



Title	Hybridity as Postcolonial Iterability : A Comparison of the Critical Approaches of Arif Dirlik and Stuart Hall
Author(s)	Sugiura, Kiyofumi
Citation	大阪大学言語文化学. 2009, 18, p. 141-155
Version Type	VoR
URL	https://hdl.handle.net/11094/77830
rights	
Note	

The University of Osaka Institutional Knowledge Archive : OUKA

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

The University of Osaka

Hybridity as Postcolonial Iterability

A Comparison of the Critical Approaches of Arif Dirlik and Stuart Hall *

SUGIURA Kiyofumi **

キーワード：Hybridity, Postcolonial Iterability, Postcolonial Criticism

本稿の目的は、ポストコロニアル批評における中心概念の一つである「ハイブリディティ」(hybridity) の概念を、「ポストコロニアル的反覆可能性」(postcolonial iterability) という視点から再考し、そこからポストコロニアル批評の新たな可能性を探求することにある。その方法として、代表的なポストコロニアリズム批判としていまだに影響力の強いアリフ・ダーリクの論文「ポストコロニアル・オーラ——グローバル資本主義の時代における第三世界批評」(1994)と、この論文への批判的応答であるスチュアート・ホールの論文「＜ポストコロニアル＞とはいつだったのか？——境界にて思考すること」(1996)との比較考察を行う。

ダーリクは「ハイブリディティ」の概念を、後期資本主義の「文化論理」に無批判的に追従したものと見做している。しかしダーリクの議論は、ジャック・デリダが西洋形而上学の根幹に見出した「同一性の反復」(the repetitions of the same) の論理の罠に囚われたものであり、その結果、「ハイブリディティ」概念の潜在的な可能性を無効化してしまっている。一方、ホールにとって「ハイブリディティ」の概念は、ポストコロニアリズムの新たな批評空間を切り開くための試金石となる。その議論はダーリクの議論を批判・修正しつつ、「ハイブリディティ」の概念を「ポストコロニアル的反覆可能性」の観点から捉え直そうとした試みと評価することができる。

「ポストコロニアル的反覆可能性としてのハイブリディティ」(hybridity as postcolonial iterability) の戦略は、デリダの「反復可能性」の概念を、現代世界のポストコロニアル状況に向けて占有 (appropriate) し、「同一性の反復」の論理と共犯関係を結ぶ植民地主義的な思考体系を脱構築していく。さらに、その脱構築的な戦略は、「マイノリティとしての他者」(the minority other) との絶え間ない交渉を実現しようとする。その概念は、新たなハイブリッド化のプロセスが進行するグローバル時代におけるポストコロニアル状況を読み解くにあたっても、「ハイブリディティ」の概念が重要なものであり続けていることを示している。

* ポストコロニアル的反覆可能性としてのハイブリディティ——アリフ・ダーリクとスチュアート・ホールの批評アプローチに関する比較考察 (杉浦清文)

** 京都外国語大学 近畿大学 神戸大学 非常勤講師

1 Introduction

In 1994, Arif Dirlik, the notable scholar of Modern China, published a polemical article criticising postcolonial theory, entitled 'The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism'.¹ It has since become one of the most controversial articles in postcolonial studies or even beyond. Stuart Hall responded to this thesis in his 1996 article, 'When Was 'the Post-Colonial'? Thinking at the Limit'.² In a thorough and unremitting critique of Dirlik's thesis, Hall tried to revise it by a deconstructive thinking through of the idea of "hybridity" in postcolonial studies and the postcolonial world itself.

Their arguments are still valuable in our attempt to elucidate the concept of "the postcolonial". In particular, when considered in the light of Jacques Derrida's concept of "iterability", they seem to suggest a way of recasting the notion of "hybridity" as *postcolonial iterability*, which undermines the *repetitions of the same* inherent in European metaphysical thinking, and enables a negotiation with the minority "other" in the contemporary postcolonial world.

The purpose of this paper, then, is to explore the notion of "hybridity" as *postcolonial iterability* through a re-examination of the articles by Dirlik and Hall. First of all, we will redefine "hybridity" in terms of the deconstructive notion of "iterability", a concept of much consequence in Derrida's deconstructive thinking. Next, we will seek to demonstrate that, from the perspective of postcolonial studies, the concept of "hybridity" strategically appropriates the movement of Derridian "iterability". The ultimate goal of this paper is to show that the comparison and re-examination of the approaches of Dirlik and Hall will help to clarify our idea of "hybridity" as *postcolonial iterability* in the present age of globalisation, and thus to point to further possibilities in postcolonial studies.

