THE OTHER QUESTION

Stereotype, discrimination and the discourse of colonialism

To concern oneself with the founding concepts of the entire history of philosophy, to deconstitute them, is not to undertake the work of the philologist or of the classic historian of philosophy. Despite appearances, it is probably the most daring way of making the beginnings of a step outside of philosophy.

Jacques Derrida, "Structure, sign and play"

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

The absence of such a perspective has its own history of political expediency. To recognize the stereotype as an ambivalent mode of knowledge and power demands a theoretical and political response that challenges deterministic or functionalist modes of conceiving of the
relationship between discourse and politics. The analytic of ambivalence questions dogmatic and moralistic positions on the meaning of oppression and discrimination. My reading of colonial discourse suggests that the point of intervention should shift from the ready recognition of images as positive or negative, to an understanding of the processes of subjectification made possible (and plausible) through stereotypical discourse. To judge the stereotyped image on the basis of a prior political normativity is to dismiss it, not to displace it, which is only possible by engaging with its effectivity; with the repertoire of positions of power and resistance, domination and dependence that constructs colonial identification subject (both colonizer and colonized). I do not intend to deconstruct the colonial discourse to reveal its ideological misconceptions or repressions, to exult in its self-reflexivity, or to indulge its liberatory 'excess'. In order to understand the productivity of colonial power it is crucial to construct its regime of truth, not to subject its representations to a normalizing judgement. Only then does it become possible to understand the productive ambivalence of the object of colonial discourse – that 'otherness' which is at once an object of desire and derision, an articulation of difference contained within the fantasy of origin and identity. What such a reading reveals are the boundaries of colonial discourse and it enables a transgression of these limits from the space of that otherness.

The construction of the colonial subject in discourse, and the exercise of colonial power through discourse, demands an articulation of forms of difference – racial and sexual. Such an articulation becomes crucial if it is held that the body is always simultaneously (if conflictually) inscribed in both the economy of pleasure and desire and the economy of discourse, domination and power. I do not wish to conflate, unproblematically, two forms of the marking – and splitting – of the subject nor to globalize two forms of representation. I want to suggest, however, that there is a theoretical space and a political place for such an articulation – in the sense in which that word itself denies an 'original' identity or a 'singularity' to objects of difference -- sexual or racial. If such a view is taken, as Feuchtwang argues in a different context, it follows that the epithets racial or sexual come to be seen as modes of differentiation, realized as multiple, cross-cutting determinations, polymorphous and perverse, always demanding a specific and strategic calculation of their effects. Such is, I believe, the moment of colonial discourse. It is a form of discourse crucial to the binding of a range of differences and discriminations that inform the discursive and political practices of racial and cultural hierarchization.

Before turning to the construction of colonial discourse, I want to discuss briefly the process by which forms of racial/cultural/historical otherness have been marginalized in theoretical texts committed to the
articulation of 'difference', or 'contradiction', in order, it is claimed, to reveal the limits of Western representationalist discourse. In facilitating the passage 'from work to text' and stressing the arbitrary, differential and systemic construction of social and cultural signs, these critical strategies unsettle the idealist quest for meanings that are, most often, intentionalist and nationalist. So much is not in question. What does need to be questioned, however, is the mode of representation of otherness. Where better to raise the question of the subject of racial and cultural difference than in Stephen Heath's masterly analysis of the chiascuro world of Welles's classic, A Touch of Evil? I refer to an area of its analysis which has generated the least comment, that is, Heath's attention to the structuration of the Mexican/US border that circulates through the text affirming and exchanging some notion of 'limited being'. Heath's work departs from the traditional analysis of racial and cultural differences, which identify stereotype and image and elaborate them in a moralistic or nationalistic discourse that affirms the origin and unity of national identity. Heath's attentiveness to the contradictory and diverse sites within the textual system, which construct national/cultural differences in their deployment of the senses of 'foreignness', 'mixedness', 'impurity', as transgressive and corrupting, is extremely relevant. His attention to the turnings of this much neglected subject as sign (not symbol or stereotype) disseminated in the codes (as 'partition', 'exchange', 'naming', 'character', etc.), gives us a useful sense of the circulation and proliferation of racial and cultural otherness. Despite the awareness of the multiple or cross-cutting determinations in the construction of modes of sexual and racial differentiation there is a sense in which Heath's analysis marginalizes otherness. Although I shall argue that the problem of the Mexican/US border is read too singularly, too exclusively under the sign of sexuality, it is not that I am not aware of the many proper and relevant reasons for that 'feminist' focus. The 'entertainment' operated by the realist Hollywood film of the 1950s was always also a containment of the subject in a narrative economy of voyeurism and fetishism. Moreover, the displacement that organizes any textual system, within which the display of difference circulates, demands that the play of 'nationalities' should participate in the sexual positioning, troubling the Law and desire. There is, nevertheless, a singularity and reductiveness in concluding that:

Vargas is the position of desire, its admission and its prohibition. Not surprisingly he has two names: the name of desire is Mexican, Miguel... that of the Law American – Mike... The film uses the border, the play between American and Mexican... at the same time it seeks to hold that play finally in the opposition of purity and mixture which in turn is a version of Law and desire.
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However liberatory it is from one position to see the logic of the text raced ceaselessly between the Ideal Father and the Phallic Mother, in another sense, seeing only one possible articulation of the differential complex 'race-sex', it half colludes with the proffered images of marginality. For if the naming of Vargas is crucially mixed and split in the economy of desire, then there are other mixed economies which make naming and positioning equally problematic 'across the border'. To identify the 'play' on the border as purity and mixture and to see it as an allegory of Law and desire reduces the articulation of racial and sexual difference to what is dangerously close to becoming a circle rather than a spiral of difference. On that basis, it is not possible to construct the polymorphous and perverse collusion between racism and sexism as a mixed economy - for instance, the discourses of American cultural colonialism and Mexican dependency, the fear/desire of miscegenation, the American border as cultural signifier of a pioneering, male 'American' spirit always under threat from races and cultures beyond the border or frontier. If the death of the Father is the interruption on which the narrative is initiated, it is through that death that miscegenation is both possible and deferred; if, again, it is the purpose of the narrative to restore Susan as 'good object', it also becomes its project to deliver Vargas from his racial 'mixedness'.

These questions of race and representation have been pursued in the issue of Screen on the problems of 'Racism, colonialism and cinema'.4 This is a timely and welcome intervention in the debate on realist narrative and its conditions of existence and representability - a debate which has hitherto engaged mainly with the 'subject' of gender and class within the social and textual formations of Western bourgeois society. It would be inappropriate to review this issue of Screen here, but I would like to draw attention to Julianne Burton's 'The politics of aesthetic distance: the presentation of representation in São Bernardo'. Burton produces an interesting reading of Hitzman's São Bernardo as a specific Third World riposte of dualistic metropolitan debates around realism and the possibilities of rupture. Although she doesn't use Barthes, it would be accurate to say that she locates the film as the 'limit-text' of both its own totalitarian social context as well as contemporary theoretical debates on representation.

Again, anti-colonialist objectives are admirably taken up by Robert Stam and Louise Spence in 'Colonialism, racism and representation', with a useful Brechtian emphasis on the politicization of the means of representation, specifically point-of-view and suture. But despite the shift in political objectives and critical methods, there remains in their essay a limiting and traditional reliance on the stereotype as offering, at any one time, a secure point of identification. This is not compensated for (nor contradicted by) their view that, at other times and places, the
same stereotype may be read in a contradictory way or, indeed, be misread. What is, therefore, a simplification in the process of stereotypical representation has a knock-on effect on their central point about the politics of point-of-view. They operate a passive and unitary notion of suture which simplifies the politics and 'aesthetics' of spectator-positioning by ignoring the ambivalent, psychological process of identification which is crucial to the argument. In contrast I suggest, in a very preliminary way, that the stereotype is a complex, ambivalent, contradictory mode of representation, as anxious as it is assertive, and demands not only that we extend our critical and political objectives but that we change the object of analysis itself.

The difference of other cultures is other than the excess of signification or the trajectory of desire. These are theoretical strategies that are necessary to combat 'ethnocentrism' but they cannot, of themselves, reconstructed, represent that otherness. There can be no inevitable sliding from the semiotic activity to the unproblematic reading of other cultural and discursive systems. There is in such readings a will to power and knowledge that, in failing to specify the limits of their own field of enunciation and effectivity, proceeds to individualize otherness as the discovery of their own assumptions.

II

The difference of colonial discourse as an apparatus of power will emerge more fully as this chapter develops. At this stage, however, I shall provide what I take to be the minimum conditions and specifications of such a discourse. It is an apparatus that turns on the recognition and disavowal of racial/cultural/historical differences. Its predominant strategic function is the creation of a space for a 'subject peoples' through the production of knowledges in terms of which surveillance is exercised and a complex form of pleasure/unpleasure is incited. It seeks authorization for its strategies by the production of knowledges of colonizer and colonized which are stereotypical but aesthetically evaluated. The objective of colonial discourse is to construe the colonized as a population of degenerate types on the basis of racial origin, in order to justify conquest and to establish systems of administration and instruction. Despite the play of power within colonial discourse and the shifting positionality of its subjects (for example, effects of class, gender, ideology, different social formations, varied systems of colonization and so on), I am referring to a form of governmentality that in marking out a 'subject nation', appropriates, directs and dominates its various spheres of activity. Therefore, despite the play in the colonial system which is crucial to its exercise of power, colonial discourse produces the colonized as a social reality which is at once an 'other'
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...and yet entirely knowable and visible. It resembles a form of narrative whereby the productivity and circulation of subjects and signs are bound to a reformed and recognizable totality. It employs a system of representation, a regime of truth, that is structurally similar to realism. And it is in order to intervene within that system of representation that Edward Said proposes a semiotic of 'Orientalist' power, examining the varied European discourses which constitute 'the Orient' as a unified racial, geographical, political and cultural zone of the world. Said's analysis is revealing of, and relevant to, colonial discourse:

Philosophically, then, the kind of language, thought, and vision that I have been calling orientalism very generally is a form of radical realism; anyone employing orientalism, which is the habit for dealing with questions, objects, qualities and regions deemed Oriental, will designate, name, point to, fix, what he is talking or thinking about with a word or phrase, which then is considered either to have acquired, or more simply to be, reality... The tense they employ is the timeless eternal; they convey an impression of repetition and strength... For all these functions it is frequently enough to use the simple copula is.

For Said, the copula seems to be the point at which western rationalism preserves the boundaries of sense for itself. Of this, too, Said is aware when he hints continually at a polarity or division at the very centre of Orientalism. It is, on the one hand, a topic of learning, discovery, practice; on the other, it is the site of dreams, images, fantasies, myths, obsessions and requirements. It is a static system of 'synchronic essentialism', a knowledge of 'signifiers of stability' such as the lexicographic and the encyclopaedic. However, this site is continually under threat from diachronic forms of history and narrative, signs of instability. And, finally, this line of thinking is given a shape analogical to the dreamwork, when Said refers explicitly to a distinction between 'an unconscious positivity' which he terms latent Orientalism, and the stated knowledges and views about the Orient which he calls manifest Orientalism.

The originality of this pioneering theory could be extended to engage with the alterity and ambivalence of Orientalist discourse. Said contains this threat by introducing a binarism within the argument which, initially setting up an opposition between these two discursive scenes, finally allows them to be correlated as a congruent system of representation that is unified through a political-ideological intention which, in his words, enables Europe to advance securely and unmetaphorically upon the Orient. Said identifies the content of Orientalism as the unconscious repository of fantasy, imaginative writings and essential ideas; and the form of manifest Orientalism as the historically and discursively

71
determined, diachronic aspect. This division/correlation structure of manifest and latent Orientalism leads to the effectivity of the concept of discourse being undermined by what could be called the polarities of intentionality.

This produces a problem with Said’s use of Foucault’s concepts of power and discourse. The productivity of Foucault’s concept of power/knowledge lies in its refusal of an epistemology which opposes essence/appearance, ideology/science. ‘Pouvoir/Savoir’ places subjects in a relation of power and recognition that is not part of a symmetrical or dialectical relation - self/other, master/slave – which can then be subverted by being inverted. Subjects are always disproportionately placed in opposition or domination through the symbolic decentring of multiple power relations which play the role of support as well as target or adversary. It becomes difficult, then, to conceive of the historical enunciations of colonial discourse without them being either functionally overdetermined or strategically elaborated or displaced by the unconscious scene of latent Orientalism. Equally, it is difficult to conceive of the process of subjectification as a placing within Orientalist or colonial discourse for the dominated subject without the dominant being strategically placed within it too. The terms in which Said’s Orientalism is unified - the intentionality and unidirectionality of colonial power - also unify the subject of colonial enunciation.

This results in Said’s inadequate attention to representation as a concept that articulates the historical and fantasy (as the scene of desire) in the production of the ‘political’ effects of discourse. He rightly rejects a notion of Orientalism as the misrepresentation of an Oriental essence. However, having introduced the concept of ‘discourse’ he does not face up to the problems it creates for an instrumentalist notion of power/knowledge that he seems to require. This problem is summed up by his ready acceptance of the view that, ‘Representations are formations, or as Roland Barthes has said of all the operations of language, they are deformations.’

This brings me to my second point. The closure and coherence attributed to the unconscious pole of colonial discourse and the unpolematised notion of the subject, restrict the effectivity of both power and knowledge. It is not possible to see how power functions productively as incitement and interdiction. Nor would it be possible, without the attribution of ambivalence to relations of power/knowledge, to calculate the traumatic impact of the return of the oppressed – those terrifying stereotypes of savagery, cannibalism, lust and anarchy which are the signal points of identification and alienation, scenes of fear and desire, in colonial texts. It is precisely this function of the stereotype as phobia and fetish that, according to Fanon, threatens the closure of the racial/
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...ternal schema for the colonial subject and opens the royal road to...

There is an underdeveloped passage in Orientalism which, in cutting across the body of the text, articulates the question of power and desire that I now want to take up. It is this:

Atogether an internally structured archive is built up from the literature that belongs to these experiences. Out of this comes a restricted number of typical encapsulations: the journey, the history, the fable, the stereotype, the polemical confrontation. These are the lenses through which the Orient is experienced, and they shape the language, perception, and form of the encounter between East and West. What gives the immense number of encounters some unity, however, is the vacillation I was speaking about earlier. Something patently foreign and distant acquires, for one reason or another, a status more rather than less familiar. One tends to stop judging things either as completely novel or as completely well-known; a new median category emerges, a category that allows one to see new things, things seen for the first time, as versions of a previously known thing. In essence, such a category is not so much a way of receiving new information as it is a method of controlling what seems to be a threat to some established view of things. . . . The threat is muted, familiar values impose themselves, and in the end the mind reduces the pressure upon it by accommodating things to itself as either 'original' or 'repetitious' . . . . The orient at large, therefore, vacillates between the West's contempt for what is familiar and its shivers of delight or fear of novelty.  

