2

Deconstruction and Cultural Studies: Arguments for a Deconstructive Cultural Studies

Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak

> The urge to put Derrida 'to use' in such critical discourses as New Historicism and Cultural Studies only underscores the resistance to the truly philosophical nature of deconstruction.
>
> Stuart Barnett, *Hegel After Derrida*

Derrida's copious teaching notes, published these days almost as is, remind us that teaching is no more than a 'who wins loses' style game against its own destined errancy.[1] A teacher will say, everyone knows this. I am not sure. Aristotle's class notes, Hegel's class notes, Saussure's class notes seem to have frozen into orthodoxies of various kinds. 'Culture' is learned without teachers, even as it is taught by parents and elders, of both genders, in different ways. 'Cultural Studies' is a terrible misnomer, now that it has been around long enough for people to have forgotten that it was originally a study of the politics of those who claim dominant culture. 'Civilizational competence' is learned by those ambitious to enter the discourse of the masters, even if to destabilize it. The institutionalization of Cultural Studies has something like a relationship with the missed crossings between errant tendencies. This essay runs after them, necessarily in vain.

I CLAIMING ANCESTORS AND TELEOPOESIS

Let us first recite the divided origin of what is metropolitan Cultural Studies today: in the sixties in Britain, Richard Hoggart publishes *Uses of*

Literacy; Stuart Hall founds Cultural Studies in Birmingham; the first group of students produce *Empire Strikes Back*, a manifesto; *Women Take Issue*, the feminist supplement, appears in 1978.[2]

Also in 1978, in the United States, Edward W. Said's Orientalism brings forth a scholarly interest in the constitution of the conquered stranger as other. (The general difference in mood between UK and US Cultural Studies can be observed in the difference between Paul Gilroy's two books, *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack* (Gilroy, 1987) and *The Black Atlantic* (Gilroy, 1993), the latter in the company of Martin Bernal, Ivan Van Sertima, Jack D. Forbes, all in the Said tradition.) A related but different story is also part of the account of US cultural studies. Lyndon Johnson had lifted the alien quotas with the new immigration act of 1965, and thus ushered in an enormous rise in Asian (including Indian) immigration. A proportion of their children, who may loosely constitute an upwardly mobile model minority, begin to inaugurate varieties of 'national origin' or 'hybridist' Cultural Studies. Already existing Pan-Africanist tendencies within the upwardly mobile sections of the beneficiaries of the Civil Rights movement feed into these tendencies, *mutatis mutandis*. Chicano/as, Latino/as, straddling two imperialisms (the Spanish and the American), become more starkly visible in this growing field. We learn of Rodolfo Acuña's *Occupied America* and Mario Barrera's *Race and Class in the Southwest*'s theories of internal colonization.[3] Asian-Americans early cathect a diversified history. Maxine Hong Kingston's *The Woman Warrior* inaugurates that thematic.[4] The oppressed autochthone, coming late to this collective claiming of 'culture' as an object of study, hits the mainstream with Leslie Marmon Silko's *Almanac of the Dead*.[5] The legacy of the Sioux Ghost Dance, celebrated in Silko's novel as the beginning of a revised cultural politics reactive to the encounter with the foreigner – French and British – dates back to the end of the previous century, of course. Curiously enough, it is to this legacy that Jacques Derrida, and therefore deconstruction, quietly allies him/itself in *Specters of Marx*: 'the past as absolute future.'[6]

By this reckoning, deconstructive Cultural Studies would also be a claiming of ancestors. In *Specters*, Derrida claims Marx in a common legacy of Abrahamic messianicity. 'There is no culture without a cult of ancestors, a ritualization of mourning and sacrifice . . . The very concept of culture may seem to be synonymous with the culture of death, as if the expression "culture of death" were ultimately a pleonasm or a tautology. But only such a redundancy can make legible the cultural difference and the grid of borders' (Derrida, 1993, p. 43).

The power and mutating foundation of metropolitan Cultural Studies can be read as the movement of the colonized towards the colonizer, with a reversal-displacement of the 'cultural difference [across a] grid of borders' that had been laid down as impassable political frontiers by the col-

onizing powers – rememorizing a history legitimately inherited only by the latter. In the process, that *topos* of *postcolonial* writing that insists that colonialism imposed a new civilization upon colonized space without proper burial rites for the earlier one is turned around. Cultural Studies calls the glass half full and reclaims a transformed history, ancestors-in-*poesis* – imaginatively Janus-faced.

I was a student of English Honours at the University of Calcutta, where the curriculum was straightforward 'Brit. Lit'. If we thought of the study of culture, we thought of neighbouring Shantiniketan, where Rabindranath Tagore had established his experimental school, college and University. Tagore was among the first thinkers of Cultural Studies in India. As he wrote of Viswa-Bharati, the University, three years before his death: 'Gradually another idea entered the school – India's connection to the world upon the terrain of culture'.[7] This confident nationalist invocation of an eclectic high culture is not necessarily what we understand by Cultural Studies today. Yet this impulse, like nation-think itself, can be found in other guises in metropolitan Cultural Studies today. The lineaments of the earlier idea are to be seen in Mnouchkine's gorgeous work, or Peter Brook's noble production of the Indian epic *Mahabharata* (1985).

In the New York production of the Brook epic, at the inception or the high point of the epic battle, a group of East Asians burst into *hingshay unmotto prithhi* – 'the world is mad with violence' – accompanying themselves on the harmonium. Tagore had made lyric music available to the Bengali middle class, in order that they may take the 'best of the colonizing culture'. The harmonium is ubiquitous in middle-class households. In the Bengali context, such a song sung to the harmonium is hopelessly kitsch. Lacking this cultural information, Brook connects to Tagore's original impulse, including his effort to welcome the high cultures of China and Japan into his Cultural Studies project. Watching this (for me) contradictory moment at the Brooklyn Academy of Music, I thought precisely of Tagore's words – India's connection to the world upon the terrain of [high] culture. *Shanskriti* (Bengali) or *samskrti* (Sanskrit) – the word Tagore uses for 'culture' – carries within it an implication of refinement.

Although the local 'tribal' Santals of Bolpur and a general imaginary of rural India provided colour for many of the thematics of the new school at Shantiniketan, the 'tribals' were not Tagore's partners. For *Cultural* Studies, Tagore looked mostly up at the ancient Hindu philosophical nondualistic *Upanisads* and out at 'the world'. Those were his ancestors and his kin. If, by contrast, we include the Santals (and the other ninety million 'tribal' or 'aboriginal' peoples) in our claim for ancestry and kinship, we would get something like the following:

> India's wide range of altitude, rainfall and geological conditions has given rise to an enormous diversity of ecosystems supporting some 81,000 recorded animal species and 45,000 plant species. Such biological diversity has nurtured cultural diversity . . . The country has 4,365 distinct ethnic communities, 325 languages, six major religions and dozens of smaller independent faiths, and ways of life ranging from hunting and gathering through farming and herding to craft working and industrial processing. The last century, however, has seen a sharp decline in biological and cultural diversity throughout India, the rate of loss accelerating in the last few decades as the development process has taken hold.[8]

It is interesting that during the very century that nationalist intellectuals were laying the foundation for an elite and international 'Indian' culture that still survives in peculiar transformations, subaltern cultural diversity, according to the authors (all from the Indian Institute of Public Administration) of the passage above, suffered a sharp decline. I will suggest later that, in globalization, this pre-text is once again important; and ignored by Cultural Studies because of its suppression at the origin. The point where Cultural Studies in India (or anywhere in the South) touches Cultural Studies in the metropolis is around the issue of multiculturalism. Ecology has no part to play there.

> It is by problematizing the connection between debates such as the one over secularism in India [writes Partha Chatterjee] and those within liberal-democratic theory in the West that it might be possible to fight the attitude, present even in the hallowed precincts of philosophical discourse, which Arjun Appadurai has described as 'Intelligent multiculturalism for us, bloody ethnicity or mindless tribalisms for them'.[9]

It is my conviction that the Tagorean variety of Cultural Studies, not necessarily so well institutionalized as Tagore's educational experiment, can be located elsewhere as well under the auspices of the colonialisms of the last century; and that it provides a sort of discontinuous prehistory for much US Cultural Studies today. It is a directedness towards the imaginative component in other 'cultures', among whom the imaginative members of the colonizing 'culture' are prominently included. Although the connection is not often made public in the mainstream, its vector directs much of the US Cultural Studies initiative. Fanon's resistant writing got its first impulse from a foiling of this hope, held only by the indigenous colonial elite: the colony's connection to the world upon the terrain of culture. How would the ghost of such a composite ancestor think the future? The word 'culture' is a name for a complex strategic situation in a particular type of society. And the prayer to be haunted by this hybrid ghost is

a robust acceptance of the fact that the old civilization of the colonized had been suppressed without proper funeral rites.[10]

The colonized intellectual claims a culturally differentiated common humanity with the colonizer. This is the condition of possibility of mimicry: to be different yet same. This is the description of the hybrid: a mixture of difference and sameness.[11] The failure of this vector – the assimilated Christian Martiniquais treated like a Negro in France – writes Fanon's desire for Africa, a ghost cleansed of hybridity, given an essentiality that the spectre cannot furnish. The dynamics of the vector makes the early DuBois write: 'I sit with Shakespeare and he winces not' (DuBois, 1970, p. 51).

This is imagination speaking, *poesis* not *istoria*.[12] This version of Cultural Studies does not check the historical Shakespeare's proclivities towards racism. Latterday claims for varieties of destabilizing subalternities can be read within this template.