2 The Re-consideration of Hybridity

2.1 Jacques Derrida's Deconstructive Notion of Iterability

First and foremost, in re-considering the notion of "hybridity", we must direct our attention to Derrida's deconstructive notion of "iterability". Derrida brings out two central

¹ Arif Dirlik, 'The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism' in *Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 20(2) Winter (1994), pp. 328-356.

² Stuart Hall, 'When Was "the Post-Colonial"? Thinking at the Limit' in *The Post-Colonial Question: Common Skies, Divided Horizons*, ed. by Iain Chambers and Lindia Curti (New York and London: Routledge, 1996), pp. 242-260.

points about the phenomena of “iterability”. The first is that “iterability” rebuts *repetitions of the same*. According to Derrida, the movement of “iterability” is a different process from the *repetition of the same*. While the *repetition of the same* tenaciously adheres to the *purity of its self-identity* – a backbone of metaphysical thought – “iterability” indicates “what it is in the *impurity* of its self-identity”.³ “Iterability” questions the belief in the *repetition of the same*; it fissures metaphysical thought. For example, in ‘Signature Event Context’ (1972),⁴ which focuses on Étienne Bonnot de Condillac’s *Essay on the Origin of Human Knowledge* (1756),⁵ Derrida seeks to divulge the metaphysical motif, lurking in Condillac’s argument, of “the economic, *homogeneous, and mechanical* reduction”;⁶ and points to Condillac’s obsession with the thought of the *repetition of the same*. In other words, Condillac does not attempt to delve into the movement of “iterability”. Through his deconstructive reading of Condillac’s text, Derrida exposes how the metaphysical perspective is apt to defy and efface the evidence of “iterability”. Derrida, in turn, traces the movement of “iterability”, a movement that “implies *both identity and difference*”.⁷ Derrida believes that the *repetition of the same or identity*, which is sustained by metaphysical thinking, can be criticised from the perspective of the repetition of a “difference”.

The second point is that the movement of “iterability” explores a way of negotiating with the “*other*”. In the same article, Derrida pays attention to the etymology of “iterability”: “*iter*, once again, comes from *itara*, *other* in Sanskrit, and everything that follows may be read as the exploitation of the logic which links repetition to alterity”.⁸ That is to say, “[i]terability supposes a minimal remainder (as well as a minimum of idealization) in order that the identity of the *selfsame* be repeatable and identifiable *in, through, and even in view of* its alteration”.⁹ In this regard, Derrida’s deconstructive notion of “iterability” places a great deal of importance on a negotiation with “*itara*” – “*other*” – “*alterity*”.

³ Jacques Derrida, ‘Limited Inc a b c...’ in *Limited Inc*, trans. by Samuel Weber (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977), p. 65.

⁴ Jacques Derrida, ‘Signature Event Context’ in *Margins of Philosophy*, trans. by Alan Bass (Brighton: Harvester Press, 1982), pp. 307-330.

⁵ Étienne Bonnot de Condillac, *Essay on the Origin of Human Knowledge*, trans. by Hans Aarsleff (New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

⁶ Derrida, ‘Signature Event Context’, p. 313.

⁷ Derrida, ‘Limited Inc a b c...’, p. 53.

⁸ Derrida, ‘Signature Event Context’, p. 315. We might as well refer to Judith Butler’s insight: “If iterability is a structural characteristic of every mark, then there is no mark without its own proper iterability; that is, for a mark to be a mark, it must be repeatable, and have that repeatability as a necessary and constitutive feature of itself”. Judith Butler, *Excitable Speech: A politics of the Performative* (New York and London: Routledge, 1997), p. 149.

⁹ Derrida, ‘Limited Inc a b c...’, p. 53.

2.2 Postcolonial Iterability

Following on from Derrida's argument that "iterability" is "indispensable to the functioning of all language",¹⁰ it becomes imperative that we should also recognise the movement of "iterability" within postcolonial discourses. It will be meaningful, in this respect, to see a relationship between Derrida's "iterability" and Homi K. Bhabha's idea of "hybridity", which is one of the most productive concepts in postcolonial studies. The place of "hybridity" deconstructs the way that the differences within postcolonial discourse are translated into *repetitions of the same*. According to Bhabha, "a place of hybridity" is "the construction of a political object that is new, *neither the one nor the other*", and that "properly alienates our political expectations, and changes, as it must, the very forms of our recognition of the moment of politics".¹¹ This remark also intimates that the notion of "hybridity" is closely related to the deconstructive methodology, by which metaphysical binary thinking is dislocated and unlearned.