What is this other scene of colonial discourse played out around the median category? What is this theory of encapsulation or fixation which moves between the recognition of cultural and racial difference and its disavowal, by affixing the unfamiliar to something established, a form that is repetitious and vacillates between delight and fear? Does the Freudian fable of fetishism (and disavowal) circulate within the discourse of colonial power requiring the articulation of modes of differentiation - sexual and racial - as well as different modes of theoretical discourse - psychoanalytic and historical? The strategic articulation of 'coordinates of knowledge' - racial and sexual - and their inscription in the play of colonial power as modes of differentiation, defence, fixation, hierarchization, is a way of specifying colonial discourse which would be illuminated by reference to Foucault's poststructuralist concept of the dispositif or apparatus. Foucault states that the relation of knowledge and power within the apparatus are always a strategic response to an urgent need at a given historical
moment. The force of colonial and postcolonial discourse as a theoretical and cultural intervention in our contemporary moment represents the urgent need to contest singularities of difference and to articulate diverse 'subjects' of differentiation. Foucault writes:

the apparatus is essentially of a strategic nature, which means assuming that it is a matter of a certain manipulation of relations of forces, either developing them in a particular direction, blocking them, stabilising them, utilising them, etc. The apparatus is thus always inscribed in a play of power, but it is also always linked to certain coordinates of knowledge which issue from it but, to an equal degree, condition it. This is what the apparatus consists in: strategies of relations of forces supporting and supported by, types of knowledge.¹¹

In this spirit I argue for the reading of the stereotype in terms of fetishism. The myth of historical origination – racial purity, cultural priority – produced in relation to the colonial stereotype functions to 'normalize' the multiple beliefs and split subjects that constitute colonial discourse as a consequence of its process of disavowal. The scene of fetishism functions similarly as, at once, a reactivation of the material of original fantasy – the anxiety of castration and sexual difference – as well as a normalization of that difference and disturbance in terms of the fetish object as the substitute for the mother's penis. Within the apparatus of colonial power, the discourses of sexuality and race relate in a process of functional overdetermination, 'because each effect ..., enters into resonance or contradiction with the others and thereby calls for a readjustment or a reworking of the heterogeneous elements that surface at various points.'¹²

There is both a structural and functional justification for reading the racial stereotype of colonial discourse in terms of fetishism.¹³ My rereading of Said establishes the structural link. Fetishism, as the disavowal of difference, is that repetitive scene around the problem of castration. The recognition of sexual difference – as the precondition for the circulation of the chain of absence and presence in the realm of the Symbolic – is disavowed by the fixation on an object that masks that difference and restores an original presence. The functional link between the fixation of the fetish and the stereotype (or the stereotype as fetish) is even more relevant. For fetishism is always a 'play' or vacillation between the archaic affirmation of wholeness/similarity – in Freud's terms: 'All men have penises'; in ours: 'All men have the same skin/race/culture' – and the anxiety associated with lack and difference – again, for Freud 'Some do not have penises'; for us 'Some do not have the same skin/race/culture.' Within discourse, the fetish represents the simultaneous play between metaphor as substitution (masking absence and difference) and
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Metonymy (which contiguously registers the perceived lack). The fetish stereotype gives access to an 'identity' which is predicated as much on mastery and pleasure as it is on anxiety and defence, for it is a form of multiple and contradictory belief in its recognition of difference and disavowal of it. This conflict of pleasure/unpleasure, mastery/defence, knowledge/disavowal, absence/presence, has a fundamental significance for colonial discourse. For the scene of fetishism is also the scene of reactivation and repetition of primal fantasy - the subject's desire for a pure origin that is always threatened by its division, for the subject must be gendered to be engendered, to be spoken.

The stereotype, then, as the primary point of subjectification in colonial discourse, for both colonizer and colonized, is the scene of a fantasized fantasy and defence - the desire for an originality which is again threatened by the differences of race, colour and culture. My contention splendidly caught in Fanon's title Black Skin, White Masks where the disavowal of difference turns the colonial subject into a misfit - a grotesque mimicry or 'doubling' that threatens to split the soul and whole, undifferentiated skin of the ego. The stereotype is not a simplification because it is a false representation of a given reality. It is a simplification because it is an arrested, fixated form of representation that in denying the play of difference (which the negation through the Other permits), constitutes a problem for the representation of the subject in significations of psychic and social relations.