At about the same time as Tagore's Shantiniketan in India, this heliotropic gesture comes into its own, most dazzlingly, in the United States, in the heritage of modern slavery where the ancestor is not merely unmourned but the pulse of ancestry is annihilated. It flowers in the Harlem Renaissance. DuBois claims that 'there are today no truer exponents of the pure human spirit of the Declaration of Independence than the American Negroes', and Alain Locke, of whom more later, writes:

> a more highly stylized art does not exist than the African. If after absorbing the new content of American life and experience, and after assimilating new patterns of art, the original artistic endowment can be sufficiently augmented to express itself with equal power in more complex patterns and substance, then the Negro may well become what some have predicted, the artist of American life.[13]

Another example, though on a different register, is the heritage of the Sioux religion of the Ghost Dance, mentioned above. Here Cultural Studies reverse and displace foundations of a transformed ancestor-claim: 1. the Sioux religion and the first battle of Wounded Knee (1890) ⇨ 2. the ghost dance 'cited' at the uprising of the second Wounded Knee (1973) ⇨ 3. a 'literary citation' in Leslie Marmon Silko, *Almanac of the Dead* (1991). James Mooney's contemporary account of the Ghost Dance religion shows how far the first impulse went towards a human embrace of the foreigner.[14] The Sioux Ghost Dance religion was already a desire to claim a 'poetic' common ancestry for all native Americans that would give the lie to mere 'history'. The step towards the foreigner, the attempt to claim a hybrid ancestry, is where I place Sitting Bull with the forerunners of metropolitan cultural study, figures like W. E. B. DuBois and Rabindranath Tagore.

A deconstructive cultural study would locate other such figures, and would note, not only the kinship, but the differences. Indeed, DuBois himself attempts such an analysis of sameness in difference under various colonial systems and acknowledges their deep ambiguities, in 'The Negro Mind Reaches Out'.[15] In 'The Shadow of France' section of his essay, for example, he asks: 'is Boineuf [of Martinique] an exception or a prophecy?' Such speculations help us understand the chiastic constitution of a figure such as Frantz Fanon, born the year DuBois wrote the essay.

Another deconstructive move can be recalled here. Introduced in Derrida's *Politics of Friendship*, it is the thinking of *teleopoesis* – 'generation by a joint and simultaneous grafting, without a proper body, of the performative and the constative'.[16] Derrida's example here is Nietzsche, who reverses Aristotle's alleged remark 'O my friends, there is no friend' to 'O my enemies, there is no enemy'. He at once *states* (or cites) the earlier remark, for it is specifically upon that remark that he grafts. But he also, of course, performs it in its *reversal*. Imaginative making at a distance – *teleopoesis*. Thus when the bondsman affects and reverse-performs the lord by claiming ancestry, that is *teleopoesis*, an important part of metropolitan Cultural Studies. This imaginative grafting is in the name of a new kind of 'perhaps', 'the possibilization of [an] impossible possible [which] must remain at one and the same time as undecidable – and therefore as decisive – as the future itself' (PF, p. 29). We cannot decide it, and therefore it remains decisive, the unrestricted gamble of claiming the metropolis as (reversed) ancestor.

Just as this 'perhaps' is perhaps an overwriting of Derrida's earlier articulation of ethics as an 'experience of the impossible', so also may this grafting of the performative and the constative be an overwriting of an earlier deconstruction of constitutions as rusing the performative in the constative. The constituted subject is performed by the act of the declaration of independence, yet it signs the declaration as if it was (con)stated beforehand: a ruse. But now a more enabling idea: a grafting. The rusing is the birth of a new nation, the grafting the gesture of the foreign body in the nation: postcoloniality and Cultural Studies – the 'and' a supplement.

There is, then, a performative-constative founding ruse in all constitutions. The specific constitution desired by Nelson Mandela relates to this generality in both similarity and difference by virtue of the asymmetry of historical interest.[17] This is a relationship that entails a judgement. Cultural Studies cannot be a disinterested pursuit. As such, it runs the risk of most things taken under deconstructive advisement – the risk of describing every human science as an ethico-political forcefield whose lineaments are made visible, never fully, through scrupulous close reading. It can be particularly useful for Cultural Studies when it is a study of the politics of who claims dominant culture.

And yet, is this not the occupational hazard of every disciplinary position? To view all that is in terms of the constitutive element of one's discipline, as molecules, as force fields, as philosophemes, as narratemes. . . .

Such a positioning constitutes itself by bracketing, of course, but also by tacitly keeping its constituted opposite at bay. By virtue of being constituted as an opposite, the domesticated difference is also a relationship of sameness. We ask this question, then, of all that we wish to constitute as itself. What does it keep at bay as its constituted opposite? What, for instance, might a Cultural Studies, at the end of the Cold War, keep at bay?

We already have that potted history in hand: migrants in the metropolis as well as a connection with a colonial past, not necessarily interconnected. Indeed, if we want to pursue the second track – tales of conqueror and conquered gradually coming to claim a shared ghost – we will lose ourselves in the temporizing of 'the world' in the displacement of peoples. Such an exploration would redo all the human sciences within a cultural studies paradigm. But that is a collective agenda. I can only look at US Cultural Studies as a discipline seeking to define itself, this being the indefinite nature of all disciplinarity. From what does it seem to be distancing itself today?

If we keep ourselves confined to US tertiary education, the fields that Cultural Studies infiltrates by distancing are, first, Area Studies; secondly, Comparative Literature and, finally, History and Anthropology.

II CROSSING DISCIPLINES

Area Studies in the US were founded in the wake of the Cold War and funded by federal grants, backed up by the great foundations, especially Ford. The United States needed to know foreign countries in order to keep its status intact as a competing superpower. The connection between power and knowledge could not have been clearer. 'To meet the demands of war, scholars of diverse disciplines [of many areas of the globe which had been inadequately studied] were forced to pool their knowledge in frantic attempts to advise administrators and policy maker', says the Introduction to the 'national conference on the study of world areas', which was held in New York on November 28–30, 1947. Language and Area Centers between 1959 and 1968 were authorized by Public Law 85–864, the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (as amended), Title VI. The great foundations are now considering rethinking the area studies mandate after the Cold War. Can deconstruction help?

The geopolitical aim of Area Studies has been an open secret for the last fifty years, although a restricted notion of academic freedom – the disinterested nature of 'the essence of knowledge as knowledge about knowledge' – has allowed the custodians of knowledge to disavow their relationship to the instruments of power.[18] The plea that Derrida made in the eighties,

> that with students and the research community, in every operation we pursue together (a reading, an interpretation, the construction of a theoretical model, the rhetoric of an argumentation, the treatment of historical material, and even mathematical formalization), we argue or acknowledge that an institutional concept is at play, a type of contract signed, an image of the ideal seminar constructed, a *socius* implied, repeated or displaced, invented, transformed, menaced or destroyed
>
> (Derrida, 1992c, p. 22)

remains as important today as it was then.

Area Studies were mostly committed to the Social Sciences – though 'culture' entered through the soft focus of non-quantitative 'history', especially Art History; and through efficient language learning. For reasons that are not far to seek, the most important Area Studies initiatives were in the areas of East Asia and Latin America. South Asia and the African theatre – the remains of the most recent European imperialisms – were engaged without typical Area Studies mediation. They were uneasily divided between colonial history and Anthropology. The Centers for South Asian Studies were few (Harvard, Berkeley, Pennsylvania), Sanskrit-focus, and German-model. Paradoxically, Southeast Asia, being more directly part of the US empire, was constructed with a more anthropological focus.

This is a rudimentary account of the complex Area Studies phenomenon, which obviously did not stay in one place.

One noticeable thing about Area Studies was high quality combined with openly conservative or 'no' politics. Because they were tied to the politics of power, their ties to the power elite in the countries studied were strong, the quality of their language-learning was generally excellent, and the processing of data often sophisticated, extensive and intensive. Academic 'Cultural Studies', as a metropolitan phenomenon originating in the radical fringes of English Departments, opposes this with no more than English-language based political convictions, in-house debates about expanding the canon, often with visibly foregone conclusions that cannot match the implicit political cunning of Area Studies at their best; and earns itself a reputation for 'lack of rigor', and for politicizing the academy. Can deconstruction help?

As it leaves the cosy shelter of the English department – everything in translation – Cultural Studies must necessarily find its being in the literary shadow of Area Studies, ostensibly well separated from it. This shadow is called 'Comparative Literature'. Area Studies related to foreign 'areas'. Comparative Literature was made up of the literatures of Western European 'nations'. This distinction, between 'areas' – non-European – and 'nations' – European – infected Comparative Literature and Area Studies from the start.

If the 'origin' of Area Studies was the aftermath of the Cold War, the 'origin' of US Comparative Literature had something like a relationship with the events that secured it: European intellectuals fleeing 'totalitarian' regimes. In the 1940s and 1950s, Comparative Literature in the US rose to unprecedented intellectual eminence with a large influx of prominent 'comparatists' (to research the Euro–US transmogrifications in an already existing disciplinary formation would make this relationship visible) seeking refuge from such regimes in Europe, including such men as Erich Auerbach, Leo Spitzer, René Wellek, Renato Poggioli and Claudio Guillén. One might say that US Comparative Literature was founded on inter-European brotherhood, even as Area Studies had been spawned out of inter-regional vigilances. It has been noticed by many and asserted by Derrida that deconstruction found a home in 'Comparative Literature' rather than in 'Philosophy' in the United States. Derrida may have been partly a beneficiary of its originating impulse. It may have kept deconstruction moored to its European provenance, even in its radicalism. It has also kept deconstruction's interest in sexual difference at an uneasy distance from the male-dominated centre of high comparativism. Thus the imperative to re-imagine Comparative Literature is also an imperative to re-imagine deconstruction.