Bhabha also underscores the importance of the process of "negotiation" rather than "negation" in conceiving the articulation of antagonistic or contradictory elements. In this respect, what is of great interest is that the concept of "negotiation" is, according to Bhabha, dynamically involved in the movement of "hybridity", a movement that impeaches the process of "negation" based on the traditional dialectic. In other words, focusing on the process of "negotiation", Bhabha makes a radical criticism of the traditional dialectic, of, so to speak, metaphysical speculation, which rushes to "produce a unity of the antagonism or contradiction" and so fails to appreciate "the differential structure".¹² However, in the attempt to subtilise the process of "negotiation", which bears a part in the movement of "hybridity", we should not overlook Bhabha's following remark:

I would not like my notion of negotiation to be confused with some syndicalist sense of reformism because that is not the political level that is being explored here. By negotiation I attempt to draw attention to the structure of *iteration* which informs political movements that attempt to articulate antagonistic and oppositional elements without the redemptive rationality of sublation or transcendence.¹³

¹⁰ Derrida, 'Limited Inc a b c...', p. 53.

¹¹ Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (New York and London: Routledge, 1994), p. 25.

¹² Bhabha, p. 25.

¹³ Bhabha, pp. 25-26.

This argument of Bhabha will also be of significance in apprehending the specific relation between “hybridity” and “iterability”. In fact, Bhabha’s notion of “hybridity” appropriates Derrida’s deconstructive notion of “iterability” in order to criticise the logic of colonialism, which can be seen as a metaphysical logic founded on the authority of the *repetitions of the same*. Bhabha indicates that one of the most crucial strategies of “hybridity” is to throw into relief the evidence of “iterability”, or “the structure of *iteration*”, within colonial discourse. In this sense, it repeats and transforms Derrida’s concept of “iterability”.

However, does Bhabha’s perspective on “the structure of *iteration*” differ, in any way, from Derrida’s “iterability”? In exploring this question, Judith Butler’s criticism of Derrida is instructive. She argues that Derrida’s deconstructive notion of “iterability” tends on occasion to paralyse an analysis of social power. According to Butler, “Derrida appears to install the break as a structurally necessary feature of every utterance and every codifiable written mark, *thus paralyzing the social analysis of forceful utterance* (My emphasis)”.¹⁴ Butler continues to state, however, that “one takes seriously the demand to think through the logic of iterability as a social logic”.¹⁵ Therefore, referring critically to the investigation of social power in Pierre Bourdieu’s *Language and Symbolic Power* (1978), Butler goes on to combine the concepts of Derrida and Bourdieu, and argues for the idea of “social iterability”.¹⁶ Through this unique concept of “social iterability”, Butler attempts to explore how to negotiate with the socially-ousted “*other*”.

We can say that Bhabha, like Butler, subtly reconsiders “the structure of *iteration*” in terms of social power in the contemporary world. However, it is especially significant that Bhabha actively reuses Derrida’s deconstructive notion of “iterability” in order to inquire into the minority “*other*” that is ignored and excluded by the neo-colonial and neo-imperial power structures of the present-day world. Bhabha insists that “hybridity”, which is a key concept for considering our contemporary postcolonial situation, should be a political practice that enables a criticism of the colonial order and its dependence upon *repetitions of the same*. Bhabha argues: “It makes us aware that our political referents and priorities – the people, the community, class struggle, anti-racism, gender difference, the assertion of an anti-imperialist, black or third perspective – are not there in some primordial, naturalistic sense”.¹⁷ In my view, Bhabha’s notion of “hybridity” can be regarded as

¹⁴ Butler, p. 150.

¹⁵ Butler, p. 150.

¹⁶ Butler, p. 150.

¹⁷ Bhabha, p. 26.

postcolonial iterability. As Bhabha implies, “hybridity” as *postcolonial iterability* subverts the notion of the *repetition of the same* and its complicity with colonialism; and “hybridity” as *postcolonial iterability* allows for the possibility of negotiating with the minority “other” in the contemporary postcolonial world.