When Fanon talks of the positioning of the subject in the stereotyped discourse of colonialism, he gives further credence to my point. The legends, stories, histories and anecdotes of a colonial culture offer the subject a primordial Either/Or. Either he is fixed in a consciousness of the body as a solely negating activity or as a new kind of man, a new genesis. What is denied the colonial subject, both as colonizer and colonized, is that form of negation which gives access to the recognition of difference. It is that possibility of difference and circulation which would liberate the signifier of skin/culture from the fixations of racial typology, the analytics of blood, ideologies of racial and cultural dominance or degeneration. 'Wherever he goes', Fanon despair, 'the Negro remains a Negro' - his race becomes the ineradicable sign of negative difference in colonial discourses. For the stereotype impedes the circulation and articulation of the signifier of 'race' as anything other than its fixity as racism. We always already know that blacks are licentious, Asians duplicitous. . .

III

There are two 'primal scenes' in Fanon's Black Skins, White Masks: two myths of the origin of the marking of the subject within the racist
practices and discourses of a colonial culture. On one occasion a white
girl fixes Fanon in a look and word as she turns to identify with her
mother. It is a scene which echoes endlessly through his essay. ‘The fact
of blackness’: ‘Look, a Negro . . . Mama, see the Negro! I’m frightened.’
‘What else could it be for me’, Fanon concludes, ‘but an amputation, an
excision, a haemorrhage that spattered my whole body with black
blood.’\(^{16}\) Equally, he stresses the primal moment when the child encoun-
ters racial and cultural stereotypes in children’s fictions, where white
heroes and black demons are proffered as points of ideological and
psychical identification. Such dramas are enacted every day in colonial
societies, says Fanon, employing a theatrical metaphor – the scene –
which emphasizes the visible – the seen. I want to play on both these
senses which refer at once to the site of fantasy and desire and to the
sight of subjectification and power.

The drama underlying these dramatic ‘everyday’ colonial scenes is
not difficult to discern. In each of them the subject turns around the
pivot of the ‘stereotype’ to return to a point of total identification. The
girl’s gaze returns to her mother in the recognition and disavowal of
the Negroid type; the black child turns away from himself, his race, in
his total identification with the positivity of whiteness which is at once
colour and no colour. In the act of disavowal and fixation the colonial
subject is returned to the narcissism of the Imaginary and its identifi-
cation of an ideal ego that is white and whole. For what these primal
scenes illustrate is that looking/hearing/reading as sites of subject-
ification in colonial discourse are evidence of the importance of the
visual and auditory imaginary for the histories of societies.\(^{17}\)

It is in this context that I want to allude briefly to the problematic of
seeing/being seen. I suggest that in order to conceive of the colonial
subject as the effect of power that is productive – disciplinary and
‘pleasurable’ – one has to see the surveillance of colonial power as
functioning in relation to the regime of the scopic drive. That is, the drive
that represents the pleasure in ‘seeing’, which has the look as its object
of desire, is related both to the myth of origins, the primal scene, and
to the problematic of fetishism and locates the surveyed object within
the ‘imaginary’ relation. Like voyeurism, surveillance must depend for
its effectiveness on ‘the active consent’ which is its real or mythical correlate
(but always real as myth) and establishes in the scopic space the illusion
of the object relation’ (my emphasis).\(^{18}\) The ambivalence of this form of
‘consent’ in objectification – real as mythical – is the ambivalence on
which the stereotype turns and illustrates that crucial bind of pleasure
and power that Foucault asserts but, in my view, fails to explain.

My anatomy of colonial discourse remains incomplete until I locate
the stereotype, as an arrested, fetishistic mode of representation within
its field of identification, which I have identified in my description of
Fahrenheit’s primal scenes, as the Lacanian schema of the Imaginary. The
'imaginary' is the transformation that takes place in the subject at the
infantile mirror phase, when it assumes a discrete image which allows
it to postulate a series of equivalences, samenesses, identities, between
the objects of the surrounding world. However, this positioning is itself
problematic, for the subject finds or recognizes itself through an image
which is simultaneously alienating and hence potentially confron-
tational. This is the basis of the close relation between the two forms of
identification complicit with the Imaginary - narcissism and aggressiv-
ity: it is precisely these two forms of identification that constitute the
dominant strategy of colonial power exercised in relation to the stereo-
type which, as a form of multiple and contradictory belief, gives knowl-
dge of difference and simultaneously disavows or masks it. Like the
mirror phase ‘the fullness’ of the stereotype - its image as identity - is
always threatened by ‘lack’.

