Hybridity is the sign of the productivity of colonial power, its shifting forces and fixities; it is the name for the strategic reversal of the process of domination through disavowal (Disavowal is the production of discriminatory identities that secure the 'pure and original identity of authority').

Hybridity is the revaluation of the assumption of colonial identity through the repetition of discriminatory identity effects.

It displays the necessary deformation and displacement of all sites of discrimination and domination. It unsettles the mimetic or narcissistic demands of colonial power but reimplicates its identifications in strategies of subversion that turn the gaze of the discriminated back upon the eye of power.

For the colonial hybrid is the articulation of the ambivalent space where the rite of power is enacted on the site of desire, making its objects at once disciplinary and disseminatory- or, in my mixed metaphor, a negative transparency. (where transparency is not achieved only by the coloniser but is something like a negative of a photograph which has to be processed to become ‘visible’)

If discriminatory effects enable the authorities to keep an eye on them, their proliferating difference evades that eye, escapes that surveillance.

Those discriminated against may be instantly recognized, but they also force a recognition of the immediacy and articulacy of authority- a disturbing effect that is familiar in the repeated hesitancy afflicting the colonialist discourse when it contemplates its discriminated subjects: the inscrutability of the Chinese, the unspeakable rites of the Indians, the indescribable habits of the Hottentots.

It is not that the voice of authority is at a loss for words. It is, rather, that the colonial discourse has reached that point when, faced with the hybridity of its objects, the presence of power is revealed as something other than what its rules of recognition assert.

If the effect of colonial power is seen to be the production of hybridization rather than the noisy command of colonialist authority or the silent repression of native traditions, then an important change of perspective occurs.

It reveals the ambivalence at the source of traditional discourses on authority and enables a form of subversion, founded on that uncertainty, that turns the discursive conditions of dominance into the grounds of intervention.

It is traditional academic wisdom that the presence of authority is properly established through the non-exercise of private judgment and the exclusion of reasons, in conflict with the authoritative reason.

Tom Nairn reveals a basic ambivalence between the symbols of English imperialism which could not help "looking universal" and a "hollowness [that] sounds through the English imperialist mind in a thousand forms: in Rider Haggard's necrophilia, in
Kipling’s moments of gloomy doubt, . . . in the gloomy cosmic truth of Forster’s Marabar cave.”

- Nairn explains this “imperial delirium” as the disproportion between the grandiose rhetoric of English imperialism and the real economic and political situation of late Victorian England.

- These crucial moments in English literature are not simply crises of England’s own making. They are also the signs of a discontinuous history, an estrangement of the English book. They mark the disturbance of its authoritative representations by the uncanny forces of race, sexuality, violence, cultural and even climatic differences which emerge in the colonial discourse as the mixed and split texts of hybridity.

- It is the effect of uncertainty that afflicts the discourse of power, an uncertainty that estranges the familiar symbol of English "national" authority and emerges from its colonial appropriation as the sign of its difference.

- Hybridity is the name of this displacement of value from symbol to sign that causes the dominant discourse to split along the axis of its power to be representative, authoritative.

- Hybridity represents that ambivalent “turn of the discriminated subject into the terrifying, exorbitant object of paranoid classification- a disturbing questioning of the images and presences of authority.

- Hybridity has no such perspective of depth or truth to provide: it is not a third term that resolves the tension between two cultures, or the two scenes of the book, in a dialectical play of "recognition."

- The displacement from symbol to sign creates a crisis for any concept of authority based on a system of recognition: colonial specularity, doubly inscribed, does not produce a mirror where the self apprehends itself; it is always the split screen of the self and its doubling, the hybrid.

- Hybridity is a problematic of colonial representation and individuation that reverses the effects of the colonialist disavowal, so that other "denied" knowledges enter upon the dominant discourse and estrange the basis of its authority-its rules of recognition.

Again, it must be stressed, it is not simply the content of disavowed knowledges-be they forms of cultural Otherness or traditions of colonialist treachery-that return to be acknowledged as counter authorities.