3 Arif Dirlik’s Postcolonial Criticism

3.1 ‘The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism’

In his 1994 article, ‘The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism’, Dirlik powerfully criticises “postcolonial intellectuals”, whose investigations into “the structure of the new global capitalism” are, he asserts, quite invalid.¹⁸ Or rather, as he provocatively states, “[w]hat is truly remarkable [...] is that a consideration of the relationship between postcolonialism and global capitalism should be absent from the writings of postcolonial intellectuals”.¹⁹ This argument is Dirlik’s central point and informs the whole article, and has had a major impact on postcolonial studies.

In his criticism of “postcolonial intellectuals”, Dirlik raises two main points. First, Dirlik takes notice of the fact that “the language of postcolonial discourse, which is the language of First World post-structuralism”,²⁰ is incompatible with a critique of global capitalism. Here Dirlik exposes the problematic situation of postcolonial studies itself, in which “postcolonial intellectuals” are paradoxically complicit with First World academia. Secondly, Dirlik asserts that “postcolonial intellectuals” tend to follow the logic of late capitalism,²¹ in that they are born out of First World academia, especially its postmodernist tendencies. In this respect, Dirlik’s argument has much in common with the criticism of postmodernism offered by David Harvey and Frederic Jameson.²² In Dirlik’s line of argument, “postcolonial intellectuals” follow uncritically the “cultural logic” of late capitalism, and unconsciously give free rein to its political power; lacking a proper self-criticism, they are completely under the influence of First World academia, and are thus incapable of a genuine critique of global capitalism. On the basis of such reasoning, Dirlik reaches the conclusion that “postcoloniality is the condition of the intelligentsia of global capitalism”.²³

¹⁸ Dirlik, p. 348.

¹⁹ Dirlik, p. 352.

²⁰ Dirlik, p. 341.

²¹ Dirlik, p. 341.

²² David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Inc, 1990); Frederic Jameson, ‘Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism’ in *New Left Review* No. 146 July/ August (1984), pp. 53-92.

²³ Dirlik, p. 356.

3.2 Arif Dirlik's Postcolonial Criticism and the Repetitions of the Same

However, Dirlik's argument does not escape the influence of "metaphysical thought" in Derrida's sense, and is haunted by the *repetitions of the same*. This eventually traps him in a careless reductionism. For example, Dirlik draws attention to the relationship between Marxism and postcolonialism; he points out that while attempts were made by Chinese Marxist revolutionaries in the 1930s to translate Marxist texts into Chinese vernacular, the postcolonial approach to Marxism has not functioned to turn it to "a national (which is rejected) or local (which is affirmed) vernacular but to rephrase it in the language of poststructuralism, in which Marxism is deconstructed, decentered, and so on".²⁴ Dirlik suggests that the object of Marxism is defeated by postcolonialism, especially by its reliance on the "deconstructive" notions of "hybridity" or "in-betweenness". In a nutshell, Dirlik sees deconstructive thinking, upon which some postcolonial criticism depends, as having politically detrimental effects.

Dirlik also says that "[p]ostcolonial critics insist that they are Marxists, but Marxists who reject the 'nineteenth-century heritage' of Marxism with its universalistic pretensions that ignored historical differences".²⁵ However, Dirlik states that Marxism transformed by postcolonialism is still paradoxically under the tutelage of "the 'nineteenth-century heritage' of Marxism". That is to say:

[A] critique that starts off with a repudiation of the universalistic presentations of Marxist language ends up not with its dispersion into local vernaculars but with *a return to another First World language with universalistic epistemological pretensions* (My emphasis).²⁶

But these arguments seem to be somewhat opaque. In *Specters of Marx*, Derrida deconstructs the idea of the "inheritance" of Karl Marx, beginning with a re-examination of the very idea of "inheritance": "An inheritance is never gathered together, it is never one with itself. Its presumed unity, if there is one, can consist only in the *injunction to reaffirm by choosing*".²⁷ Following Derrida's argument, we can assume that postcolonialism will also "filter, shift, criticize" the "inheritance" of Marxism, and "sort out several different

²⁴ Dirlik, p. 342.

²⁵ Dirlik, p. 342.

²⁶ Dirlik, p. 342.

