

Diaspora and Migrancy : Theorizing a Literature of the In-Between

Sukalpa Bhattacharjee

Diaspora and migrancy have acquired a critical centrality in contemporary cultural discourse because they raise important questions about the nature of Post-colonial diaspora, the role of Third World immigrants and the functions of metropolitan academic institutions. The uprooting of post-colonial populations has generated a vocabulary of migrancy and diaspora and has also raised questions about the role of post-colonial intellectuals in the construction of diasporic consciousness. Narratives of migrancy and diaspora have always provided for a productive site for post-colonial resistance with the (dis)location of post-colonial intellectuals in the metropolis. That is how the metropolitan discourses have framed contemporary conceptions of hybridity and migrancy. The hegemony of the post-colonial and post-modern theorizations of power and identity have not adequately addressed the nexus of historical, political, economic, cultural and ideological forces affecting the construction and consumption of post-colonial realities and representations, which involve border crossings of the post-colonial and the post-modern. The figure of migrancy has succeeded in drawing attention to the unrepresented 'in between' of the post-colonial and the post-modern, which constitutes the marginalized indigenous people, the subalterns, indigenous and aboriginal women, refugees, internees and immigrant writers. Narratives of migrancy and diaspora substantiate the conceptualization of the 'in-between', because they question essentialist models and the ideology of a unified natural/cultural norm, one that underpins the centre/margin model of colonialist discourse. They also question the simpler kinds of theories of nativism which

suggest that decolonization can be affected by a recovery or reconstruction of pre-colonial societies. The most recent and most socially significant diasporic movements have been those of colonized people(s) back to the metropolitan centres. In recent times, the notion of a 'diasporic identity' has been adopted by many writers as a positive affirmation of their hybridity. However, migrancy, diaspora and exile are sometimes used as politically charged words emptied of their histories of pain and suffering. The present study takes note of the cross-cultural facets of these terms but emphasizes more the pain, loss of 'self' and the paradox of the identity construction of migrant and diasporic cultures. The 'in-between' as a metaphor of place/non-place, border/non-border, presence/non-presence is always already the space for the migrant, the traveller who so free in his physical and mental movement beyond the shackles of national history and politics. A whole mythology of migrancy and a concomitant oppositional politics sees the development of the 'migrant sensibility' to be "one of the central themes of this century of displaced persons."¹ The migrant sensibility is not only endowed with the freedom and facility to construct its own (contingent) truths, she/he makes it a singular repository of experience and resistance as well. The cultural productions of 'cosmopolitan celebrities' in the metropolitan institutions have been increasingly forming the critical archival material of alternative canons. The language of migrancy and diaspora has gained wide currency among today's theorists of identity and authority. Edward Said's essay, "Third World Intellectuals and Metropolitan Culture" for example, foregrounds the "exile figure" as the most authentic embodiment of the post-colonial intellectual. In another essay entitled, "Identity, Authority and Freedom : The Potentate and the Traveller", Said has suggested that "our model for

1. Salman Rushdie, "The Location of Brazil", *Imaginary Homelands : Essays and Criticism 1981-1991*, London : Granta and Viking, 1991, p. 124

academic freedom" should be "the migrant or traveller."² The rhetoric of migrancy, exile and diaspora owes much of its credibility to the massive and uneven uprooting of "Third World" people(s) particularly after large scale decolonization in the 1960s. The effect of mass migration owes much to the economic and political forces behind immigration. Salman Rushdie thus observes :

The effect of mass migration has been the creation of radically new types of human being : people who root themselves in ideas rather than places, in memories as much as in material things; people who have been obliged to define themselves—because they are so defined by others—by their otherness; people in whose deepest selves strange fusions occur and where they find themselves.³

However, discourses of migrancy and diaspora in post-modern and post-colonial studies by emphasizing mostly the mental or psychological processes of migration, dematerialize the migrant into an abstract thing. The post-colonial account of Third World immigration fails to describe factors that fracture immigrant experience, especially in terms of location, identity and culture. The significant question here is, how can one belong to a culture or 'identity', when one is already conditioned by the exigencies of neocolonial global capitalism in the New World Order, which creates a sense of multiple belonging? The post-colonial has also not adequately described the distinctly class and gender differentiated nature of immigrant experience.

