in Said the suggestion that colonial power and discourse is possessed entirely by the coloniser which is a historical and theoretical simplification. The terms in which Said's Orientalism is unified – intentionality and unidirectionality of colonial power also unify the subject of colonial enunciation.

Now, this is a very debatable argument that Bhaba is making and he is saying that you know in Said despite the historical and profound cultural influence in Said's Orientalism there is a problem In Said's book and that is he acknowledges the Orient and (()) (22:09) to fixed binaries right. These are things you know this is a tool, this is a instrument, this is a prism through which Said looks at Orientalism or devices this book Orientalism.

Now, he sort of assumes according to Bhaba that colonial power is possessed entirely by the coloniser which is a simplification in terms and what Bhaba is doing over here he is drawing in Said, he is using Said and then he is complicating the mechanism of Said as had propounded in

Orientalism. Now he says essentially that the idea of power is more problematic. The idea of power is more complicated than just you know binary of you know powerful and powerless.

It does not just rely entirely on the coloniser and said the colonised person is entirely powerless. Power becomes very political process. Power becomes a very slippery, plastic process. It becomes a performance. It becomes a performative act, a mimetic act to a certain extent right and this is where Bhaba talks, sort of departs from Said to a certain extent and then gives a very different albeit you know similar structurally similar view of Orientalism and power knowledge.

(Refer Slide Time: 23:18)

cault's post-structuralist concept of the *dispositif* or apparatus. Foucault stresses that the relations of knowledge and power within the apparatus are always a strategic response to *an urgent need* at a given historical moment – much as I suggested at the outset, that the force of colonial discourse as a theoretical and political intervention, was the *need*, in our contemporary moment, to contest singularities of difference and to articulate modes of differentiation. Foucault writes:

... the apparatus is essentially of a strategic nature, which means assuming that it is a matter of a certain manipulation of relations of forces, either developing them in a particular direction, blocking them, stabilising them, utilising them etc. The apparatus is thus always inscribed in a play of power, but it is also always linked to certain coordinates of knowledge which issue from it but, to an equal degree, condition it. This is what the apparatus consists in: strategies of relations of forces supporting and supported by, types of knowledge.¹⁰

Now, then he come to Foucault and we will spend some more time with Foucault later in this course but it is useful to understand how Bhaba looks at Foucault in terms of looking at entire power knowledge paradigm that categorizes colonialism that categorizes the colonial condition. And he says Foucault stresses that the relations of knowledge and power within the apparatus are always a strategic response to an urgent need at a given historical moment.

So you know the entire relationship with knowledge and power, power becomes knowledge, knowledge becomes power and Foucault is study of knowledge and power. Now that is basically a response, is a bit of a kneejerk response if you will to a certain historical need at a certain point of time, a certain need for domination, certain need for colonial control, and certain need for hegemony etc.

So that produces this power, knowledge paradigm that Foucault made so famous in his work. The force of colonial discourse as a theoretical and political intervention was the need in our contemporary moment to contest singularities of difference and to articulate modes of differentiation and Foucault writes, the apparatus is essentially of a strategic nature which means assuming that it is a matter of certain manipulation of relations of forces either developing them in a particular direction, blocking them, stabilizing them, utilizing them etc.

The apparatus is thus always inscribed in a play of power. But it is also always linked to certain coordinates of knowledge which issue from it but to an equal degree condition it. This is what the apparatus consists in. strategies of relations of forces supporting and supported by types of knowledge. So you know Foucault is most famous for the idea of knowledge as a political process, the idea of knowledge as hegemonic.

The idea of knowledge as something which is you know used very effectively in colonial condition to control, contain, measure, survey certain population and this is exactly what Foucault talks about by the way and power draws on him in order to support his arguments.

(Refer Slide Time: 25:21)

metonymy (which contiguously registers the perceived lack). The fetish or stereotype gives access to an 'identity' which is predicated as much on mastery and pleasure as it is on anxiety and defence, for it is a form of multiple and contradictory belief in its recognition of difference and disavowal of it. This conflict of pleasure/unpleasure, mastery/defence, knowledge/disavowal, absence/presence, has a fundamental significance for colonial discourse. For the scene of fetishism is also the scene of the reactivation and repetition of primal fantasy—the subject's desire for a pure origin that is always threatened by its division, for the subject must be gendered to be engendered, to be spoken.

Right, so then we move on to another very important term that Bhaba used, something which is profound in terms of looking at how other formation, the formation of the other is you know

happens, is operative, is produced through a political process. The term that Bhaba uses the term called fetish. What is a fetish? The fetish or stereotype gives access to an identity which is predicated as much on mastery and pleasure as it is on anxiety and defence, for it is a form of multiple and contradictory belief in its recognition of difference and disavowal of it.

This conflict of pleasure, unpleasure; mastery, defence; knowledge, disavowal; absence, presence has a fundamental significance for colonial discourse. For the scene of fetishism is also the scene of the reactivation and repetition of primal fantasy the subject's desire for a pure origin that is always threatened by its division for the subject must be gendered in order to be engendered to be spoken. Now what is this fetish?

The fetish is this very interesting play between absence and presence between knowledge and disavowal between desire and dread between pleasure and unpleasure right between anxiety and defence. So you know fetish is a very contradictory construction of a certain identity right. So you are fetish for a certain identity. You are fetish for a certain colonial condition which basically means there is a bit of anxiety about it.

This anxiety of losing this, the anxiety of losing something you already have but at the same time there is also a desire to have something that you do not have and this play between desire and death this play between anxiety and aspiration is something which categorizes the fetish. So the scene of fetishism as Bhaba studies it is also the scene of the reactivation and repetition of the primal fantasy. The scene of pure regime.

The desire for pure regime, a pure starting point which never existed in the first place right and that becomes a scene through which the fetish is produced right; the colonial fetish, the racial fetish, the gendered fetish etc. So you know just to conclude this essay today, what Bhaba is doing over here. He is taking a very poststructuralist understanding of the colonial condition of knowledge and power, a very poststructuralist understanding of the colonial condition of identity formation. So the identity of the other is not a simple process.

It is a process which is very complicated, a process which is very poststructuralist because what it entails is not just desire but also absence, anxiety. So the way the other is produced in a colonial condition also you know entails certain degree of anxiety, certain degree of absence, a certain degree of threat, a certain degree of ambivalence right. It is not just a straight linear complicated uncomplicated process through which the other is produced by attributing stereotypes, by attributing certain derogatory knowledge etc. It is not that simple.

It is a more complicated process because what it also contains in conditions is the idea of ambivalence, idea of anxiety, the idea of threat and this is what we should be setting at, we should be looking at when we look at the condition through which the other is produced as a political process in a colonial condition. So I conclude the lecture today and I hope you got something out of it. Please read this highlighted sections carefully and we will continue the rest of the essay in the lecture next time. Thank you for your attention.