As graduate students of Comparative Literature in the early sixties, we were made to read fantasmatic origins split between Germany and France: Goethe's notion of *Weltliteratur* as a mirror for ourselves and Van Tieghem in the Que-sais-je series giving us a run-down of the French version.[19] We read René Etiemble's *Comparaison n'est pas raison* to get a sense of controversy. We leaned to scoff at influence-studies, referring to them collectively as *Rousseau en Angleterre*. Some of the source texts were Auerbach, Poulet, Curtius, Heller.[20] René Wellek was one of the major movers. I received my degree in Comparative Literature (English, French and German) and went on to teach at the Program in Comparative Literature that Professor Wellek had founded at the University of Iowa. In ten years I was its Chair, was about to bring out *Of Grammatology*, and met Wellek, the grand old man. 'Do you teach oriental languages?', he asked me. He worked on 'national' language Comparative Literature, I was clearly from an 'area'.

One way that this divide is being filled up is by destabilizing the 'nation'-s – introducing Francophony, Teutophony, Lusophony, Anglophony, Hispanophony within the old 'national' boundaries – the biggest winner being 'Global English'. This is so often contested by vested interests that I state my reservations hesitantly. Yet it must be said that this restricted destabilization effort, recalling the initial Birmingham model, is to put some black on the Union Jack or, to put a spin on Jesse Jackson's slogan, to paint the red, white and blue in the colours of the rainbow. You can give it a deconstructive name by 'naturalizing' hospitality and the *arrivant*, give it a Levinasian aura by 'naturalizing' the 'other'. Perhaps deconstruction does have some role to play in providing the heritage of imperialism some metropolitan legitimacy. This too is a matter of claiming ancestry, after all.

But deconstruction also provides a check for this tendency towards totalization. You mark your place in the text, as far as you can, so that you don't feel like offering your thoughts as a totalizable generalization, which, by the presuppositions of deconstruction would be a 'transgression'.

This is one aspect of deconstruction that is often overlooked. Derrida says it simply in an interview: 'the reference to a critical function of literature, in the West, remains very ambiguous. The freedom to say everything is a very powerful political weapon, but one which might immediately let itself be neutralized as a fiction. This revolutionary power can become very conservative' (Derrida, 1992a, p. 38). In *Politics of Friendship*, Derrida writes that we must read carefully precisely because all decisions are made in urgent non-knowledge (PF, pp. 78–9). In *Of Spirit*, even as he cautions that in all opposition, we are unilateral, he also says that 'the question of knowing which is the least grave of these [unilateral] forms of complicity is always there – its urgency and its seriousness could not be over-stressed' (Derrida, 1989, pp. 39–40).

Deconstruction, in other words, is limited by the undecidability of the empirical, of decisions, of the future – the 'perhaps' decides. To ignore this limit is to transcendentalize systems, including 'social constructions'. Derrida's example of systemic construction is Saussure's view of language: '[L]anguage always appears as a heritage of the preceding period. . . . Everything that pertains to a linguistic system, is . . . a fortuitous and involuntary result of evolution'.[21] 'Since language', Derrida writes in 1968,

> which Saussure says is a classification, has not fallen from the sky, the differences have been produced, are produced effects, but they are effects which do not have as their cause a subject or substance. . . . If such a presence were implied in the concept of cause in general . . . we then would have to speak of an effect without a cause, which very quickly would lead to no longer speaking of effects. I have attempted to indicate the direction [*tenter d'indiquer la visée*] out of the closure of this loop [*schème*] via the 'trace' which is no more an effect than it has a cause, but which in and of itself, extra-textually [*hors-texte*], is not sufficient to operate the necessary transgression.[22]

An effect that seems to have no subject can seem to lose its status as effect. We must not think of 'culture' as such an effect. Think of it as a 'trace' – something that structurally signals at the absence of its 'source', but to a particular absence, not absence in general. Thus a trace is caught

in text or weave and cannot become 'an effect without a cause' leading to 'no effect at all'. No grin without a specific cat.

One cannot of course identify this general thought of the trace with some specific critical move. But surely there is something like a relationship between this warning (in the general sense) and the gesture that opens Derrida's conversation with Derek Attridge (in the narrow sense). In answer to the question – 'Could you expand upon that statement concerning your primary interest in literature', Derrida asks the interviewer to situate his own 'stereotype' of himself; and engage in a textual weaving of the production of his preferences in adolescence and early career, that would be as indecisive as any tracing (see Derrida, 1992a, pp. 34–7). No general systemic pronouncing on 'deconstruction and literature', as, for us, there cannot be a general systemic pronouncement on 'deconstruction and culture'. This is where Cultural Studies must forever rehearse the cultural subject's 'politics of exodus': middle passage, exile, indenture, migration . . . ? From where do you stereotype yourself? How is this different from mere historicizing? In that there is never a closure here. The trace is also an effort to indicate intentionality [*tenter d'indiquer la visée*], not a cause or effect.

Some years later, when even seeing one's own text as a seamless text seemed too 'naturalizing' a metaphor, Derrida writes of 'the textile metaphor': 'it remains more natural, originary, proper than that of sewing . . . Sewing . . . *betrays*, it exhibits that which it should hide, dissimulacras that which it signals.'[23] This passage could be a description of the technique of *Glas* where, twenty-five years ago, Derrida had tried to get the blasting-effect of placing what we would today call 'queer culture' in metonymic positioning with hegemonic straight male culture; attempting to graft performative and constative.

Can we describe, transcode, transmit, and institute the relationship (perhaps) resulting from deliberate positioning, as a method? Is this not also the question of Cultural Studies? To this Derrida's answer might be, not only: 'Here again I do nothing other, can do nothing other than cite . . . only to displace the syntactic layout [*agencement*] around a physical world, real or fake, which signals and makes forget the other'; but also this imperative to anyone who would learn deconstruction to keep that question alive, not just short-circuit it: 'all the examples can be cut out [*se découpent*] thus. Regard the holes if you can.'[24]

Let us now look at Anthropology and History as Cultural Studies' antonym. Those disciplines have undergone changes in the direction of Cultural Studies, although factoring in 'culture' without textuality is not much use. I am treating such changes as part of the 'Cultural Studies' initiative towards reforming its antonyms.

Both of these disciplines, in their pristine forms, deny the cultural 'other' the subjectship or agency of unmediated academic knowledge.

'Subaltern Studies', inspiring itself from Gramsci, took its brief of rewriting Indian colonial history by looking for insurgent agency below the progressive bourgeoisie.[25] However, since the initial practitioners of Subaltern Studies had no interest in legitimizing their own civil status in the name of 'culture', their work stands as an important element in the prehistory of 'Cultural Studies' that is counter to the Tagore/DuBois/Fanon line. The first flush of British Cultural Studies is unmarked by the subalternist impulse. To the extent that Cultural Studies in the United States attempts to come to terms with the indigenous subaltern as an inhabitant of an originary hybrid space, it has had to be deconstructive of notions of autochthonous origin. I am thinking specifically of the work of groups such as the Public Culture collective. Everyone is from somewhere else, and the queer is askew.

But even so, these attempts have perhaps not interested themselves sufficiently to 'regard the holes if you can'. Let us consider what such an injunction might mean.

First, to consider, not the continuity of a concatenation (I lean here upon the French where the word for argument is *enchaînement*) in the text, but the gaps that have had to be supplemented by citation. And, in order to regard them responsibly, to work at the aporia of exemplarity. In so far as the cited fillers are 'examples' of your argument, they are not identical with and self-sufficient unto themselves and cannot constitute your hybridity. When we choose something as an example or counter-example, we are obliged to deny its singularity by subduing it to our argument. In fact this aporia contains as it denies all understanding, not merely deliberate citation. The ethical gesture towards the other of my understanding may be simply a scrupulous methodological reminder that all our understandings are bound by a future anterior that will have happened because we speak and in spite of our speech. The most logical practical acknowledgment of the aporia at the origin is to beg the question, to take as demonstrated that which we set out to prove. You assume your hybridity in order to cite its examples. 'I sit with Shakespeare and he winces not'. The hybrid I is constituted to state the programme of hybridity. The performative ruses the constative. Or, perhaps, grafts them without a proper body – a trace, a stereotype, the ingredients of our work.