The justification for migrancy as a subject of the '*in-between*' lies in the notion of margins in immigrant sensibility. Margins

2. Edward Said, "Identity, Authority and Freedom : The Potentate and the Traveller," *Transitions* 54, 1991, pp. 131-50

3. Salman Rushdie, "The Location of Brazil", *Imaginary Homelands : Essays and Criticism 1981-1991*, London : Granta and Viking, 1991, p. 124.

become significant metaphors in migrant literatures, waiting to be destroyed, replaced, expanded and incorporated as new territorial acquisitions, as novel 'fields' of inquiry. The migrant writer's project is defined as one of drawing new or imaginary borders, of recreating and reclaiming new or imaginary territories. The artistic strength of a migrant sensibility is drawn from a sense of an urgency to recover and so although fractured, the migrant imagination is an imperializing consciousness, imposing itself upon the world. However, one detects two variations in migrancy—one invokes an existential condition of homelessness with a concomitant attitude of autonomy and detachment as the privileged locus of imaginative experience. The other validates multiplicity and hybridity of subject positions, generating a feeling of belonging to several, even too many homes. But, the image of the intellectual as an embattled figure of exile is not new; major icons of Modernism like Conrad, Joyce, James, Pound and T.S. Eliot embody and represent exile as a painful yet exquisitely enabling experience for the artistic consciousness. What is new in migrancy is the delinking of distress from dislocation and the attendant idea of belonging everywhere by belonging nowhere. Spivak says that the effect of the 'real' cannot be expressed in discursive domains alone but by situating simultaneously an 'in' and 'out', a play of difference within the discourse that speaks of realities. The question is, does the self-declared modernist mode of 'exile' posit a dynamics of difference by shedding some of its artistic archetypes like the dialectical double bind between loss and gain, deprivation and surplus, alienation and unity? What is lost in this dialectic is the play of difference.⁴ Even the postmodernist talk of the celebration of the experience of loss in terms of the plural and the partial downloads the same exegetical apparatus of modernism. Therefore, situating

4. Gayatri Spivak, "The Rani of Sirmur," *Europe and Its Others*, F. Barker et al., Colchester, University of Essex Press,(?) Vol. I, 128-151

the alternate space of experience within the discourse of theory assumes its own exterior in a textual juxtaposition between the artistic drives of modernism and postmodern celebration of that drive. The experience of exile, for example, is such a juxtaposition between belonging to a genre and subject, interrupted by the loss of the same, a play between 'exile from' and 'exile to', both crossing out its site of identification. This opens up the possibility of describing the exile as an '*in-between*' without anchoring in a modernist pre-exiled location and shifting to a postmodern site of loss which really means something more new than what is left behind. So locating exile in the '*in-between*' space is a normative re-articulation of the effect of the real, a chain of shifting signification that iterates the effects of migration to places of exile.

The post-colonial can be divided into two basic identities : the national and the migrant. The migrant seeks to assimilate into the metropolis while the national lives segregated from the metropolis within the metropolis.⁵ Again, a distinction may be drawn between "eternal exile" and permanent migrancy. "Eternal exile" is a painful condition since "exile is a soulless country".⁶ On the other hand, the state of permanent migrancy emanates an exuberance that dissipates the pain of multiple dislocation and translates migrancy into a positive and prolific idiom.⁷ Instead of disempowering the self, dislocation actually opens up an abundance of alternative locations, allowing the individual to own several different 'homes' by first becoming 'homeless'. Notwithstanding these

5. Salman Rushdie's *Satanic Verses* (New York : Viking, 1989) offers this prescriptive of the two post-colonial identities in the figures of Saladin (migrant) and Iman (national).

6. *Ibid.*, p. 208.

7. Naipaul's position for example may be characterized as one of eternal exile, while Rushdie's may be defined as one of permanent migrancy.