²⁷ Derrida, *Specters of Marx* (New York and London: Routledge, 1994), p.16.

possibles that inhabit the same injunction".²⁸ This predicates that, even if postcolonialism tries to be a true "inheritor" of Marxism, it is an impossible attempt. There is no guarantee that we can say which inheritor is true or not; the distinction is "undecidable". Rather, Derrida suggests the "iterability" of Marxism; in other words, Marxism "contains *in itself* the discrepancy of a difference that constitutes it as *iteration* (My emphasis)".²⁹

By the same token, it would be difficult to regard postcolonial discourse as a true "inheritor" of the First World language, simply because it uses "the language of First World poststructuralism" or "postmodernism". Derrida's remark that "iterability" is "indispensable to the functioning of all language, written or spoken (in the standard sense)"³⁰ also means that "the First World language" could be criticised and deconstructed by the movement of "iterability". Dirlik, however, looks on the process as just "*a return to another First World language with universalistic epistemological pretensions* (My emphasis)".³¹ In this remark, Dirlik is reducing differences between postcolonial discourse and "the language of First World post-structuralism" or "postmodernism" into a *repetition of the same*. When he considers deconstructive criticism as complicit with the First World language, Dirlik appears to erase deliberately the evidence of "iterability" in deconstructive and postcolonial discourses. In his failure to recognise the movement of "iterability", Dirlik sees the "differences" among "postcolonial intellectuals" just as *repetitions of the same*. In this regard, it seems that Dirlik's postcolonial criticism is obsessed by the will to identify or homogenise, which demands the support of the metaphysical thinking that Derrida convincingly deconstructs. Dirlik does not attempt to read the trace of "hybridity", which in postcolonial studies can be one of the most fruitful strategies for deconstructing the metaphysical thinking of *repetitions of the same*: "To insist on hybridity against one's own language, it seems to me, is to disguise not only ideological location but also the differences of power that go with different locations".³² Dirlik's deliberate effacement of the evidence of "iterability" and "hybridity" prevents his postcolonial criticism from exploring "hybridity" as *postcolonial iterability*, an exploration that demands more reflective re-examination of semiotic generation and other possibilities within postcolonial discourse.

²⁸ Derrida, *Specters of Marx*, p. 16.

²⁹ Derrida, 'Limited Inc a b c...', p. 53.

³⁰ Derrida, 'Limited Inc a b c...', p. 53.

³¹ Dirlik, p. 342.

³² Dirlik, p. 343.

3.3 Contemporary Critiques of Arif Dirlik's Postcolonial Criticism

Over time, we have heard a variety of arguments for and against Arif Dirlik's views on postcolonial criticism. But, in my opinion, most of the contemporary critique of Dirlik is paradoxically similar to Dirlik's critical point of view; that is, such critics consider the notion of "hybridity" as nothing but the villain of the piece, guilty of procreating the ills of postcolonial criticism. For instance, in *Empire* (2000), Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri question Dirlik's argument that postcolonial theorists are "the intelligentsia of global capitalism". However, Hardt and Negri's opinions echo Dirlik's argument in that they acrimoniously dissect Bhabha's notion of "hybridity". Hardt and Negri assume that "hybridity" has a political strategy. They remark that, through the notion of "hybridity", Bhabha offers an astringent critique against the traditional dialectic, which is buoyed by "binary divisions, essential identities, and totalization";³³ and they recognise that "hybridity" is "both a sociological claim about the real nature of societies and a political project aimed at social change".³⁴ But, according to Hardt and Negri, "hybridity" does not take into account the actual condition of the global age; to put it simply, "hybridity" is, for them, no more than a strategy that keeps on "attacking an old form of power and propos[ing] a strategy of liberation that could be effective only on that old terrain".³⁵

However, is it conceivable that the "new" order of globalism – or, to use Hardt and Negri's term, "Empire" – can be as radically different from the past colonial order as they assert? Hardt and Negri's arguments, to some degree, ignore the remnants of the colonialism of the past that persist into the present. Their arguments, thus, uncritically follow a process of "negation" that effaces the voices of the subaltern in the global postcolonial age; in other words, they ignore the possibilities of "hybridity" as a *postcolonial iterability* that perpetually explores the negotiation with "*itara*" – "*other*" – in the contemporary postcolonial world. As far as their criticism against "hybridity" is concerned, the argument of Hardt and Negri oddly appears to inhabit virtually the same critical logic of the *repetitions of the same* as Dirlik's.

In 2004, Neil Lazarus also takes a sceptical view of Dirlik's argument; he makes the point that its criticism is fundamentally reductive. For example, referring to Anthony D. King's argument,³⁶ Lazarus points out a similarity between their criticisms. Lazarus

³³ Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Empire* (Cambridge and Mass: Harvard University Press, 2000), p. 144.