The construction of colonial discourse is then a complex articulation
of the tropes of fetishism - metaphor and metonymy - and the forms of
narcissistic and aggressive identification available to the Imaginary.
Stereotypical racial discourse is a four-term strategy. There is a tie-
ning between the metaphoric or masking function of the fetish and the
narcissistic object-choice and an opposing alliance between the meta-
onymic figuring of lack and the aggressive phase of the Imaginary. A
repertoire of conflictual positions constitutes the subject in colonial dis-
course. The taking up of any one position, within a specific discursive
form, in a particular historical conjuncture, is thus always problematic
at the site of both fixity and fantasy. It provides a colonial ‘identity’ that
is played out - like all fantasies of originality and origination - in the
pace and space of the disruption and threat from the heterogeneity of
other positions. As a form of splitting and multiple belief, the stereotype
requires, for its successful signification, a continual and repetitive chain
of other stereotypes. The process by which the metaphoric ‘masking’ is
enacted on a lack which must then be concealed gives the stereotype
with its fixity and its phantasmatic quality - the same old stories of the
negro’s animality, the Coolie’s inscrutability or the stupidity of the Irish
must be told (compulsively) again and afresh, and are differently gratify-
ing and terrifying each time.

In any specific colonial discourse the metaphoric/narcissistic and the
metonymic/aggressive positions will function simultaneously, strategi-
cally poised in relation to each other; similar to the moment of alienation
which stands as a threat to Imaginary plenitude, and ‘multiple belief’
which threatens fetishistic disavowal. The subjects of the discourse are
constructed within an apparatus of power which contains, in both senses
of the word, an ‘other’ knowledge - a knowledge that is arrested and
fetishistic and circulates through colonial discourse as that limited form
of otherness that I have called the stereotype. Fanon poignantly describes the effects of this process for a colonized culture:

a continued agony rather than a total disappearance of the pre-existing culture. The culture once living and open to the future, becomes closed, fixed in the colonial status, caught in the yolk of oppression. Both present and mummified, it testifies against its members. . . . The cultural mummification leads to a mummification of individual thinking. . . . As though it were possible for a man to evolve otherwise than within the framework of a culture that recognizes him and that he decides to assume.  

My four-term strategy of the stereotype tries tentatively to provide a structure and a process for the 'subject' of a colonial discourse. I now want to take up the problem of discrimination as the political effect of such a discourse and relate it to the question of 'race' and 'skin'. To that end it is important to remember that the multiple belief that accompanies fetishism not only has disavowal value; it also has 'knowledge value' and it is this that I shall now pursue. In calculating this knowledge value it is crucial to consider what Fanon means when he says that:

There is a quest for the Negro, the Negro is a demand, one cannot get along without him, he is needed, but only if he is made palatable in a certain way. Unfortunately the Negro knocks down the system and breaks the treaties.  

To understand this demand and how the native or Negro is made 'palatable' we must acknowledge some significant differences between the general theory of fetishism and its specific uses for an understanding of racist discourse. First, the fetish of colonial discourse - what Fanon calls the epidermal schema - is not, like the sexual fetish, a secret. Skin, as the key signifier of cultural and racial difference in the stereotype, is the most visible of fetishes, recognized as 'common knowledge' in a range of cultural, political and historical discourses, and plays a public part in the racial drama that is enacted every day in colonial societies. Second, it may be said that sexual fetish is closely linked to the 'good object'; it is the prop that makes the whole object desirable and lovable, facilitates sexual relations and can even promote a form of happiness. The stereotype can also be seen as that particular 'fixated' form of the colonial subject which facilitates colonial relations, and sets up a discursive form of racial and cultural opposition in terms of which colonial power is exercised. If it is claimed that the colonized are most often objects of hate, then we can reply with Freud that

affection and hostility in the treatment of the fetish - which run
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parallel with the disavowal and acknowledgement of castration – are mixed in unequal proportions in different cases, so that the one or the other is more clearly recognisable.22

What this statement recognises is the wide range of the stereotype, from the loyal servant to Satan, from the loved to the hated; a shifting of subject positions in the circulation of colonial power which I tried to account for through the mutability of the metaphoric/narcissistic and metonymic/aggressive system of colonial discourse. What remains to be examined, however, is the construction of the signifier of ‘skin/race’ in those regimes of visibility and discursivity – fetishistic, scopic, imaginary – within which I have located the stereotypes. It is only on that basis that we can construct its ‘knowledge-value’ which will, I hope, enable us to see the place of fantasy in the exercise of colonial power.

My argument relies upon a particular reading of the problematic of representation which, Fanon suggests, is specific to the colonial situation. He writes:

the originality of the colonial context is that the economic substructure is also a superstructure . . . you are rich because you are white, you are white because you are rich. This is why Marxist analysis should always be slightly stretched every time we have to do with the colonial problem.23

Fanon could either be seen to be adhering to a simple reflectionist or determinist notion of cultural/social signification or, more interestingly, he could be read as taking an ‘anti-repressionist’ position (attacking the notion that ideology as misrecognition, or misrepresentation, is the repression of the real). For our purposes I tend towards the latter reading which then provides a ‘visibility’ to the exercise of power; gives force to the argument that skin, as a signifier of discrimination, must be produced or processed as visible. As Paul Abbot says, in a very different context,

whereas repression banishes its object into the unconscious, forgets and attempts to forget the forgetting, discrimination must constantly invite its representations into consciousness, reinforcing the crucial recognition of difference which they embody and revitalising them for the perception on which its effectivity depends. . . . It must sustain itself on the presence of the very difference which is also its object.24