Shifting again to the concept-metaphor of a patchwork from that of grafting, we consider the injunction to regard the holes as holes cut from anterior texts, themselves not originary.[26] Those cuts bleed. Thus the affect and passion of the cut must be felt in terms of that anteriority if possible. This possibility is related to the prayer to be haunted by a past, for the unanticipatable periodicity of a haunting, that can only be described as a 'perhaps'. And here, the rupture with the past, willed or unwilled, of the subject of Cultural Studies, the metropolitan migrant or the candidate for globalization, is such that the ancestors claimed are some version of

the Euro–US, straight up or reversed: Straight up: 'I sit with Shakespeare and he winces not', reversed: the subaltern only speaks in the native languages of the Southern hemisphere.[27]

What would Deconstruction and Cultural Studies look like if the hospitality/*arrivant* figure were twisted [*retorse*], as a subject for historical or anthropological investigation? In other words, taking account of the earlier impulse (a fold in the fabric of hospitality), to be imaginatively hospitable to the colonizing culture, even as it contested the right to colonize, what if we ceased imagining the object of hospitality only as the begging stranger at the door, and the subject of hospitality only as the arch-European dominant, Periclean Greece or its contender, Jerusalem? What if we supplemented Derrida's *De l'hospitalité* with a history that relates with a twist to the democratic tradition? It is with this question in mind that I approach *Gora*, a novel by Tagore, perhaps a response to Kipling's *Kim*, where the presuppositions are based in the species of colonial Cultural Studies I have described above.[28]

The point I am trying to make, I suppose, is that we cannot use deconstruction if we borrow no more than its thematics:

> What we will thus be concerned with here is the very possibility of thematic criticism, seen as an example of modern criticism, at work wherever one tries to determine a meaning through a text, to pronounce a decision upon it, to decide that this or that is a meaning and that it is meaningful to say that this meaning is posed, posable, or transposable as such: a theme . . . [I]f we can begin to see that the 'blank' and the fold cannot in fact be mastered as themes or as meanings, . . . then we will precisely have determined the limits of thematic criticism itself. (Derrida, 1981, pp. 245–6)

Derrida's concept-metaphor is the fold of the hymen. The sustaining argument of my essay is in the fold of minoritarian or postcolonial claims upon an unproblematic history or ancestry, as marked in Cultural Studies. A reading that ignores the first fold, the located Cultural Studies impulse produced by the colonial subject, focuses thematically on migration as the bottom line of culture.[29]

During the Indian Mutiny (the First Battle of Indian Independence, 1857), the Irish widow of an Irish soldier killed in battle dies in childbirth at the home of an Indian civil servant, in the employ of the Crown. The child is brought up by the Indian couple and becomes a heroic Brahmin-identitarian Hindu nationalist. When his (foster) father is dying, the secret of his birth is revealed to him because, not being by birth a Brahmin, he cannot perform the funeral rites. It is after this knowledge that he becomes a 'true' Indian. The novel celebrates the not-quite-not-colonizer (Irish-as-British) as hybrid. This is *Gora*.

The question in *Gora* does indeed come from abroad [*de l'étranger* H, p. 11]. What would it be to be hospitable to the invader: Sitting Bull's quesion. *Gora* attempts to imagine the *xenos* – the foreigner (H. p. 11) from below. (Strictly speaking, the above of the below, the colonized elite, a category not thinkable when we conceive of Socratic Greece in an opacity that conceals an oligarchy supported by an upwardly mobile slave population, an agist caste-bound queer population, and an instrumentalized female population.[30]) I am not sure why Derrida quotes the stranger in Plato's *Sophist* who, contradicting old Parmenides, does not wish to be considered a patricide (H, p. 12). But in the heritage of slavery or postcoloniality, the question of patricide is the first question of teleopoesis – enemy into friend. In *Gora*, for example, agency is displaced into the subjected. The foreigner can only be welcomed by (forgetting) the murder of the fathers: Gora's biological Irish/British father and his collectivity. Derrida's rich text moves to ask if all laws of hospitality are not obliged to transgress *the* law of hospitality: to offer the newcomer an unconditional shelter. To Derrida's list of the indeterminate newcomer (H, p. 73) Tagore adds the impossible category of a member of the imperial race as one to whom a singular hospitality can be shown by the spirit of the subject nation, by a nationalist of the subject-nation. This singular fictive hospitality is shown in the embrace of the Indian (foster) mother, who is, strictly speaking, foreign to the foreigner. Such hospitality puts the father's murder under erasure, only for the space of the book. To generalize it is to forbid resistance. Yet surely such a welcome is upstream from the political – a depoliticization that deconstructs the genealogical (PF, pp. 104–5). The violent death of the biological father is finally obliterated in the novel by the banal failed death of the querulous and unwilling adoptive father, the colonized host.

This impossible colonizing foreigner, being, in history, though not in consciousness, part of the colonizing group, is the Law of forced entry *as* Law that he questions.

Marx had complimented Aristotle but exempted him from understanding quantification as *telos* – the capitalist value-form.[31] The Platonic Socrates maybe thus forgiven by restoring him to his 'trace', forgiven from understanding the upstairs/downstairs twist of modern colonial hospitality. *Gora* stages the unknowing 'Law' giver (Gora, the white man), disgusted by an Indian colonial subject, whom he mistakenly considers to be bound to himself by a greater Law (G, pp. 47–9); scorning a white Magistrate, mistakenly considering him to be on the other side, a mere 'Law' giver (G, pp. 179–81); and, finally, the real encounter, the real invitation to teleopoesis, the furtive silence at the foster-father's bedside, when he knows he is Irish. The European doctor enters with the Bengali family physician. Gora is still dressed in ritual clothes, with the marks of ritual upon his face and body. The doctor looks at him and thinks: 'Who

is this person? 'Before this Gora would have felt a resentment', Tagore continues, 'at the very sight of an English doctor. Today he kept looking at him with a special eagerness [*bishesh ekta outshukyer shohit*] as he examined the patient. He kept asking himself the same question again and again "Is this man my closest kin here?"' (G, p. 472).

My apologies for this hasty cobbling of two important texts. It is simply to suggest that a 'deconstructive' Cultural Studies cannot stop at undoing Area Studies by the migrant's celebration of herself as the other. Then it amounts to excluding 'the rest of the world', as it was compellingly articulated in that 1981 address 'Geopsychoanalysis: . . . "and the rest of the world"'.[32] In this courageous essay, protesting the policy of the International Psychoanalytic Association towards political torture, the graphic of the exclusion of the arriver, more dominant today as 'a messianicity without messianism' and 'hospitality', resonates with the earlier themes of ethnocentrism and, more important for our argument, the irrelevance of our institutional behaviour for large areas of the contemporary world – naming 'Latin America' as the space of paradox in-between – a note increasingly submerged in the varieties of globalizing triumphalism, which sees the in-between only as celebratory:

> What will from now on be called the Latin America of psychoanalysis is the only area in the world where there is coexistence, whether confrontational [*s'affrontant*] or not, between a strong psychoanalytic institution on the one hand and a society on the other (civil society or State) that engages in torture on a grand scale that no longer limits itself to its brutally classical and easily identifiable forms. (GΨ, pp. 228–9; translation modified)

Without deconstructive care, metropolitan Cultural Studies can institutionally ignore such coexistences and complicities, precisely because it is metropolitan, precisely because claiming hybridized ancestry can cut both ways. It will not acknowledge that the cuts bleed.[33] How can 'the rest of the world' be acknowledged?

In his *Specters of Marx*, Derrida proposes a New International which is, crudely put, the Human Rights initiative with an economic consciousness. In a certain sense, this request has been kept by the United States. 'Human Rights' are now almost inevitably exercised within a trade paradigm.

But I think it can be safely argued that this is not what Derrida meant. As to what he did mean one must of course and always only conjecture. Let us say he meant that, when we consider human rights infringements by governments, we should also consider the economic exploitation urged upon those governments by the Group of Seven, through trade-related economic restructuring, as practices to be measured upon their

people. If that is so, Derrida's urging remains astute and has gone increasingly unheeded.

This is a good thought, to which I would add that the reverse is also true. Because the question of Human Rights has been so often confined within trade-related political paradigms, it can only be approached if culturally diversified ethical systems are studied. Pedagogically speaking, such studies are much more successful through language-based literary investigation than through evidence from interested cultural informants. History and Anthropology must approach the language of the other not only as 'field languages'. In order to crack this one, we need to move from Anglophony, Lusophony, Teutophony, Francophony, et cetera. We must take the languages of the Southern hemisphere as active cultural mediums, rather than as objects of cultural study by the sanctioned ignorance of the metropolitan migrant. I cannot dictate a model for this from my New York City office, or Derrida from Irvine or Paris. I can only qualify myself and my students to attend upon this as it happens elsewhere. Here and now, I can only caution against some stereotypes: that such an interest is anti-hybridist, culturally conservative, 'ontopologist', 'parochial'.[34] Other stereotypes are correct but irrelevant; namely, that attention to the languages of the Southern hemisphere is inconvenient and impractical.

Inconvenient. There are, after all, only a few hegemonic European languages and innumerable Southern hemisphere languages. The only answer to that, asked to write on so potentially pretentious a topic as 'Deconstruction and Cultural Studies' is: 'too bad'. Think of the many texts where Derrida has commented on the separate trajectories of French and English, too many to count. In *Given Time*, circulating around the necessary impossibility of thinking (that there is an unaccountable) gift (in the beginning), Derrida writes as follows in Chapter Two, 'The Madness of Economic Reason', before plunging into the reading of a French text in the rest of the book:

> Let us not accumulate these examples [of idiomatic differences]; they will be numerous but different from one language to another. Let us merely draw from them a *conclusion* (which is that the essential link from the thought of the gift to language, or in any case to the trace, will never dispense with [*faire l'économie des*] idioms) and a *doubt* (is it not impossible to isolate a concept of the essence of the gift that transcends idiomatic difference?). (Derrida, 1992d, p. 54)

Do such things apply only to French and German? Does the story of aporias vanishing if 'shibboleth' be pronounced right only apply to Hebrew (see Derrida, 1992b, pp. 390–400)? India has long laboured under Weber's denial of philosophy, Africa under Hegel's denial of humanity. Latin America, indeed all the settler colonies, fall into a similar pit if one

gets off the Ariel–Caliban debates. Can the serious international scope of something called Islam be diversified or unmarked? At the end of 'The Madness of Economic Reason', after meticulous readings of two poems by Mallarmé, when Derrida quotes Mauss quoting 'a beautiful Maori proverb' (see Derrida, 1992d, p. 67), should we remember his conclusion and his doubt as we read the concluding paragraphs and footnotes to his chapter? Can the 'native informant' ever become the subject of a 'Cultural Study' that does not resemble metropolitan language-based work? If one asks these questions, one sees that the neat reversal (often called destabilization) must exclude much for its own convenience.