³⁴ Hardt and Negri, p. 144.

³⁵ Hardt and Negri, p. 146.

³⁶ Anthony D. King, 'Writing Colonial Space. A Review Article' in *Comparative Study of Society and History*

detects in their arguments a common tendency that needs to be reconsidered; that is to say, such criticism “crudely quantifies and renders one-dimensional a phenomenon that was clearly qualitative and multi-dimensional”.³⁷ However, Lazarus’s argument also seems to have little interest in giving more detailed examinations of these phenomena, especially that of “hybridity”. For example, in critiquing Bhabha’s theory, Lazarus states that his postcolonial criticism “refused an antagonistic or strugglebased model of politics in favor of one that emphasises ‘cultural difference’, ‘ambivalen[ce]’ and ‘the more complex cultural and political boundaries that exist on the cusp’ of what ‘modern’ philosophy had imagined as the determinate categories of social reality”.³⁸ The idea of “hybridity” is an inseparable companion of “ambivalence”, and we appear to see from this comment by Lazarus the reason for his discontent with the idea. But his dissatisfaction seems also to come from an insufficient examination of the idea of “iterability”. From these critical positions, it is difficult to investigate the “clearly qualitative and multi-dimensional” situations among “postcolonial intellectuals”. In an ironic twist, Lazarus’s statement that Dirlik’s argument “crudely quantifies and renders one-dimensional a phenomenon that was clearly qualitative and multi-dimensional” appears to characterise his own critical manoeuvres. In this regard, Lazarus also appears to uncritically follow Dirlik’s metaphysical logic of the *repetitions of the same*.

It seems that, misconstruing Bhabha’s idea “hybridity”, Hardt, Negri and Lazarus, like Dirlik, fail to see the possibility of “hybridity” as *postcolonial iterability*, a possibility that moves towards a negotiation with the minority “other” in the global postcolonial world, holding out against the logic of the *repetition of the same* through which colonialism is produced.

4 Stuart Hall’s Postcolonial Criticism

4. 1 Stuart Hall’s Critique of Arif Dirlik’s Postcolonial Criticism

When we seek to clarify the problems in Dirlik’s argument, Hall’s disputation seems to be more useful than those discussed above. In ‘When Was ‘the Post-Colonial’? Thinking at the Limit’, Hall makes a scathing comment on the “reductionism” and “functionalism” in Dirlik’s argument:

Vol. 37(3) July (1995), pp. 541-554.

³⁷ Neil Lazarus, ‘Introducing Postcolonial Studies’ in *The Cambridge Companion to Postcolonial Literary Studies*, ed. by Neil Lazarus (New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. 7.

³⁸ Lazarus, p. 4.

This is a conclusion to a long and detailed argument of such stunning (and one is obliged to say, banal) reductionism, a functionalism of a kind which one thought had disappeared from scholarly debate as a serious explanation of *anything*, that it reads like a echo from a distant, primeval era.³⁹

However, we must bear firmly in mind that Hall's criticism is based on an assumption that we should examine the evidence of "hybridity" among "postcolonial intellectuals" or within "postcolonial studies". Unlike Dirlik, Hall carefully appreciates the strategy of "hybridity". He remarks that "the cultural consequences of the colonising process" should be considered "*through*, rather than around 'hybridity'",⁴⁰ and advises us to inquire into "the questions of cultural power and political struggle *within* rather than against the grain of 'the post-colonial'".⁴¹

Hall uncovers the fact that a "dominant western historiographical tradition" – Eurocentric historical narrative – disregards the "difference" between the present postcolonial situation and the colonial situation of the past. According to Hall, the "dominant western historiographical tradition" is supported by a myth that temporalities and histories "ever were or are *the same*";⁴² in short, the tradition follows the metaphysical logic of *repetitions of the same*. Hall implies that the historical narrative of colonisation, based on the "dominant western historiographical tradition", is not wholly relevant to contemporary postcolonial issues. Therefore, the brunt of Hall's criticism is borne by the historical narrative with its *repetitions of the same*. For example, he writes that "[t]he argument is not that, thereafter, everything has remained *the same* – colonisation *repeating* itself in perpetuity to the end of time (My emphasis)",⁴³ and argues:

It is, rather, that colonisation so refigured the terrain that, ever since, the very idea of a world of separate identities, of isolated or separable and self-sufficient cultures and economies, has been obliged to yield to a variety of paradigms designed to capture these different but related forms of relationship, interconnection and discontinuity.⁴⁴

³⁹ Hall, p. 259.

