



Homi K. Bhabha's Third Space Theory and Cultural Identity Today: A Critical Review

Nagendra Bahadur Bhandari, PhD 

Department of English, Prithvi Narayan Campus, Pokhara, Nepal

Article History: Submitted 20 January 2022; Reviewed 15 March 2022; Accepted 26 April 2022

Corresponding Author: Nagendra Bahadur Bhandari, Email: nagendra@pncampus.edu.np

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3126/paj.v5i1.45049>

Copyright 2022 © The author(s). The publisher may reuse all published articles with prior permission of the concerned authors. This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International \(CC BY 4.0\) License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



ScanToAccess eCopy

ABSTRACT

Homi K. Bhabha proposes the interstitial space of cultural encounter in which the colonizer and the colonized negotiate, producing hybridity in culture. This type of culture subverts colonial domination by deconstructing essentialist identity and binary opposition of the colonizer and colonized or the East and the West. In this case, his in-between third space resists colonial oppression largely depending on the analysis of colonial discourse and cultural identity formation of the colonized people. However, lack of concern to the political and economic exploitation of the colonizers and the material condition of unequal access to resources and opportunities make his third space a cultural project that helps for mental and psychological liberation only. Today, the First World countries and the former colonizers manipulate a negotiation in the intercultural and international third space created by World Trade Organization (WTO) and Social Media Networks (SMNs) in their favour. Thus, the main objective of this article is to review his notion of third space in relation to its limitations in resisting colonial and neocolonial domination that is caused by the exclusion of the material condition and human relationship.

KEYWORDS: Postcoloniality, third space, cultural identity, hybridity, neocolonialism

INTRODUCTION

To subvert colonial domination, Bhabha (1994) proposes the in-between space of the cultural encounter of the colonizer and colonized which he calls the third space of cultural enunciation. This space primarily undermines “the binary thought and essentialist identities produced by colonial knowledge” (p. 276). It deconstructs the binary of the self and the other, the colonizer and the colonized, or the East and the West. Moreover, it is the space of ambiguity, uncertainty and the renunciation of colonial authority and deconstructs the authentic and essentialist oppositional polarities (Bhabha, 1990). He examines “the psychic and cultural fault-lines which are generated around and constantly threaten, any simple ‘black-and-white’ distinction between two conventional

parties to the colonial relationship” (as cited in Boehmer, 2005, p. 355). He contends that colonialism and globalization have perpetuated cultural contact and interaction rendering a hybrid third space. Consequently, negotiation is elemental to the cultural meaning when the colonizer and the colonized come together. This negotiation renders an ambivalent retention, which subverts essentialist identity and the domination of the colonizers over the colonized. However, indifference to material realities, struggle of resistance and unequal access to the resources and opportunities interrogate the possibility of resisting colonial and neocolonial domination. The negotiation in the intercultural and international contact zone does not voluntarily ensure a resistance to the exploitation of the under-privileged groups and nations. For instance, the World Trade Organization (WTO) and Social Media Networks (SMNs) function in transcultural and transnational space enhancing social, cultural and technological connectivity in today's world. The powerful First World countries often manipulate a negotiation in such economic, cultural and technological third space to create and sustain a new form of neocolonial exploitation of the Third World countries and people. This article reviews Bhabha's conceptualization of the third space and discusses its limitation in resisting colonial and neocolonial exploitation in today's world.

THE CONCEPT OF THIRD SPACE

Bhabha (1994) conceptualizes the third space of enunciation in coloniality and postcoloniality in a political discourse of in-betweenness and hybridity. He scrutinizes a formation of hybrid cultural identity of colonized people in their cultural encounter in colonial domination and inequality. For him, hybridity is the process by which the colonial power attempts to transform the identity of the colonized people within a uniform global framework, producing something recognizable and new (Papastergiadis, 2021). A new hybrid identity evolves from the cultural negotiation of the colonizer and colonized. In this context, Lazarus (2004) elucidates that Bhabha's third space "is a fighting term, a theoretical weapon, which intervenes in existing debates and resists certain political and philosophical constructions" (p. 4) by interrogating the legitimacy and validity of the essentialist cultural identity.