differences, however, there is one feature shared by both paradigms : a de-territorialized consciousness freed from such collectives as race, class, gender or nation, an unattached imagination that conveniently can become cosmopolitan and subaltern, alternately or simultaneously. However, in emphasizing a de-territorialized position it must be kept in mind that the views of immigrant Indian writers such as Naipaul and Rushdie are quite different from many African writers who have tried to re-territorialize themselves. Unlike immigrant Indian writing, there is an obdurate presence of the local in African writings. The Indian immigrant writers like Rushdie and Naipaul as de-territorialized, migrant cultural wanderers enjoy a floating position which according to them, is a great source of artistic inspiration. Rushdie in *Imaginary Homelands* says that imagination works best when it is most free. Besides, tracing one's identity is a complex process. For example, the word 'Indian' is such a scattered concept that one cannot conceptualize it in the framework of Colonial/ Post-colonial. Rushdie, for example, mentions that "Indian writers in England include political exiles, first generation migrants, affluent expatriates whose residence here is frequently temporary," naturalized Britons, people born here who may have never have laid eyes on the subcontinent,⁸ but on whose 'being' the conflictual currents of identity claims, have been inscribed. Although established parameters of post-colonial and post-modern criticism have described the politics of inclusion and exclusion from/within dominant canons, the struggle of identities to come in or move out of the established canons of literature and criticism have not been adequately described. In other words, the processes involved in the trafficking of so-called minority and majority identities across the post-colonial and post-modern categories of hegemony/counter-hegemony, in relation to fixed 'centres'

8. Salman Rushdie, "Imaginary Homelands" in *Imaginary Homelands: Essays and Criticism* (1981-1991), London: Granta and Viking, p. 17.

and 'margins' have not been specified. Therefore, this paper seeks to argue that post-colonial and post-modern studies do not highlight the disparity of discourses and descriptions that take place inside and outside the defined spaces of hegemony among recognized identities and those seeking a self-definition. One of the aspects of such a self-definition is the location of a 'home'—a place or locale to which one belongs, one's language, one's culture. Distance from 'home', displacement or forced evacuation from home (land) and journey from home/culture constitutes the state of exile, migrancy, diaspora or expatriation. For a creative artist, distance from home is a major stimulus to write because exile sometimes creates the mind of isolation which is the nearest thing to freedom. Writers in various modes of exile have utilized their conditions of exile in various ways. One needs to make a departure from the conventional idea of a single 'home' from which one moves out to return or never to return. For the new subject, cross-pollinated by post-modernism and post-colonialism, the play of home and homelessness is created from his journey across cultures, so that he belongs not only to one culture or home but to multiple homes. Therefore her/his problem of 'home' is not an absence of belonging, but of belonging to too many places—an excess of belonging. A migrant is said to have floated upward from history and so her/his journey across histori(es) and culture(s) of the world transforms the myth of her/his ontological unbelonging to a larger myth of excess of belonging. This dialectic of belonging and unbelonging constitutes one of the social conditions of the Third World subject into becoming a subject of the *'in-between'*. The best thing about such subjects is their hopefulness—an urge to break down all stable semiology and represent a more autonomous articulation. The worst thing about these subjects is what, Rushdie calls "the emptiness of one's luggage" — a feeling of having floated upward from history and from time. This unique characteristic of 'emptiness' and racial ambiguity of such a subject is a part of the Jewish experience.

While one underscores this 'racial' dimension, it is nevertheless important to emphasize that the sense of 'racial' impurity condensed into the name "'Jew' was projected outwards onto a series of others—slaves, gypsies, homosexuals, dissidents, the mentally ill, and so on."⁹ It is in relation to such a situation that Lyotard writes of 'the Jews' -

I use the lower case to indicate that I am not thinking of a nation. I make it plural to signify that it is neither a figure nor a political-Zionism), religious (Judaism) or philosophical (Jewish philosophy) subject that I put forward in this name. I use quotation marks to avoid confusing these 'Jews' with real Jews. What is most real about real Jews is that Europe, in any case, does not know what to do with them. Christians demand their conversion; monarchs expel them; republics assimilate them; Nazis exterminate them. 'The Jews' are the object of a dismissal with which Jews, in particular, are afflicted in reality.¹⁰

The epistemic violence inscribed by the horror of the Holocaust has caused a serial erasure—seriasure (a Derridean neologism) of Jewish identity. Seriasure engenders a certain disjointure in the event of the Holocaust itself, and not merely around it. It relays an unrepresentable breakpoint that will never be part of any memory, any experience or any concept, maintaining within itself the disjointure of an irreducible silence. In a more complex formation like the Jewish-American, the protagonist attempts to create a 'space' that operates as an aporia and attempts at self-definition as an unconscious votary of the Jewish Renaissance. Each time an attempt is made to construct a Jewish-American identity, it results in an erasure. It never seems possible to reconcile the two warring identities of the 'Jew' and the 'American'.