Engagement with the idiom of the global other(s) in the Southern hemisphere, uninstitutionalized in the Euro–US university structure except via the objectifying discontinuous transcoding tourist-gaze of anthropology and oral history, is the displaced lesson of Deconstruction and Cultural Studies. This is not remedied by the re-territorialized desire of the metropolitan migrant to collaborate with the South, through the mediation of the class, increasingly produced by globalization, that is sufficiently out of touch with the idiomaticity of non-hegemonic languages. This is the flip side of the databasing of so-called indigenous knowledge undertaken today by the globalizing agencies directly, without accessing the cultural idiom of the Aboriginal from the position of the subject. I remind the reader of the aboriginal diversity ignored by the Tagorean version of Cultural Studies. Today, a deconstructive cultural study must ponder the ruse between the necessary yet impossible constative thought of *gift* at the origin and the unquestioning performative of 'data' (*given*-s) at the end, opening the way to a quantification (value-form) whose translation into qualitative good is again in the mode of the necessary/impossible. The move from money to data as the general equivalent is the move from industrial to finance capital, world trade to globalization, economic questions to questions, seemingly, of 'culture'.[35]

What I am suggesting may sound discouraging. And perhaps deconstructive Cultural Studies' battle against the cultural imperialism of metropolitan multiculturalism takes it clear out of the academic enterprise.[36] I hate to use this word, but perhaps it gives us a certain kind of honesty.

In other words, Cultural Studies must open up from the inside the colonialism of European national-language based Comparative Literature and the Cold War format of Area Studies, and infect History and Anthropology with the 'other' as producer of knowledge. But from the inside, acknowledging complicity. No accusations. No excuses. Only, learning the protocol of those disciplines, turn them around, laboriously. This is the new politics of reading Derrida outlined in *The Ear of the Other* (Derrida, 1985).

III RECIPROCITY, PERHAPS: FIELD WORK WITHOUT TRANSCODING, THERE: CARE IN THE CLASSROOM, HERE

Doing this carefully will surely reveal how we, the metropolitan new immigrants who provide the major motor of Cultural Studies and provide others the models to teach with, are complicit, folded together, with the very disciplines we invade and transform; if only because we inherit the same institution, nestled in the ideology of a political economy that we too act out, at best interrupting it with gestures that are subsumed within the nation. We too, like Goethe, want to see our own face in the world. We are in the country that has won the Cold War. Redoing the Cold War we want to globalize, disavowing an exodus.

Ours is a commercializing culture, not the best subject position for undertaking cultural study. A glance at the day's newspaper shows that older folks' sports and grandparents' christmas ornaments are now big business.[37]

We redesign for Cultural Studies, keeping this 'in view'. Subaltern 'cultures' of the South cannot give rise to a Cultural Study continuous with the institutions of the North.

Not ever? Perhaps not.

Let us play Alain Locke's thought of 'reciprocity' off Jacques Derrida's thought of the 'perhaps'.

Locke faced the cultural 'globalizing' of Pan-Africanism in the twenties and offered us this model of reciprocity, surprisingly close to today's mainstream, yet with an enlightened view of cultural exchange:

> [U]nless we approach Africa in the spirit of the finest reciprocity, our efforts will be ineffectual or harmful. We need to be the first of all Westerners to rid ourselves of . . . the insufferable bias of the attitude of 'civilizing Africa'. . . . On the other hand, the average African of the enlightened classes has his . . . pride of blood and bias of clan. . . . [I]t must be recognized that for the present the best channels of cooperative effort lie along economic and educational lines . . . America offers the African his greatest educational opportunity; Africa offers the Afro-American his greatest economic opportunity. (Locke, 1924, p. 37)

This is a project to transform African subalternity, inside and outside, through education and economics. With no example of hybridity accessible to him but 'the Afro-American', in the political atmosphere of 1924, before the spate of *de jure* decolonizations, Locke cannot imagine that a literature can arise out of anything but a national base. He risks the statement of a counter-internationalizing nationalism that is distinct from celebrations of subalternity: 'It is contemporary criticism, not contemporary art, which is at fault through obscuring the progressive cultural

nationalisms of the future with the reactionary political nationalisms of the past.'[38] Yet, the question that he asks has strong resonances today: 'does the internationalization of culture imply for art more or less of the spirit which we admit is now its animating breath and inspiration?' Let us supplement it with Derrida's question: 'Would there be in the concept of *eudoxia* [to be found in a Platonic discussion of democracy] (reputation, approbation, opinion, judgement), and in the concept of equality (equality of birth, *isogonia*, and equality of rights, *isonomia*) a double motif that might, *interpreted otherwise* [*autrement*], remove [*soustraire*] democracy from autocthonous and homophilic rooting?' (PF, p. 104; emphasis mine; translation modified). Deconstruction is one name of interpreting otherwise; Locke's argument can take it on board.

Locke repeatedly recommends the training of a readership – *eudoxia* (Derrida), if you like, or 'educate the educators' (Marx, Third Thesis on Feuerbach):

> Not cultural uniformity, but cultural reciprocity is needed. . . . If criticism could somehow in an effective modem way achieve this spirit and attitude, the art which today seems so hopelessly sectarian would appear in transformed values as essentially international and universal. . . . Our real step toward a permanently broadened cultural attitude has been the realization of the crossing of cultures as after all the fundamental source of unusual cultural developments. . . . The only consistent attitude with such a situation is the cultural reciprocity which we think to be the basis of the soundest possible internationalization of culture. (Locke, 1925, pp. 75–6)

This combination – reciprocity, training of the imagination to recognize a counter-internationalizing rather than essentializing nationalism, accompanied by a clear-eyed acknowledgement of the contaminated foundations of metropolitan agency – stages a step forward that is also a restraint, the deconstruciive *pas*, itself caught in French, 'step' and 'halt!' at once. We are traced in those contaminated foundings. We have already seen that Derrida advised trace-thinking to restrain the loop of arguing out production as causeless effect. That would be to halt. But we are now assured that 'no context can determine meaning to the point of exhaustiveness. Therefore the context neither produces nor guarantees impassable borders, thresholds that no step could pass . . .' (Derrida, 1993, p. 9). Step halting, then, halt stepping.

This compromised moment of the 'perhaps' is what a deconstructive cultural studies re-inscribes. This is where Derrida is indeed a Franco-Maghrebin, as Locke is an 'Afro-American'. I re-cite a move from Virginia Woolf here to show that the opening of this 'perhaps' for readers to come is not confined to some essentialized or naturalized hybrid. '"I" is only a convenient term for somebody who has no real being', Woolf writes in one of her most persuasive texts. 'Lies will flow from my lips, but there may *perhaps* be some truth mixed up with them; it is for you to seek out this truth and to decide whether any part of it is worth keeping.'[39]

Woolf places us in the classic paradox – 'I will lie' – and writes the reader in the 'perhaps'. It is in this mode that she gives a random name to that 'I' that is merely a convention: Mary Beton or Mary Seton. And it is also within this mode that she acknowledges the compromised foundations of metropolitan agency. Mary Beton owes her £500 to imperialism, her eponymous aunt 'died by a fall from her horse when she was riding out to take the air in Bombay', and she herself sees money as a better alternative to democracy (RO, p. 37). In the final movement, Woolf takes us into the impossible possible of the 'perhaps', only as fiction can. She puts Mary Beton to rest (RO, pp. 104–5) and speaks 'in my own person' (RO, p. 105). She inaugurates a ghost dance, asking all aspiring woman writers to be haunted by the ghost of Shakespeare's sister, and quite gives up the 'room of one's own and £500 a year' in her closing words: 'I maintain that she would come if we worked for her, and that so to work, *even in poverty and obscurity*, is worth while' (RO, p. 114).

A Room of One's Own has become a hastily read cult text and Alain Locke is not part of mainstream Cultural Studies. We add the cynicism of the last seventy years, remind ourselves that no place on earth has been able to practise an inner-directed 'responsible' reciprocity where the exchange with the subaltern has altered itself as a result of the impetus from the other side. And, offering Cultural Studies nothing more plausible than a fieldwork without the goal of transcoding for the academy, let us think 'perhaps'. Let us think teleopoesis: 'generation by a joint and simultaneous grafting, without a proper body, of the performative and the constative'.

Fieldwork without transcoding: an alteration perhaps happening to the imagination of a fieldworker rather than a difference claimed by the ethnographer. At the extreme edge of Cultural Studies, where the critique of Anthropology/History/Comparative Literature begins to fill itself with content, this silent work can stand guard. We can keep teaching its cautionary practice in the deconstructive classroom. This instruction, *mutatis mutandis*, applies even to so-called South–South Cultural Studies.

It seems to us now that the idea of a collectivity without organization – that may seem hopelessly impractical at first glance as suggested in *Specters of Marx* or *Politics of Friendship* – is actually the figure of a classroom. To demonstrate this, I read two paragraphs of *Politics of Friendship*.