- For the resolution of conflicts between authorities, civil discourse always maintains an adjudicative( a formal judgement is made) procedure.

- What is irremediably estranging in the presence of the hybrid-in the revaluation of the symbol of national authority as the sign of colonial difference-is that the difference of cultures can no longer be identified or evaluated as objects of epistemological or moral contemplation: they are not simply there to be seen or appropriated.
• Hybridity reverses the *formal* process of disavowal so that the violent dislocation, the *Entstellung* of the act of colonization becomes the *conditionality* of colonial discourse.

• The presence of colonialist authority is no longer immediately visible; its discriminatory identifications no longer have their authoritative reference to this culture’s cannibalism or that people’s perfidy. As an articulation of displacement and dislocation, it is now possible to identify “the cultural” as a disposal of power, a negative transparency that comes to be agonistically constructed on the boundary between frame of reference frame of mind.

It is crucial to remember that the colonial construction of the cultural (the site of the civilizing mission) through the process of disavowal is authoritative to the extent to which it is structured around the ambivalence of splitting, denial, repetition-strategies of defence that mobilize culture as an open-textured, warlike strategy whose aim “is rather a continued agony than a total disappearance of the pre-existing culture.”

• Hybridity intervenes in the exercise of authority not merely to indicate the impossibility of its identity but to represent the unpredictability of its presence. The book retains its presence, but it is no longer a representation of an essence; it is now a partial presence, a (strategic) device in a specific colonial engagement, an appurtenance of authority.

• This partializing process of hybridity is best described as a metonymy of presence.

• This, however, exacts a price, for the existence of two contradictory knowledges (multiple beliefs) splits the ego (or the discourse) into two psychical attitudes, and forms of knowledge, toward the external world.

The first of these takes reality into consideration while the second replaces it with a product of desire.

What is remarkable is that these two contradictory objectives always represent a "partiality" in the construction of the fetish object, at once a substitute for the phallus and a mark of its absence.

• There is an important difference between fetishism and hybridity.

The fetish reacts to the change in the value of the phallus by fixing on an object prior to the perception of difference, an object that can metaphorically substitute for its presence while registering the difference. So long as it fulfills the fetishistic ritual, the object can look like anything (or nothing!).

The hybrid object, however, retains the actual semblance of the authoritative symbol but revalues its presence by resisting it as the signifier of *Entstellung*—after the intervention of difference.

• It is the power of this strange metonymy of presence to so disturb the systematic (and systemic)construction of discriminatory knowledges that the cultural, once recognized as the medium of authority, becomes virtually unrecognizable.
Culture, as a colonial space of intervention and agonism, as the trace of the displacement of symbol to sign, can be transformed by the unpredictable and partial desire of hybridity.

Deprived of their full presence, the knowledges of cultural authority may be articulated with forms of "native" knowledges or faced with those discriminated subjects that they must rule but can no longer represent.

• The display of hybridity-its peculiar replication- terrorizes authority with the ruse of recognition, its mimicry, its mockery.

• Such a reading of colonial authority profoundly unsettles the demand that figures at the centre of the originary myth of colonialist power. It is the demand that the space it occupies be unbounded, its reality coincident with the emergence of an imperialist narrative and history, its discourse non-dialogic, its enunciation unitary, unmarked by the trace of difference.

• What renders this demand of colonial power impossible is precisely the point at which the question of authority emerges.

• The colon(iser) is an exhibitionist, because his preoccupation with security makes him "remind the native out loud that there he alone is master."

• The native, caught in the chains of colonialist command, achieves a "pseudopetrification" (false replication process) which further incites and excites him, thus making the settler-native boundary an anxious and ambivalent one.

What then presents itself as the subject of authority in the discourse of colonial power is, in fact, a desire that so exceeds the original authority of the book and the immediate visibility of its metaphoric writing that we are bound to ask: What does colonial power want?

My answer is only partially in agreement with Lacan's vel or Derrida's veil or hymen.