The negotiation of cultural differences of the colonizer and colonized produces a new form of cultural identity. Bhabha (1994) stresses that the new form of cultural identity simultaneously combines and goes beyond the past and the present in an innovative act of cultural conversion. He further elucidates:

Such act does not merely recall the past as social cause or aesthetic precedent; it renews the past, refiguring it as a contingent 'in-between' space, that innovates and interrupts the performance of the present. The past-present becomes part of necessity, not the nostalgia, of living. (p. 7)

He affirms the role of past and present in producing a cultural identity in their constant interaction in the interstitial cultural space. In fact, the in-between space does not produce merely a combination of two opposites. It is “creative, malleable indeterminacy involving feelings of simultaneously repulsion and desire that exist at the interface between self and other, or between the polarities of unequal world that we still inhabit, of what Bhabha calls the ‘ongoing colonial present’” (as cited in Boehmer, 2005, p. 355). Like a colonial encounter, the process of globalization renders the in-between space of cultural encounters, which produces hybrid cultural identities in today's world.

Bhabha (1994) concedes the multiplicities of voices and identities in the in-between cultural hybrid space. He borrows his conceptualization of hybridity "from Mikhail Bakhtin, who uses it to discriminate texts with a 'single voice' (lyrical poems) from those with a 'double voice' (such as novels, whose narrator cites characters speaking

in their own voice — these texts are hybridic)" (as cited in Easthoe, 1998, p. 343). Furthermore, he borrows Derrida's deconstructive approach to subvert the colonial fixity and binary opposition (as cited in Nuyen, 1989). He applies Derrida's notion of difference in his analysis of colonial discourse. Apparently, he interrogates the dominant meaning of hegemonic culture by applying the notion of hybridity and difference.

For Bhabha (1994), the subversion of authority takes place through a process of hybridization. Hybridity undermines the hegemonic colonial power's sole authority on the meaning. Rather, it acknowledges the influence of other marginal cultures and languages in the process of producing a meaning. He explains it as "a problematic of colonial representation...that reverses the effects of the colonialist disavowal, so that other "denied" knowledge enters upon the dominant discourse and estrange the basis of its authority" (p. 156). The function of hybridity in the colonial discourse, for him, lies in the subversion of the relation of domination in a colonial situation. In doing so, it exposes the influence of the other so that it reveals itself as double-voiced in the third space of cultural negotiation.

Bhabha's (1994) third space assumes the negotiation of cultures in ambivalent and contradictory spaces in which cultural identities are contested and evolved. It symbolizes both common provision of language, and the cultural negotiation and transformation. It deconstructs the fixity by assuming an ambivalent process of producing a meaning. It is not an actual space that can be represented, it is rather produced by fluidity and openness of cultural signs and symbols. This cultural semiotics is negotiated, rehistoricised, appropriated and read to formulate a new concept. It is a hybrid transcultural space of cultural differences in which the cultural identity evolves negating the purity and hierarchy of cultures. Rather, it celebrates multiplicities, pluralities and hybridities.

The importance of the third space does not lie on tracing the origins from which the third emerges; rather it enables other positions to evolve. Discrediting the histories, the third space unfolds new possibilities which requires a novel approach to understand it. Bhabha (1994) clarifies that "the transformational value of [third space] lies in the rearticulation, or translation, of elements that are neither the One...nor the Other...but something else besides, which contests the terms and territories of both" (p. 28). The third space is a new space although it partially belongs to two preceding spaces. It departs momentarily from the established values and norms, and allows scrutinizing them with fresh perspectives.

Byrne (2009) expounds that Bhabha's notion of the third space "is not simply one thing or the other, nor both at the same time, but a kind of negotiation between both positions" (p. 42). Similarly, Ikas and Wagner (2009) consider that this negotiation is a creative and fertile ground that leads to a kind of dislodgment of both groups from their origins. In this sense, the third space might be termed as an anti-essentialist revolutionary strategy against every form of authoritative domination. So, this interfering third space can be described as "being in the beyond" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 10) with ramifications to multiple directions.