In the Foreword to the book Derrida tells us that the entire book is an account of but one session of the seminar on the topic of the politics of friendship that he had taught in 1988–9 (PF, p. vii). He tells us further that

in each session the same questions had been repeated, permutations and combinations played, in many different ways.

> In the course of the academic year 1988–89, each session opened with these words from Montaigne, quoting a proposition [*propos*] attributed to Aristotle: 'O my friends, there is no friend'. Week after week, its voices, tones, modes and strategies were tried on, to see if its interpretation could then be sparked. . . . This text, taking its time, replays, *represents*, only its first session. (PF, pp. vii–viii)

Reading the book, we should imagine the iteration in the classroom. A few chapters in, after reminding us what happens if we simply act on the philosophy of the perhaps (a passage we have already quoted), Derrida insists that, in spite of this, the philosophy of the perhaps must be repeatedly rehearsed in the classroom.

In *Politics*, the un-organized, un-collectivized practitioners of the New International of *Specters* are re-inscribed as figures who can re-cite an alleged saying of Aristotle's through many relays across the centuries. For the duration of the book, the possibility of such a company – 'How many are we?' is reiterated – is the invocation of that absent class. And a single teacher's students, flung out into the world, is surely a better real-world example than one named the New 'International', which immediately brings Marxist organization to mind. In the context of the earlier book, perhaps the lesson was that the presuppositions of the text of Marx should be internalized (learnt) by as large a group as possible – so that practice is changed upstream from the party line – rather than be the means of metonymically collectivizing people whose other differences will inevitably bring the 'collectivity' down.

This is clearly not the place to discuss the idea in the context of Marx and Marxism. But in the context of deconstructive Cultural Studies the idea is worth considering. If we teachers try to learn and teach the limit to our institutional Cultural Studies as the subject-position of our 'other' in subaltern Southern culture, even as we rigorously disassemble the presuppositions of traditional Anthropology, History, Area Studies, Comparative Literature, we can, 'perhaps', hope not to drown a good thing in the quick fix of triumphalism.

Derrida has strongly and subtly questioned the efficacity of multiplying 'warnings . . . such as these typical and recurrent syntagms: "relation without relation", community without community . . . "inoperative" community, "unavowable" communism or community, and all the "X without X" whose list is, by definition, endless, finite in its infinitude'. If 'a political history or philosophy . . . attempted to read all the apparently contradictory possibles . . . that these "sophisticated discourses" recall [*rapellent*] . . . they could do very little, almost nothing' (PF, p. 81). Put crudely, they offer the ability of quick fixes while we eat our cake and have it too. Let us teach a resistance to mere theoreticism in the classroom.

IV CONCLUSION

In a more extended study, I had chosen the diachrony and synchrony of a South Asian religious minority as 'A Compromised Example', where the US classroom played a mobilizing electronic role. I had passed to the question of woman and advanced the following suggestion in the end: The epistemological undertaking of constituting a general gendered will for globalization is an object of deconstructive cultural study. This is the female client of micro-credit. If the colonial subject was classed, and the briefly appearing postcolonial subject raced, the subject of globalization is gendered. It was in view of globalization and virtuality that I offered a gloss on mere 'transnational literacy'.

For globalization is not only transnationalization. The day for learning the agency of the letter (literacy) is over. The task is to wrench Marx from Judeo-Christian messianicity and the apparent failure of his Eurocentric discourse of progress as we see the triumph of the spectrality of capital as Reason. (Deconstruction taught us long ago to call it keeping 'the economic under erasure'.[40] But the day for thinking capital as merely economic is over as well.) The task, further, is to wrench deconstruction from its proper home in 'Comparative Literature', to let it loose in 'Cultural Studies' so that it can transform its nice nursery of hybrid plantings to reveal the saturnalia of an imagined counter-globalization. An unrestricted Hegelianism, undoing Hegel's Eurocentric teleologies:

> During saturnalia, order was overturned; the law transgressed itself: time of debauchery, of licentiousness, of drunkenness, spasmodic revolution in the course of which, says an anachronistic treatise of mythology, 'the social classes were topsy-turvy', the masters becoming the slaves of their slaves. . . . *Sa* [Absolute Knowledge]'s satumalia would then be intimately bound up with a disordering [*dérèglement*] of the *seminarium*.[41]

As for wrenching deconstruction from 'true' philosophy, deconstruction itself gives us a guarantee for it, *pace* the epigraph to this essay.

'Deconstruction' might be the name, the textual figure, of a great messy change, not confined to the metropolis. The academic activities undertaken in the name of deconstruction, including this one, inevitably, manage that mess. Perhaps we will become the object of some future 'Cultural Studies' as the organic intellectuals of the first wave of deconstruction.

We must remain open to the scrutiny of the improper. Perhaps this is the last lesson of deconstruction for the proper investigation of culture.

NOTES

1. I thank Deborah White for a perceptive first reading of this essay.
2. Richard Hoggart, *The Uses of Literacy: Aspects of Working-Class Life, with Special Reference to Publications and Entertainments* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970); Stuart Hall, 'Cultural Studies and the Centre: Some Problematics and Problems', in Hall et al. (eds), *Culture, Media, Language* (London: Hutchinson, 1980), pp. 15–47; *The Empire Strikes Back: Race and Racism in 70s Britain* (London: Hutchinson, 1982); *Women Take Issue: Aspects of Women's Subordination* (London: Hutchinson, 1978).
3. Rodolfo F. Acuña, *Occupied America: The Chicano's Struggle Toward Liberation* (San Francisco, CA: Canfield Press, 1972), and Mario Barrera, *Race, and Class in the Southwest: A Theory of Racial Inequality* (Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 1979). The colonial line was Antonio Gramsci, 'Some Aspects of the Southern Question', in Gramsci, *Selections from Political Writings, 1921–1926*, trans. Quintin Hoare (New York: International Publishers, 1978), pp. 441–62. Postcolonially, the source for the notion was Samir Amin, *Unequal Development: An Essay on the Social Formation of Peripheral Capitalism*, trans. Brian Pearce (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1976). The internal colonization debate in the African-American context, recounted in Philip S. Foner and James S. Allen (eds), *American Communism and Black Americans: A Documentary History, 1919–1929* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1987) was an earlier formation which arose anew with Stokeley Carmichael and Charles V. Hamilton (eds), *Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America* (New York: Vintage, 1967).
4. Maxine Hong Kingston, *The Woman Warrior: Memoirs of a Girlhood Among Ghosts* (New York: Knopf, 1976).
5. Leslie Marmon Silko, *Almanac of the Dead* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1991).
6. Jacques Derrida, *Specters of Marx: The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning, and the New International*, trans. Peggy Kamuf (New York: Routledge, 1994), p. 35. See also Ken McMullen's 1983 film *'Ghost Dance'*, made for Channel Four (London), where Derrida makes a cameo appearance, playing himself.
7. Rabindranath Tagore, *Rabindra Racanabali* (Calcutta: W. Bengal Govt. Press, 1961), vol. 11, p. 801; translation mine.
8. Ashish Kothari, Saloni Suri, and Neena Singh, 'People and Protected Areas: Rethinking Conservation in India', *The Ecologist*, 25.5 (Sept/Oct 1995), p. 188. The difficulty of calling the supposedly pre-Indo-European autocthonous groups uniformly 'aboriginal' or 'tribal' is precisely that India is an ancient settler colony.
9. 'Religious Minorities and the Secular State: Reflections on the Indian Impasse', *Public Culture*, 8.1 (Fall 1995), p. 13. It should perhaps be mentioned that this piece is a typical case of the locationist problem in Cultural Studies. It was published in the US without the introductory section (*Economic and Political Weekly*, 9 July, 1994, pp. 1768–77), which applies to India alone.
10. I have discussed this in greater detail in 'Academic Freedom', *Pretexts*, v, i–ii (1995), pp. 117–56.
11. The concept of hybridity owes most to the work of Homi K. Bhabha. Its most powerful recent articulation is in 'Border Lives: The Art of the Present', in Bhabha, *Location of Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1994), pp. 1–18.
12. Aristotle, *The Poetics*, trans. W. Hamilton Fyfe and W. Rhys Roberts (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991), p. 35.
13. DuBois, *Selected Writings*, p. 57. Alain Locke, 'The Legacy of the Ancestral Arts', in Alain Locke (ed.), *The New Negro: An Interpretation* (New York: Arno Press, 1968), pp. 256–8. I thank Brent Edwards for mentioning Alain Locke to me.
14. James Mooney, *The Ghost-Dance Religion and the Sioux Outbreak of 1890* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1991).
15. DuBois, 'The Negro Mind Reaches Out', in Locke, *New Negro*, pp. 392–7. The next quoted passage is from p. 397.
16. Derrida, *Politics of Friendship*, trans. George Collins (New York: Verso, 1997), p. 32; translation modified. Hereafter cited in text as PF, with page reference following.
17. In spite of the important critique of Anne McClintock and Rob Nixon in 'No Names Apart: The Separation of Word and History in Derrida's "Le Dernier Mot Du Racisme"', in *'Race', Writing, and Difference*, ed. Henry Louis Gates, Jr (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), pp. 339–53, the reading of Nelson Mandela's autobiography in 'The Laws of Reflection: Nelson Mandela, in Admiration', in *For Nelson Mandela*, ed. Jacques Derrida and Mustapha Tlili (New York: Seaver Books, 1987), pp. 11–42, remains a model of postcolonial cultural studies. Mandela, a Christian legalist who repeatedly claims 'conscience' over an unjust law and is brutally thwarted from entering that tradition honourably, reclaims his own ancestry by inscribing his 'village in the Transkei' as the seed-bed of 'a revolutionary democracy' (primitive communism: Marx), rather than 'custom' (colonial powers). See Terence Ranger, 'The Invention of Tradition in Colonial Africa', in Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (eds), *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), pp. 211–62, and, in greater detail, Mahmood Mamdani, *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Capitalism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996).
18. Derrida, 'Mochlos; or, the Conflict of the Faculties', in Richard Rand (ed.), *Logomachia: The Conflict of the Faculties* (Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press, 1992) is an extended critique of this vision of knowledge. Derrida's lecture was delivered at Columbia University in 1980.
19. 'National literature is now rather an unmeaning term; the epoch of World literature is at hand, and everyone must strive to hasten its approach. But, while we thus value what is foreign, we must not bind ourselves to anything in particular, and regard it as a model. . . . [I]f we really want a pattern, we must always return to the ancient Greeks. . . . All the rest we must look at only historically, appropriating to ourselves what is good, so far as it goes' (January 31, 1827), Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, in John Oxenford (trans.), *Conversations with Eckermann* (Washington, DC, Walter Dunne, 1901), p. 175. With hindsight, it would be interesting to descend from the sublime to the ridiculous and compare this 'structure of feeling' with the appropriative multicultural menu under the master-pattern of Thanksgiving in Gopinathan, 'With Justice', quoted in note 77. The *metaphora* of Cultural Studies must make odd connections. Paul Van Tieghem, *Le Mouvement romantique (Angleterre-Allemagne-Italie-France)* (Paris: Vuibert, 1923) is the other book cited in my text.
20. René Etiemble, *The Crisis in Comparative Literature*, trans. Herbert Weisinger and Georges Joyaux (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1966); Erich Auerbach, *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*,