(Lacan believes that the other defines the desire of man because the primary desire is always to be recognised by the other. He talks about Vel while talking about alienation where Vel means a false choice or a Forced choice. Derrida’s veil signifies lack or absence)

• For the desire of colonial discourse is a splitting of hybridity that is less than one and double; and if that sounds enigmatic, it is because its explanation has to wait upon the authority of those canny questions that the natives put, so insistently, to the English book.

• The native questions quite literally turn the origin of the book into an enigma. First: How can the word of God come from the flesh-eating mouths of the English? - a question that faces the unitary and universalist assumption of authority with the cultural difference of its historical moment of enunciation. And later: How can it be the European Book, when we believe that it is God’s gift to us? He sent it to
**Hurdwar.** This is not merely an illustration of what Foucault would call the capillary effects of the microtechnics of power.

- It reveals the penetrative power—both psychic and social—of the technology of the printed word in early nineteenth-century rural India. Imagine the scene: the Bible, perhaps translated into a North Indian dialect like Brigbhasha, handed out free or for one rupee within a culture where usually only caste Hindus would possess a copy of the Scriptures, and received in awe by the natives as both a novelty and a household deity.

- Contemporary missionary records reveal that, in Middle India alone, by 1815 we could have witnessed the spectacle of the Gospel "doing its own work," as the Evangelicals put it, in at least eight languages and dialects, with a first edition of between one thousand and ten thousand copies in each translation (see MR, May 1816, pp. 181-82). It is the force of these colonialist practices that produce that discursive tension between Anund Messeh, whose address assumes its authority, and the natives who question the English presence and seek a culturally differentiated, "colonial" authority to address.

- What is the value of English in the offering of the Hindi Bible? It is the creation of a print technology calculated to produce a visual effect that will not "look like the work of foreigners"; it is the decision to produce simple, abridged tracts of the plainest narrative that may inculcate the habit of "private, solitary reading," as a missionary wrote in 1816, so that the natives may resist the Brahmin’s "monopoly of knowledge" and lessen their dependence on their own religious and cultural traditions; it is the opinion of the Reverend Donald Corrie that "on learning English they acquire ideas quite new, and of the first importance, respecting God and his government".

- When they make these intercultural, hybrid demands, the natives are both challenging the boundaries of discourse and subtly changing its terms by setting up another specifically colonial space of power/knowledge.

And they do this under the eye of authority, through the production of "partial" knowledges and positionalities in keeping with my earlier, more general explanation of hybridity. Such objects of knowledges make the signifiers of authority enigmatic in a way that is "less than one and double."

They change their conditions of recognition while maintaining their visibility; they introduce a lack that is then represented as a doubling or mimicry.

- These books . . . teach the religion of the European Sahibs. It is THEIR Book; and they printed it in our language, for our use." The natives expel the copula, or middle term, of the Evangelical "power = knowledge" equation, which then disarticulates the structure of the God-Englishman equivalence. Such a crisis in the positionality and propositionality of colonialist authority destabilizes the sign of authority.

For by alienating "English" as the middle term, the presence of authority is freed of a range of ideological correlates— for instance, intentionality, originality, authenticity, cultural normativity. The Bible is now ready for a specific colonial appropriation. On the one hand, its paradigmatic presence as the Word of God is assiduously pre-served: it is only to the direct quotations from the Bible that the natives give their unquestioning
The expulsion of the copula, however, empties the presence of its syntagmatic supports-codes, connotations, and cultural associations that give it contiguity and continuity- that make its presence culturally and politically authoritative.

- It is at the point of its fading that the signifier of presence gets caught up in an alienating strategy of doubling or repetition. Doubling repeats the fixed and empty presence of authority by articulating it syntagmatically with a range of differential knowledges and positionalities that both estrange its "identity" and produce new forms of knowledge, new modes of differentiation, new sites of power.

- In each of these cases we see a colonial doubling which I’ve described as a strategic displacement of value through a process of the metonymy of presence.

It is through this partial process, represented in its enigmatic, inappropriate signifiers-stereotypes, jokes, multiple and contradictory belief, the "native" Bible-that we begin to get a sense of a specific space of cultural colonial discourse.