⁴⁰ Hall, p. 251.

⁴¹ Hall, p. 251.

⁴² Hall, p. 252.

⁴³ Hall, p. 252.

⁴⁴ Hall, pp. 252-253.

Hall sees, to borrow Bhabha's term, "the structure of *iteration*" within the history of colonisation; to meticulously look into the *hybrid* postcolonial situation of the present, Hall focuses on a "distinctive form of *dissemination – and – condensation* which colonisation set in play (My emphasis)".⁴⁵ Accordingly, while criticising the "dominant western historiographical tradition", Hall aptly explores the strategy of "hybridity", a strategy that criticises the historical narrative of colonisation as *repetitions of the same*, and directs attention to colonisation's "pluralities and multiplicities".

Hall also attempts to develop "*through*" the notion of "hybridity" a way of negotiating with the minority "*other*". In the process of questioning the "dominant western historiographical tradition", Hall exposes both the logic of the *repetition of the same* that neglects the "structure of *iteration*" within the history of colonisation, and the irresponsible effacement of the minority "*other*" in the contemporary postcolonial age. Finally, Hall's strategy of "hybridity" moves towards thinking of the "*other*": "No site, either 'there' or 'here', in its fantasied autonomy and in-difference, could develop without taking into account its significant and/or abjected *others* (My emphasis)".⁴⁶

Referring to Hall's postcolonial criticism thus enables us to re-think the strategy of "hybridity" as *postcolonial iterability*. This strategy indicts the "dominant western historiographical tradition" and its logic of the *repetition of the same*; it permits a perpetual negotiation with the minority "*other*" in the age of globalism as a *hybrid* postcolonial phenomenon. The investigation of the postcolonial condition should be conducted with an attentive deconstructive thinking about the strategy of "hybridity" as *postcolonial iterability*, as Hall's postcolonial criticism aptly illustrates.

4. 2 The Relationship between Postcolonial Criticism and Global Capitalism

Hall tries to open up the possibilities of postcolonial studies by pursuing the traces of "hybridity" that hollow out and fissure metaphysical postcolonial criticism. In contrast to Dirlik, Hall never attempts to bury the possibilities of the strategy of "hybridity" in postcolonial studies. But is his position diametrically opposed to Dirlik's postcolonial criticism? Here we should not disregard the fact that, while Dirlik's postcolonial criticism is undoubtedly reductive in some ways, its significance has not been lost by any means; on the contrary, it appears to be increasingly valid for its insights into the weakness of

⁴⁵ Hall, p. 253.

⁴⁶ Hall, p. 252.

postcolonial studies. Despite its shortcomings, Dirlik's position is still tenable as a caution for postcolonial scholarship, for it seems abundantly clear that postcolonial studies should reconsider "the relationship between postcolonialism and global capitalism". Hall even accepts Dirlik's argument that the absence of investigation into the complicity between postcolonialism and global capitalism "has become seriously damaging and disabling for everything positive which the post-colonial paradigm can, and has the ambition to, accomplish".⁴⁷ Therefore, referring to Dirlik's postcolonial criticism, Hall finds it indispensable to inquire, "*through*" the strategy of "hybridity", into the actual *hybrid* postcolonial situation – into what he describes as the "transverse", "transnational", and "transcultural" post-colonial moment.⁴⁸ In this respect, Hall's strategy of "hybridity" appears to be focussed more explicitly than Bhabha's on the context of the actual postcolonial situation. Hall states:

Understood in its global and transcultural context, colonisation has made ethnic absolutism an increasingly untenable cultural strategy. It made the 'colonies' themselves, and even more, large tracts of the 'post-colonial' world, always-already 'diasporic' in relation to what might be thought of as their cultures of origin. The notion that only the multi-cultural cities of the First World are 'diaspora-ised' is a fantasy which can only be sustained by those who have never lived in the hybridised spaces of a Third World, so-called 'colonial', city.⁴⁹

Hall's postcolonial criticism seeks to effectively revise Dirlik's postcolonial criticism by highlighting the evidence of actual *hybrid* postcolonial situations in the global age.