9. Marcus A. Doel, "Holocaust Topologies: Singularity, Politics, Space", *Political Geography*, Vol. 15, No. 6/7, 1996, p. 458.

10. J. F. Lyotard, *Heidegger and 'The Jews'*, Minneapolis: Minnesota university Press, 1990, P. 3.

The 'Jew' cannot be represented in the nationalist discourse of the Third World nor can a Jewish identity be problematized in the multicultural space of the First World or the Second World. The fuzziness of such an identity construction(s) find textual representation in the writings of authors like the Australian aboriginal Sally Morgan, the Ameri-Indian Paula Gunn Allen and the Trini-Indian V.S. Naipaul. The unrepresentability of the Jewish experience for example, finds representation also in the Jewish-American writer, Stanley Elkin's *The Rabbi of Lud*.

Again, the Carib-Indian experience of the Indian diaspora, quite like and yet unlike the Jewish-American case is an expansion of the colonial project. Under the colonial yoke, groups of India people from the rural class, labourers, artisans and peasants were transported across the 'black waters' (*Kalapani*) as indentured labourers to West Indies. These Indian 'labourers', who crossed the black waters were transferred from one kind of colonialism (Indian) to another kind of colonialism in the West Indies, while having the imaginary of the Indian nation in their psyche. Theirs was an experience of double colonization, and so their mind and memory constantly sought to distinguish between their own (Indian) nation under colonial rule and their locale of migration—West Indies under a different kind of colonial rule. With time and the stress of 'writing' and 'erasure' in their memories, their own nation was relegated to a fuzzy distance as a past, illegibly inscribed on the present. The confusion produced by two kinds of colonialism created a gap between the 'real' and the 'imaginary' in such a way that the 'real' became the 'imaginary'. Indian nationhood became an abstract idea and India became the 'Imaginary homeland'. In post-colonial West Indies, with the expansion of the generations of the indentured labourers, the question of their identity became more complex and problematic. What could the second or third generation of Indian migrants call themselves—an Indian? a West Indian? How could one

describe one's story of migration in one's inscription of identity by the 'self' and by the 'other' The attempt to juxtapose the imagined nation, India with the present location in the West Indies generated questions of belonging and unbelonging, 'home' and 'homelessness'. In search of a 'home' or 'belonging', could an Indian migrant in the West Indies privilege his/her 'Indian' identity over the West Indian identity? The privileging of the 'Indian' identity over the West Indian identity seems an absurd exercise in the context of the new generations of Indian migrants, who have never known India but had drawn a faint image of a nation to which they were told they belonged. For this generation it was not a question of being *either* 'West Indian' or 'Indian' but *neither* 'West Indian' *nor* 'Indian'—a third possibility that goes beyond the stereotype of these identities. This third possibility of identity construction is the unrepresented '*in-between*', which is the lack, the absence of a definite identity and a definite home. In post-colonial West Indies, the idea of a 'home' became more ambivalent. Trinidad emerged as a post-colonial urban centre, releasing currents of hybridity of identities and cultures. The first generation of Indian migrants in Trinidad still tried to hold on to 'a sense of themselves' through observance of rituals and traditions, which seemed like 'empty instructions' and 'outgrown habits' by the generations that followed. The image of the Indian 'home' in Trinidad was an archaic presence with its dark and backward looking rituals which had no more meaning to the new 'Trini-Indian' or the 'Carib-Indian' generation, than the romantic fantasies of escapist stories. V.S. Naipaul the Trinidad born Carib-Indian artist is a master of the kind of discreet irony contained in the word 'home'. Naipaul's *A House for Mr Biswas* is an explication of the unrepresented irony of 'home' and '(un) belonging'.¹¹

11. Concepts of 'home' and 'homelessness' have been elaborated in Andrea Gure's book, *Writers in Exile: The Creative Use of Home in Modern Literature*, New Jersey: Humanities Press Inc., 1981.