It is a "separate"space, a space of separation- less than one and double-which has been systematically denied by both colonialists and nationalists who have sought authority in the authenticity of "origins." It is precisely as a separation from origins and essences that this colonial space is constructed.

- The effect of mimicry," writes Lacan, "is camouflage, in the strictly technical sense. It is not a question of harmonizing with the background but, against a mottled background, of being mottled-exactly like the technique of camouflage practised in human warfare."

Read as a masque of mimicry, Anund Messeh’s tale emerges as a question of colonial authority, an agonistic space. To the extent to which discourse is a form of defensive warfare, mimicry marks those moments of civil disobedience within the discipline of civility: signs of spectacular resistance. When the words of the master become the site of hybridity- the warlike sign of the native-then we may not only read between the lines but even seek to change the often coercive reality that they so lucidly contain.

- Summary from altexploit.wordpress.com

Writers, such as Homi Bhabha and Salman Rushdie, who proceed from a consideration of the nature of postcolonial societies and the types of hybridization these various cultures have produced, proposed a radical rethinking—an appropriation of the European thinking by a different discourse.

Whereas in European thinking, history and the past are the reference point for epistemology, in postcolonial thought space annihilates time.

History is rewritten and realigned from the standpoint of the victims of the destructive progress.
Also, Homi Bhabha talks about a third space of enunciation, a hybrid space or a new position in which communication is possible.

Third Space theory emerges from the sociocultural tradition in psychology identified with Lev Vygotsky. Sociocultural approaches are concerned with the “... constitutive role of culture in mind, i.e., on how mind develops by incorporating the community’s shared artifacts accumulated over generations”.

Bhabha applies socioculturalism directly to the postcolonial condition, where there are, “… unequal and uneven forces of cultural representation”. For Bhabha, such negotiation is neither assimilation nor collaboration as it makes possible the emergence of an “interstitial” agency that refues the binary representation of social antagonism.

The “interstitial perspective” as Bhabha calls it replaces the “polarity of a prefigurative self-generating nation ‘in-itself’ and extrinsic other nations” with the notion of cultural liminality within the nation. the liminal figure of the nation-space would ensure that no political ideologies could claim transcendent or metaphysical authority for themselves. this is because the subject of cultural discourse – the agency of a people – is spilt in the discursive ambivalence that emerges in the contest of narrative authority between the pedagogical and the performative, which is to say, between the peoples’ status as historical objects of a nationalist pedagogy and their ability to perform themselves as subjects of a process of signification that must erase any prior or originally national presence.

• This “new position” Bhabha proposes is closely related to the “homeless” existence of post-colonial persons. It certainly cannot be assumed to be an independent third space already there, a “no-man’s-land” between the nations. Instead, a way of cultural syncretization, i.e. a medium of negotiating cultural antagonisms, has to be created.

Cultural difference has to be acknowledged: “Culture does imply difference, but the differences now are no longer, if you wish, taxonomical; they are interactive and refractive”.

This position emphasizes, contrary to the too facile assumption of world literature and world culture as the stages of a multicultural cosmopolitanism already in existence, that the “intellectual trade” takes place mostly on the borders and in the border crossings between cultures where meanings and values are not codified but misunderstood, misrepresented, even falsely adopted.

Bhabha explains how beyond fixed cultural (ethnic, gender- and class-related) identities, so-called “hybrid” identities are formed by discontinuous translation and negotiation. Hybridity, liminality, “interrogatory, interstitial space” – these are the positive values Bhabha opposes to a retrograde historicism that continues to dominate Western critical thinking, a “linear narrative of the nation,” with its claims for the “holism of culture and community” and a “fixed horizontal nation-space”.

• We must, he argues eloquently, undo such thinking with its facile binary oppositions. Rather than emphasizing the opposition between First World and Third World nations, between colonizer and colonized, men and women, black and white, straight and gay, Bhabha would have it, we might more profitably focus on the faultlines themselves, on border situations and thresholds as the sites where identities are performed and contested. Bhabha says, “hybridity to me is the ‘third space’ which enables other positions to emerge”.