What ‘authorizes’ discrimination, Abbot continues, is the occlusion of the preconstruction or working-up of difference: ‘this repression of production entails that the recognition of difference is procured in an
innocence, as a “nature”; recognition is contrived as primary cognition, spontaneous effect of the “evidence of the visible”.25

This is precisely the kind of recognition, as spontaneous and visible, that is attributed to the stereotype. The difference of the object of discrimination is at once visible and natural – colour as the cultural/political sign of inferiority or degeneracy, skin as its natural ‘identity’. However, Abbot’s account stops at the point of ‘identification’ and strangely colludes with the success of discriminatory practices by suggesting that their representations require only the repression of the working-up of difference; to argue otherwise, according to him, would be to put the subject in ‘an impossible awareness, since it would run into consciousness the heterogeneity of the subject as a place of articulation’.26

Despite his awareness of the crucial recognition of difference for discrimination and its problematicization of repression, Abbot is trapped in his unitary place of articulation. He comes close to suggesting that it is possible, however momentarily and illusorily, for the perpetrator of the discriminatory discourse to be in a position that is unmarked by the discourse to the extent to which the object of discrimination is deemed natural and visible. What Abbot neglects is the facilitating role of contradiction and heterogeneity in the construction of authoritarian practices and their strategic, discursive fixations.

My concept of stereotype-as-suture is a recognition of the ambivalence of that authority and those orders of identification. The role of fetishistic identification, in the construction of discriminatory knowledges that depend on the ‘presence of difference’, is to provide a process of splitting and multiple/contradictory belief at the point of enunciation and subjectification. It is this crucial splitting of the ego which is represented in Fanon’s description of the construction of the colonized subject as effect of stereotypical discourse: the subject primordially fixed and yet triply split between the incongruent knowledges of body, race, ancestors. Assailed by the stereotype, ‘the corporeal schema crumbled, its place taken by a racial epidermal schema... It was no longer a question of being aware of my body in the third person but in a triple person... I was not given one, but two, three places.’27

This process is best understood in terms of the articulation of multiple belief that Freud proposes in his essay on fetishism. It is a non-repressive form of knowledge that allows for the possibility of simultaneously embracing two contradictory beliefs, one official and one secret, one archaic and one progressive, one that allows the myth of origins, the other that articulates difference and division. Its knowledge ‘value’ lies in its orientation as a defence towards external reality, and provides, in Metz’s words,
THE OTHER QUESTION

the lasting matrix, the effective prototype of all those splittings of belief which man will henceforth be capable of in the most varied domains, of all the infinitely complex unconscious and occasionally conscious interactions which he will allow himself between believing and not-believing.28

It is through this notion of splitting and multiple belief that I believe, becomes easier to see the kind of knowledge and fantasy, power and pleasure, that informs the particular regime of visibility deployed in normal discourse. The visibility of the racial/colonial Other is at once a point of identity (‘Look, a Negro’) and at the same time a problem for the attempted closure within discourse. For the recognition of difference to ‘imaginarily’ points of identity and origin — such as black and white — is disturbed by the representation of splitting in the discourse. What enabled the play between the metaphorical/narcissistic and metonymic/aggressive moments in colonial discourse — that four-part strategy of the stereotype — crucially recognizes the prefiguring of desire as a potentially inflammatory, disturbing force in all those regimes of ‘originality’ that I have brought together. In the objectification of the scopic drive there is always the threatened return of the look; in the identification of the imaginary relation there is always the alienating other (or mirror) which ideally returns its image to the subject; and in that form of substitution and fixation that is fetishism there is always the trace of loss, absence. To put it succinctly, the recognition and disavowal of ‘difference’ is always disturbed by the question of its re-presentation or construction.

The stereotype is in that sense an ‘impossible’ object. For that very reason the exertions of the ‘official knowledges’ of colonialism — pseudo-scientific, typological, legal-administrative, eugenicist — are articulated at the point of their production of meaning and power with the fantasy that dramatizes the impossible desire for a pure, undifferentiated origin. Not itself the object of desire but its setting, not an ascription of prior identities but their production in the syntax of the scenario of racist discourse, colonial fantasy plays a crucial part in those everyday scenes of subjectification in a colonial society which Fanon refers to repeatedly. Like fantasies of the origins of sexuality, the productions of ‘colonial desire’ mark the discourse as ‘a favoured spot for the most primitive defensive reactions such as turning against oneself, into an opposite, projection, negation’.29