The quest for 'home' and the dialectic of belonging and unbelonging is however linked to the quest for personal and racial/cultural identity. Since the 1970s, the writings of indigenous or 'First' people in white settler colonies have emerged as another important constituency located at once within and without existing forms of post-colonial self-expression. As mentioned earlier, aboriginal writers in Australia, such as Oodgeroo Noonuccal, Sally Morgan or Maori New Zealanders like Witi Ihimaera and Patricia Grace or native American writers like Paula Gunn Allen reflect this quest for personal and cultural identity and the belief that writing is an integral part of self-definition. The emphasis in such cases, is on historical reconstruction through personal myths, family albums and the memories of the older generations.

Australian aboriginal writing and Native American writing has been emphasized as a part of the wider genre of Indigenous writing, which constitutes the politico-aesthetics of the histories of diaspora and migrancy. Australian aboriginality is an unique case of an assimilative state—an admission of conflicting and hybrid cultural allegiances. Indigenous Australians of the late twentieth century see their own history of the last two hundred years as "inextricably bound up with that of whites."¹² Although they emphasize a reconstruction of their own Koore cultural memories and histories, the Australian aboriginals also believe that aboriginality forms a composite part of Australia. As in the West Indies, aboriginals in Australia strive to fill those spaces where mother tongues were erased or lost. While aboriginal writers like Mudrooroo and Sally Morgan focus their energies on revising the language, narrative styles and historical representations of the colonizer, their aim is not to create a binary opposite of the Colonial representation. Rather it is a

12. Elleke Boehmer, "Postcolonialism and Beyond" in *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature: Migrant Metaphors*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

representation beyond the black/white or colonial/post-colonial dichotomy of cultural constructs. Aboriginal Australian writing accentuates hybridity and seeks to (re)write indigenous narratives using so-called 'white forms' like the novel.

It constitutes a weaving, constantly and creatively, of the colonial and the post-colonial, Modern and the post-modern creating an '*in-between*' of what is native and what is alien. This involves a crossing of boundaries set by the fine binaries of colonial power/knowledge and post-colonial appropriation of the colonial rule. Crossing boundaries means a new interest in the provisional and fragmentary aspects of signification, the constructed nature of cultural or personal identity and a transgression of the parameters of grand narratives. Indigenous writers are conscious of the inevitability of a mixing of cultural perspectives of the native and the colonizer. A cultural reconciliation of the two perspectives is perhaps the best way of preserving the cultural difference. Ironically, it is in 'border crossing' of the native and its 'other' that the native reclaims his/her own 'cultural matrix'. Indigenous writers attempt to show that despite long years of deprecation, the cultural matrix of the 'native' can be claimed and reclaimed as a 'present' of the Mythic past. Sally Morgan's *My Place* (1987) is such an aboriginal text, which seeks to reconstruct aboriginal history and engage in giving an aboriginal interpretation to the past. Aboriginal writers hold that indigenous traditions extend back to pre-colonial times in an unbroken line. In cases where models for indigenous writing is not available closer to home, indigenous writers have tried to borrow the rhetoric of other decolonizing worlds. However, indigenous rhetoric has always maintained a distinctness from the rhetoric of anti-colonial struggle or nationalist ascertains, in their hybridity. There seems to be an apparent contradiction in the fact that indigenous cultures represent their distinctness in their hybridity. An attempt to recreate aboriginal cultural authenticity is related to how

well the non-aboriginal is adopted and translated. It is an attempt to define the 'self' in the translation of the 'other'. Such a point about hybridity has been made by Mudrooroo, one of the most prolific of aboriginal writers. Therefore, "the aboriginal writer is a Janus-type figure, with one face turned to the past and the other to the future while existing in a post-modern, multicultural Australia."¹³

In the context of a multicultural America also, the American-Indian or a native American subject, like the aboriginal subject, is a Janus-type figure in the present struggling to reconstruct a history of the past and future. There were first of all no native American texts until the Whites decided to collaborate with Indians and make them in the nineteenth century. With a few exceptions, Indian texts did not begin to be produced until the 1830s, when the eastern tribes were forcibly removed west of the Mississippi. It was then that Indians, still popularly believed to have no culture of their own and so without the capacity for cultural contribution, were accorded a history—one which began when a particular tribe resisted White encroachment. Indian resistance was not new, having commenced almost at the first moment of White invasion; what was new after 1830 was an interest in the Indians' own perspectives on this 'history'. Thus, a majority of these early Native American texts were attempts to preserve, complete or correct the record inscribed by Whites as a contribution to history.