5 Conclusion

It can be concluded, from what has been said above, that we still have much to do to develop the full potentialities of postcolonial studies, and it is imperative here that we should continue to explore the strategy of "hybridity" as *postcolonial iterability*. It is a strategy that conducts a deconstructive criticism of colonial discourse and its thought, seeking, above all, to undermine the logic of the *repetitions of the same* that is one of its

⁴⁷ Hall, p. 257.

⁴⁸ Hall, p. 251.

⁴⁹ Hall, p. 250.

strongest underpinnings. It also develops ways to negotiate with “*itara*” – “*other*” – “*alterity*” as *hybrid* postcolonial phenomena in the age of globalisation.

In looking ahead to further possibilities of postcolonial studies from the perspective of “hybridity” as *postcolonial iterability*, the re-consideration of the approaches of Dirlik and Hall to postcolonial criticism has proved, we hope, to be still valid and productive. On the other hand, as this paper has tried to illustrate, the strategy of “hybridity” has recently come under attack from various directions, but it seems to be high time to pertinently re-examine the potentialities of the idea of “hybridity” in the present “new” world (dis) order. In this light, the strategy of “hybridity” as *postcolonial iterability* will bear a central role in our efforts to arrive at a version of postcolonial studies that will conduct more circumspect and promising researches into the *hybrid* postcolonial condition in the global age.

References

Primary Sources

- Dirlik, Arif, ‘The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism’ in *Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 20 (2) Winter (1994), 328-356
- Hall, Stuart, ‘When Was “the Post-Colonial”? Thinking at the Limit’ in *The Post-Colonial Question: Common Skies, Divided Horizons*, ed. by Iain Chambers and Lindia Curti (New York and London: Routledge, 1996), 242-260

Secondary Sources

- Bearn, Golden C. F., ‘Derrida Dry: Iterating Iterability Analytically’ in *Diacritics*, Vol. 25(3) Autumn (1995), 3-25
- Bhabha, Homi.K., *The Location of Culture* (New York and London: Routledge, 1994)
- Bourdieu, Pierre, *Language and Symbolic Power*, ed. by John B. Thompson, trans. by Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson (Cambridge and Mass: Harvard University Press, 1991)
- Butler, Judith, *Excitable Speech – A politics of the Performative* (New York and London: Routledge, 1997)
- Condillac, Étienne Bonnot de, *Essay on the Origin of Human Knowledge*, trans. by Hans Aarsleff (New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001)
- Culler, Jonathan, *On Deconstruction – Theory and Criticism after Structuralism* (New York

- and London: Routledge, 1983)
- Derrida, Jacques, *Of Grammatology*, trans. by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1974)
- Derrida, Jacques, 'Limited Inc a b c...' in *Limited Inc*, trans. by Samuel Weber (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977), 29-110
- Derrida, Jacques, 'Signature Event Context' in *Margins of Philosophy*, trans. by Alan Bass (Brighton: Harvester Press, 1982), 307-330
- Derrida, Jacques, *Specters of Marx* (New York and London: Routledge, 1994)
- Fish, Stanley, 'With the Compliments of the Author: Reflections on Austin and Derrida' in *Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 8(4) Summer (1982), 693-721
- Hardt, Michael and Negri, Antonio, *Empire* (Cambridge and Mass: Harvard University Press, 2000)
- Harvey, David, *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Inc, 1990)
- Jameson, Frederic, 'Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism' in *New Left Review* No. 146 July/ August (1984), 53-92
- King, Anthony D., 'Writing Colonial Space. A Review Article' in *Comparative Study of Society and History* Vol. 37(3) July (1995), 541-554
- Lazarus, Neil, 'Introducing Postcolonial Studies' in *The Cambridge Companion to Postcolonial Literary Studies*, ed. by Neil Lazarus (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 1-16
- Loomba, Ania, *Colonialism / Postcolonialism* (New York and London: Routledge, 1998)
- Lucy, Niall, *A Derrida Dictionary* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2004)
- McLeod, John, *Beginning Postcolonialism* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000)
- McLeod, John, ed., *The Routledge Companion to Postcolonial Studies* (New York and London: Routledge, 2007)
- Miller, J. Hillis, *Fiction and Repetition: Seven English Novels* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1984)
- Norris, Christopher, *Derrida* (London: Fontana, 1987)
- Royle, Nicholas, *Jacques Derrida* (New York and London: Routledge, 2003)
- Searle, John R., 'Reiterating the Differences: A Reply to Derrida' in *Glyph* Vol. 1 (1977), 198-208