The problem of origin as the problematic of racist, stereotypical knowledge is a complex one and what I have said about its construction will come clear in this illustration from Fanon. Stereotyping is not the setting up of a false image which becomes the scapegoat of discriminatory practices. It is a much more ambivalent text of projection and re-projection, metaphoric and metonymic strategies, displacement, over-
determination, guilt, aggressivity; the masking and splitting of 'official' and phantasmatic knowledges to construct the positionalities and oppositionalities of racist discourse:

My body was given back to me sprawled out, distorted, recoloured, clad in mourning in that white winter day. The Negro is an animal, the Negro is bad, the Negro is mean, the Negro is ugly; look, a nigger, it's cold, the nigger is shivering, the nigger is shivering because he is cold, the little boy is trembling because he is afraid of the nigger, the nigger is shivering with cold, that cold that goes through your bones, the handsome little boy is trembling because he thinks that the nigger is quivering with rage, the little white boy throws himself into his mother's arms: Mama, the nigger's going to eat me up. 30

It is the scenario of colonial fantasy which, in staging the ambivalence of desire, articulates the demand for the Negro which the Negro disrupts. For the stereotype is at once a substitute and a shadow. By acceding to the wildest fantasies (in the popular sense) of the colonizer, the stereotyped Other reveals something of the 'fantasy' (as desire, defence) of that position of mastery. For if 'skin' in racist discourse is the visibility of darkness, and a prime signifier of the body and its social and cultural correlates, then we are bound to remember what Karl Abraham says in his seminal work on the scopic drive: 31 The pleasure-value of darkness is a withdrawal in order to know nothing of the external world. Its symbolic meaning, however, is thoroughly ambivalent. Darkness signifies at once both birth and death; it is in all cases a desire to return to the fullness of the mother, a desire for an unbroken and undifferentiated line of vision and origin.

But surely there is another scene of colonial discourse in which the native or Negro meets the demand of colonial discourse; where the subverting 'split' is recuperable within a strategy of social and political control. It is recognizably true that the chain of stereotypical signification is curiously mixed and split, polymorphous and perverse, an articulation of multiple belief. The black is both savage (cannibal) and yet the most obedient and dignified of servants (the bearer of food); he is the embodiment of rampant sexuality and yet innocent as a child; he is mystical, primitive, simple-minded and yet the most worldly and accomplished liar, and manipulator of social forces. In each case what is being dramatized is a separation - between races, cultures, histories, within histories - a separation between before and after that repeats obsessively the mythical moment of disjunction.

Despite the structural similarities with the play of need and desire in primal fantasies, the colonial fantasy does not try to cover up that moment of separation. It is more ambivalent. On the one hand, it pro-
poses a teleology - under certain conditions of colonial domination and
control the native is progressively reformable. On the other, however, it
effectively displays the 'separation', makes it more visible. It is the
visibility of this separation which, in denying the colonized the capacities
of self-government, independence, Western modes of civility, lends
authority to the official version and mission of colonial power.

Racist stereotypical discourse, in its colonial moment, inscribes a form
of governmentality that is informed by a productive splitting in its
constitution of knowledge and exercise of power. Some of its practices
recognize the difference of race, culture and history as elaborated by
stereotypical knowledges, racial theories, administrative colonial experi-
ence, and on that basis institutionalize a range of political and cultural
ideologies that are prejudicial, discriminatory, vestigial, archaic, 'myth-
ical', and, crucially, are recognized as being so. By 'knowing' the native
population in these terms, discriminatory and authoritarian forms of
political control are considered appropriate. The colonized population
is then deemed to be both the cause and effect of the system, imprisoned
in the circle of interpretation. What is visible is the necessity of such
rule which is justified by those moralistic and normative ideologies of
amelioration recognized as the Civilizing Mission or the White Man's
Burden. However, there coexist within the same apparatus of colonial
power, modern systems and sciences of government, progressive 'West-
ern' forms of social and economic organization which provide the mani-
fest justification for the project of colonialism - an argument which, in
part, impressed Karl Marx. It is on the site of this coexistence that
strategies of hierarchization and marginalization are employed in the
management of colonial societies. And if my deduction from Fanon
about the peculiar visibility of colonial power is justified, then I would
extend that to say that it is a form of governmentality in which the
ideological space functions in more openly collaborative ways with
political and economic exigencies. The barracks stands by the church
which stands by the schoolroom; the cantonment stands hard by the
civil lines'. Such visibility of the institutions and apparatuses of power
is possible because the exercise of colonial power makes their *relationship*
obscure, produces them as fetishes, spectacles of a 'natural'/racial pre-
eminence. Only the seat of government is always elsewhere - alien
and separate by that distance upon which surveillance depends for its
strategies of objectification, normalization and discipline.

The last word belongs to Fanon:

this behaviour [of the colonizer] betrays a determination to objec-
tify, to confine, to imprison, to harden. Phrases such as 'I know
them', 'that's the way they are', show this maximum objectification
successfully achieved. . . . There is on the one hand a culture in
which qualities of dynamism, of growth, of depth can be recognised. As against this, [in colonial cultures] we find characteristics, curiosities, things, never a structure."