trans. Willard R. Trask (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1953); Georges Poulet, *Studies in Human Time*, trans. Elliott Coleman (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1979); Ernst Robert Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, trans. Willard R. Trask (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1973); Erich Heller, *The Disinherited Mind: Essays in Modern German Literature and Thought* (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1971).

21. Ferdinand de Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics*, trans. Wade Baskin (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959), pp. 71, 86.
22. Derrida, 'Differance', in *Margins of Philosophy*, trans. Alan Bass (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), pp. 11–12; translation modified. 'Loop' is bold, but it catches exactly the implication of the passage; at the time of the writing of which this particular meaning was not available in colloquial American English.
23. Derrida, *Glas*, trans. John P. Leavey, Jr and Richard Rand (Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press, 1990), pp. 208b, 209b; translation modified.
24. *Ibid.*, pp. 215b, 210b; translation modified. The sentences are not consecutive in Derrida's text.
25. Ranajit Guha et al. (eds), *Subaltern Studies: Writings on South Asian History and Society* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1982–), vols 1–11.
26. 'Concept-metaphor' mutely marks the closing argument in Derrida's 'White Mythology: Metaphor in the Text of Philosophy': '. . . to explode the reassuring opposition of the metaphoric and the proper, the opposition in which the one and the other have never done anything but reflect and refer to each other in their radiance' (Derrida, *Margins*, pp. 270–1).
27. For the latter position, see Ramachandra Guha, 'Subaltern and Bhadralok Studies', *Economic. and Political Weekly*, **30.33** (19 August, 1995), p. 2058, and Harish Trivedi, 'India and Postcolonial Discourse', in Harish Trivedi and Meenakshi Mukherjee (eds), *Interrogating Post-colonialism: Theory, Text and Context* (Shimla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study, 1996), pp. 231–47.
28. Rabindranath Tagore, *Gora*, trans. Sujit Mukherjee (New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi, 1997); Derrida, *De l'hospitalité* (Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1997). Hereafter cited in text as G and H respectively, with page reference following. I have given a more extended reading of *Gora* in an anthology being edited by Ato Quayson and forthcoming from Cambridge University Press.
29. Christopher Bracken plays interestingly with Derridian concept-metaphors, despite a slight tendency towards unmediated thematizing of philosophemes, in *The Potlatch Papers: A Colonial Case History* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1997), especially pp. 5–31.
30. Assia Djebar's impulse towards placing Delacroix, or the French Captain who occupied Algiers, into teleopoesis, shares something of this impulse from the above of the below, but she foregrounds that subject-position as a woman: see 'Forbidden Gaze, Severed Sound' in *Women of Algiers in their Apartment*, trans. Marjolin de Jaeger (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 1992), pp. 136–40; and *Fantasia: An Algerian Cavalcade*, trans. Dorothy Blair (London: Quartet, 1985), pp. 6–8.
31. Marx, *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, trans. Ben Fowkes (New York: Vintage, 1976), vol. 1, p. 52.
32. Derrida, 'Geopsychoanalysis: . . . and the rest of the world', trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith, in *American Imago* **48.2** (summer 1991), pp. 199–231. Hereafter cited in text as GΨ, with page reference following.
33. To some it may seem incorrect that I say nothing about the use of psychoanalytic vocabulary in Cultural Studies. Over the years, I have often indicated my discomfort with it. To do no more than signal the nature of that discomfort,

and to link it with metropolitan thematizing discourses on 'deconstruction [postmodernism] and politics' by analogy, I will content myself here with quoting a passage from 'Geopsychoanalysis': 'despite all the commotion over such issues as "psychoanalysis and politics", despite the deluge of discussions on this kind of topic that we have witnessed over the last ten or twelve years at least, it has to be acknowledged – indeed all this agitation actually signals the fact – that at present there exists no approach to political problems, no code of political discourse, that has in any rigorous way incorporated the axiomatics of a possible psychoanalysis [to tap the history of the subject responsibly in order to restore agency?] – if a psychoanalysis is possible. . . . I am speaking of discourses emanating from non-analysts as well as others, that of psychoanalysts or crypto-analysts operating in the psychoanalytic milieu and using psychoanalytic terminology' (GΨ, p. 214; translation modified).

34. For 'ontopologist' see Derrida, *Specters*, p. 82. In a recent issue of *The New Yorker* (June 23 and 30, 1997), Salman Rushdie refers to all the literatures of India not in English as 'parochial'.
35. For money as the 'general equivalent', see Marx, *Capital*, vol. 1, pp. 162–3.
36. A text for meditation: 'The decision of thought cannot be an intra-institutional event, an academic moment'. See Derrida, 'The Principle of Reason: the University in the Eyes of its Pupils', *Diacritics*, **13.3** (Fall 1983), p. 19.
37. These two examples are from *The New York Times*, 28 December 1998 (Richard Weir, 'Pay for Play: Aging Athletes Can Still Find Competition in Sports Leagues Run for Fun and Profit', and Kimberley Stevens, 'Snapped Up: Tinsel Trees and Ornaments of Yore', *The City*, pp. 4–6). But examples are everywhere, every day, of course.
38. Locke, 'Internationalism – Friend or Foe of Art?' in *The World Tomorrow* (March, 1925), p. 75. The next quoted passage is from the same page. Here I can only signal the importance of this set – cultural and political nationalisms. See Joseph Stalin, *Marxism and the National-Cultural Question: A Collection of Articles and Speeches* (San Francisco, CA: Proletarian Publishers, 1975); and V. I. Lenin, *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism* (New York: International Publishers, 1993). Although Stalin constantly invokes Lenin in order to legitimize himself, Lenin is speaking of the Northwestern European single nation empires and their connections to the march of Capital, whereas Stalin is speaking of the Russian, Ottoman and Habsburg empires, and the manipulation of their cultures and identities in the interest of forming something like a new empire. Thus their lines lead toward finance capital and linguistic and cultural politics respectively. In this essay, I attempt to show how deconstruction can undo this polarization. For the Indian case, the difference signalled by Locke may be seen in the contrast between '*Mera Bharat Mahan*' – 'my India is great', a politically nationalist slogan – and the music video 'I love my India', written by an Indian woman located, as it happens, in the subcontinent. Corresponding undoings proliferate in globalization, generally with a national-identity tag, under erasure, as that which remains – *ce qui reste*. The sheer usefulness of a deconstructive habit of mind is undeniable here, even as deconstruction questions its usefulness, as in Derrida, 'Passions: "An Oblique Offering"', in David Wood (ed.), *Derrida: A Critical Reader* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), pp. 5–35. If I needed a logo for this footnote, I would choose the Canadian artist Karma Clarke-Davis's 'Untitled', from *Corner Buddha – Karma. Om . . . The Walk of a Nomad*, colour photograph employed in video (final illustration, catalogue, 'Tourists in Our Own Land(s)', Gallery 44 (Toronto), 9 July–8 August 1998) – lit-up outline of part of a bridge against a dark sky, and the oblique neon sign 'OPEN'. . .

39. Virginia Woolf, *A Room of One's Own* (New York: Harcourt, 1929), pp. 4–5, emphasis mine. Hereafter cited in text as RO, with page references following.
40. Gayatri Spivak, *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics* (New York: Methuen, 1987), p. 168.
41. An unrestricted Hegelianism without a recognizable political agenda was announced as early as 1967 in Derrida, 'From Restricted to General Economy: A Hegelianism without Reserve', in *Writing and Difference*, trans. Alan Bass (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1978), pp. 251–77. The quoted passage is from Derrida, *Glas*, pp. 232–3a. If it is hard or incorrect to analogize the philosopheme, it is altogether risky with *Glas*. I offer nonetheles my dry reduction: deconstruction can not only undo Hegel's Eurocentric teleologies, but deconstructive Cultural Studies can aspire to undo the hybrid as *telos*; and at least in theory make us aware of the myriad resistances that cannot be conveniently catalogued.