A historical account of the disturbing evidence of colonialism in the Native American's life narratives could be gathered from narrated autobiographies by Native American writers. But, written personal narrative is a Euro-American genre; its form is inherently colonial and generally recognized as such, so much so that this awareness is currently generating

13. Mudrooroo Narogin, *Writing from the Fringe*, Melbourne: Hyland House, 1990 and quoted in *Ibid.*

experimentation in forms that will minimize the domination of native by non-native inscription.¹⁴ The recognition by critics of the imbalance of power in such collaborative process between the native and the non-native, has been beneficial to the interpretation of collaborative inscription of personal narrative. It has been critical in its search for less colonial inscription strategies and narrowly conceived application of Colonial theory which invites interpretation of native collaborators as victims. Such a characterization risks resuscitation of very powerful but denigrating stereotypes. Thus, post-colonial theory can become a dangerously reductive stance.

Therefore, the labelling of a terrain interrupted by contrary sense of belonging constitutes the discursive representation of an '*in-between*' space. The contrariness is presented as a settled imagery fixed in certain sites and locations. Notwithstanding such a virtuous presentation of a contrary, a critic in Saidean terms looks into the textuality of diffusing the contrariness. Contra- Said, one can read the nuances of appropriation of the contrary in several layers of conflicts nascent within the contrary. The best mode of wording the textuality could be a simultaneous unpacking and distributing of fragments from within while relating each such fragment to its opposing notions. In a Cartesean sense, neither the text nor the world can become a whole or a totality in this unpacking of fragments.

The narrativization of identity following a ethico-political determination is a technique of representation that assumes a stable form. But the question is what kind of politics guarantees the stability of such a politic. Can the spaces traversed by a migrant collective be described without the

14. Paul Smith and John Mowitt's Volume, *Discerning the Subject*, (Minnesota: Minneapolis University Press, 1994) presents the argument that women's autobiography feuds off stereotypes of exploitation, objectification and oppression of women.

traces of its movement? Does the crossing over of temporalities produce a narrative unity in its linear history? Does it entail juxtaposition of various appearances and forms of settlement rather than the reality of displacements? So the narrative strategy is short circuited into a linear narrativization of a set of markers with its usual conventional signification. The question for a critic is, how to release these significations from its stereotypical reproductions. The significant political question is, do nation(s), states, communiti(es) as settled signifiers occupy a prior place over the figurative or the imaginary. The politics of appearances encoded in a unifying narrative could be contrasted from this position of prioritizing the imaginary to unpack the consensual meaning and describe a position below such constructions. Taking the current mode of argument to its local end, one can locate a contradiction between the preference of the 'imaginary' and the figurative over the 'real' and the reality of subtle signifiers as given in the dominant discourse. One who distances oneself from the Post-colonial and the Post-modern shall take this contradiction as a field of heterogeneity in which the positive always undermines itself. In a field of migrancy there is no sacrosanct identity that overcomes the reality of displacements. Such a reality is misrepresented in the dominant representations of a set of subtle signifiers, while the traces of the movement retains its imaginary movement in the apparent and not in the real. Therefore, the strategy of privileging the 'real' over the 'apparent' necessitates the strategy of playing the contradiction in the matrix of various other oppositions generated from a descriptive category. For example, the coinage Carib-Indian generates in instantaneous opposition with both the 'Carib' and the 'Indian' which construes the oppositional reality of appearances. One could locate this reality in a multifarious space of oppositions. Which 'Carib' is one 'speaking of', is it Trinidadian? Is it Guyanian? Or tracing the North-Indian or South-Indian past? A string of such oppositions constitutes the space of contraries directly opposite a centred hegemony.

The site becomes self-subversive constantly indicating an 'other' within. Therefore, the privileging of the imaginary can retrieve roots of time and place and invite a deracinated presence, a twilight of fractured memories, a disposition of unmitigated loss. This is a strategy of interpellating, individually discrete positions. So the question becomes a questioning of settled categories, a functional displacement of historici(ties) produced within texts of migrancy. Diaspora positions the traces of this migrancy in spaces of contraries that display the fragments of imagination that take one both to the 'past' and to the 'post', the 'self' and the 'other', the 'inside' and the 'outside' for exploring the full potential of the ethico-political determination of the dominant. One can aestheticize the politics of the dominant/apparent in order, to retrieve the imaginary which further subverts both the politics of determination and imagination within textualities.