WORKS CITED

Acuña, Rodolfo F. (1972), *Occupied America: The Chicano's Struggle Toward Liberation* (San Francisco, CA: Canfield Press).

Amin, Samir (1976), *Unequal Development. An Essay on the Social Formation of Peripheral Capitalism*, trans. Brian Pearce (New York: Monthly Review Press).

Aristotle (1991), *The Poetics*, trans. W. Hamilton Fyfe and W. Rhys Roberts (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

Auerbach, Erich (1953), *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*, trans. Willard R. Trask (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

Barrera, Mario (1979), *Race and Class in the Southwest: A Theory of Racial Inequality* (Notre Dame, IL: Notre Dame University Press).

Bhabha, Homi (1994), 'Border Lives: The Art of the Present', in *Location of Culture* (New York: Routledge), pp. 1–18.

Bracken, Christopher (1997), *The Potlatch Papers: A Colonial Case History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Carmichael, Stokeley and Charles V. Hamilton (eds) (1967), *Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America* (New York: Vintage).

Chatterjee, Partha (1994), 'Religious Minorities and the Secular State: Reflections on the Indian Impasse', *Economic and Political Weekly* (9 July), pp. 1768–77.

Chatterjee, Partha (1995), 'Religious Minorities and the Secular State: Reflections on the Indian Impasse', *Public Culture*, **8.1** (Fall).

Curtius, Ernst Robert (1973), *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, trans. Willard R. Trask (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

Derrida, Jacques (1978), 'From Restricted to General Economy: A Hegelianism without Reserve', in *Writing and Difference*, trans. Alan Bass (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press), pp. 251–77.

Derrida, Jacques (1981), 'The Double Session', in *Dissemination*, trans. Barbara Johnson (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press), 173–286.

Derrida, Jacques (1982) 'Differance', in *Margins of Philosophy*, trans. Alan Bass, (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press).

Derrida, Jacques (1983), 'The Principle of Reason: the University in the Eyes of its Pupils', *Diacritics*, **13.3** (Fall).

Derrida, Jacques (1985), *The Ear of the Other: Otobiography, Transference, Translation*, trans. Peggy Kamuf (New York: Schocken Books).

Derrida, Jacques and Mustapha Tlili (eds) (1987), 'The Laws of Reflection: Nelson Mandela, in Admiration', in *For Nelson Mandela* (New York: Seaver Books), pp. 11–42.

Derrida, Jacques (1989), *Of Spirit; Heidegger and the Question*, trans. Geoffrey Bennington and Rachel Bowlby (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press)

Derrida, Jacques (1990), *Glas*, trans. John P. Leavey, Jr and Richard Rand (Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press).

Derrida, Jacques (1991), 'Geopsychoanalysis: . . . "and the rest of the world"', trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith, in *American Imago*, **48.2** (Summer) pp. 199–231.

Derrida, Jacques (1992a), 'This Strange Institution Called Literature', in *Acts of Literature*, ed. Derek Attridge (New York: Routledge), pp. 33–75.

Derrida, Jacques (1992b), 'Shibboleth', in *Acts of Literature*, ed. Derek Attridge (New York: Routledge), pp. 399–400.

Derrida, Jacques (1992c), '*Mochlos*; or, the Conflict of the Faculties', in *Logomachia: The Conflict of the Faculties*, ed. Richard Rand (Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press), pp. 1–34.

Derrida, Jacques (1992d), *Given Time: I. Counterfeit Money*, trans. Peggy Kamuf, (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press).

Derrida, Jacques (1992e), 'Passions: "An Oblique Offering"', in *Derrida: A Critical Reader*, ed. David Wood (Oxford: Blackwell), pp. 5–35.

Derrida, Jacques (1993), *Aporias*, trans. Thomas Dutoit (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press).

Derrida, Jacques (1994), *Specters of Marx: The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning, and the New International*, trans. Peggy Kamuf (New York: Routledge).

Derrida, Jacques (1997a), *Politics of Friendship*, trans. George Collins (New York: Verso).

Derrida, Jacques (1997b), *De l'hospitalité* (Paris: Calmann-Lévy).

Djebar, Assia (1985), *Fantasia: An Algerian Cavalcade*, trans. Dorothy Blair (London: Quartet).

Djebar, Assia (1992), 'Forbidden Gaze, Severed Sound', in *Women of Algiers in their Apartment*, trans. Marjolin de Jaeger (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press), pp. 136–40.

DuBois, W. E. B. (1968), 'The Negro Mind Reaches Out', in *The New Negro: An Interpretation*, ed. Alain Locke (New York: Arno Press), pp. 392–7.

DuBois, W. E. B (1970), *The Selected Writings* (New York: Mentor).

Etiemble, René (1966), *The Crisis in Comparative Literature*, trans. Herbert Weisinger and Georges Joyaux (East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press).

Foner, Philip S. and James S. Allen (eds) (1987), *American Communism and Black Americans: A Documentary History, 1919–1929* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press).

Gilroy, Paul (1987), *'There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack': The Cultural Politics of Race and Nation* (London: Hutchinson).

Gilroy Paul (1993), *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press).

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von (1901), *Conversations with Eckermann*, trans. John Oxenford (Washington: Walter Dunne).

Gramsci, Antonio (1978), 'Some Aspects of the Southern Question', in *Selections from Political Writings, 1924–1926*, trans. Quintin Hoare (New York: International Publishers), pp. 441–62.

Guha, Ramachandra (1993), 'Subaltern and Bhadralok Studies', *Economic and Political Weekly*, **30.33**, 19 August.

Guha, Ranajit, et al. (eds) (1982), *Subaltern Studies: Writings on South Asian History and Society*, vols 1–11 (Delhi: Oxford University Press).

Hall, Stuart (1978), *Women Take Issue: Aspects of Women's Subordination* (London: Hutchinson).
Hall, Stuart (1980), 'Cultural Studies and the Centre: Some Problematics and Problems', in *Culture, Media, Language*, ed. Hall *et al.* (London: Hutchinson), pp. 15–47.
Hall, Stuart (1982), *The Empire Strikes Back: Race and Racism in 70s Britain* (London. Hutchinson).
Heller, Erich (1971), *The Disinherited Mind: Essays in Modem German Literature and Thought* (New York: Barnes & Noble).
Hoggart, Richard (1970), *The Uses of Literacy: Aspects of Working-Class Life, with Special Reference to Publications and Entertainments* (New York: Oxford University Press).
Kingston, Maxine Hong (1976), *The Woman Warrior: Memoirs of a Girlhood Among Ghosts* (New York: Knopf).
Kothari, Ashish, Saloni Suri and Neena Singh (1995), 'People and Protected Areas: Rethinking Conservation in India', *The Ecologist*, **25.5** (Sept/Oct.)
Lenin, V. I. (1993), *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism* (New York: International Publishers).
Locke, Alain (1968), 'The Legacy of the Ancestral Arts', in *The New Negro: An Interpretation*, ed. Alain Locke (New York: Arno Press), pp. 256–8.
Locke, Alain (1924), 'Apropos of Africa', in *Opportunity* (February).
Locke, Alain (1925), 'Internationalism – Friend or Foe of Art?', in *The World Tomorrow* (March).
Mamdani, Mahmood (1996), *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Capitalism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
Marx, Karl (1976), *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, vol. 1, trans. Ben Fowkes (New York: Vintage).
McClintock, Anne and Rob Nixon (1986), 'No Names Apart: The Separation of Word and History in Derrida's "Le Dernier Mot Du Racisme"', in *'Race', Writing, and Difference*, ed. Henry Louis Gates, Jr (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press), pp. 339–53.
McMullen, Ken (1983), *'Ghost Dance'*, a film made for Channel Four (London).
Mooney, Jarnes (1991), *The Ghost-Dance Religion and the Sioux Outbreak of 1890* (Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press).
The New Yorker 23 and 30 June 1997.
Poulet, Georges (1979), *Studies in Human Time*, trans. Elliott Coleman (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press).
Ranger, Terence (1983), 'The Invention of Tradition in Colonial Africa', in *The Invention of Tradition*, ed. Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 211–62.
Saussure, Ferdinand de (1959), *Course in General Linguistics*, trans. Wade Baskin (New York: McGraw-Hill).
Silko, Leslie Marmon (1991), *Almanac of the Dead* (New York: Simon and Schuster).
Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (1987), *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics* (New York: Methuen).
Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (1995), 'Academic Freedom', *Pretexts*, **V** pp. i–ii, 117–56.
Stalin, Joseph (1975), *Marxism and the National-Cultural Question: A Collection of Articles and Speeches* (San Francisco, CA: Proletarian Publishers).
Tagore, Rabindranath (1961), *Rabindra Racanabali*, vol. 11 (Calcutta: W. Bengal Govt. Press).
Tagore, Rabindranath (1997), *Gora*, trans. Sujit Mukherjee (New Delhi: Sabitya Akademi).

Tieghem, Paul Van (1923), *Le Mouvement romantique (Angleterre-Allemagne-Italie-France* (Paris: Vuibert).
Trivedi, Harish (1996), 'India and Postcolonial Discourse', in *Interrogating Post-colonialism: Theory, Text and Context*, ed. Harish Trivedi and Meenakshi Mukherjee (Shimla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study), pp. 231–47.
Woolf, Virginia (1929), *A Room of One's Own* (New York: Harcourt).