The cultural negotiation in the third space undermines the total and absolute power of the colonizer. The colonized subjects resist the total subjugation to the colonial authority in their ambivalent retention, which creates a gap between the expectation of the colonizer and the response of the colonized. The subversion of the colonial power results in hybridity and ambivalence in the liminal in-between space. In this sense, Bhabha's interstitial space provides postcolonialism a form of resistance, which "illuminates the way in which more material forms of opposition, struggle, and protest can be seen as enabling, and enabled by, modes of discursive *refusal*, wherein the

colonial narrative does not simply fail but is transformed by the colonized in politically meaningful ways" (Jefferess, 2008, p. 29). So, this form of resistance provides a platform for the political struggle by discursively subverting colonial identities and binary dichotomies. Moreover, implications of the notion of the third space proliferate different disciplines like anthropology, sociology, education, communication studies, linguistics, human geography and archaeology, and inquire about human encounters across time and space (Xiaowei & Pilcher, 2019, p. 1). In its emphasis on human encounters, it acknowledges the role of human agency.

The first implication of the discursive instability in the third space lies in recognition of agency (Kapoor, 2002, p. 651). Bhabha (1994) succinctly acknowledges the role of human agency in the negotiation, which undermines the colonizers' expectation. For this, he cites an example of converting a group of Indian villagers into the Christians outside Delhi in 1817. The villagers resist on the ground of their vegetarianism and argue that they will accept the sacrament only from the vegetarian person (as cited in Kapoor, 2002, p. 651). The human agency renders unpredictability in the output of the negotiation in the third space. The acceptance of human agency in the negotiation process also leads to affirm the differences (Kapoor, 2002, p. 652) in opposition of the homogenizing mission of the colonizers.

Postcolonialism "seeks to preserve heterogeneity and to criticise its disparagement or transcendence by any master discourse" (Kapoor, 2002, p. 652). The space is the space of negotiation between the differences. The acknowledgement of the differences provides a space for the marginalized. In this regard, Spivak (1988) seems more vocal in her mission of exploring history "from below to provide space for subsistence farmers, unorganized peasant labour, the tribals and communities of zero workers on the street or in the countryside" (p. 288). Among them, she takes an interests to the "disenfranchised woman" who in her opinion is the figure "most consistently exiled from episteme" (Spivak, 1990, pp. 102–103). However, she accepts her failure to retrieve the voice of female subalterns. She cites an example of the nineteenth century *sati* (a system of immolating widow in the pyre of dead husband) who cannot speak as she is always denied to speak and lacks power to ventilate her feelings (Spivak, 1988, p. 306). Her voice is always negotiated and appropriated by the powerful people and institutions like the colonial ruler, or patriarchal culture. However, Spivak concludes that "the role of the postcolonial critic is to record this silence or disappearance so as to valorise the 'difference' revealed by the disenfranchised woman and to criticise the domination of imperial and patriarchal discourses" (as cited in Kapoor, 2002, p. 653). However, the recognition of the differences and voices from the margin do not substantially change the material situation of the marginalized groups.

The discursive subversion of colonial power in the third space may help to the psychological and spiritual liberation, which is also the decolonization of the mind, but it does not involuntarily render the physical and material liberation. Similarly, it does not talk about the condition of labor exploitation, unequal access to the resources and use of state apparatus for an economic gain. Rather, it concentrates on the formation of subjectivities of the colonized in the in-between space of the cultural encounter of the colonizer and the colonized. In Jefferess's (2008) opinion, this form of resistance reduces colonialism into cultural projects as it ignores the material conditions and the role of ideology that structures such conditions. Similarly, Bhabha's third space does not talk about the liberation of the colonized people from the political and economic exploitation. The following section discusses some of the limitations of Bhabha's notion in reference to its relevance to the resistance of colonial and neocolonial oppression.

IGNORING THE ORIGIN

In his conceptualization of the negotiation in the third space, Bhabha often ignores an affiliation with the historical genealogy and cultural root. The third space is characterized as a space of liberation in which the "interlocutors are freed from prior cultural roots, and openly negotiate and reconcile issues emanating from differences between neutrally juxtaposed cultures" (as cited in Xiaowei & Pilcher, 2019, p. 1). We cannot negate the role of shared cultural values and historical experience of an individual in the formation of cultural identity. Hall (1994) in his conceptualization of cultural identity affirms the role of historical references and common cultural backgrounds. He elaborates his concept in his notion of being and becoming. The concept of being refers to the origin and similarities among a community of people. He also accepts the role of present negotiation which he refers as a becoming process. Both being and becoming conjointly recreate cultural identity. Our cultural identities "come from somewhere, have histories... they undergo constant transformation. Far from being eternally fixed in some essentialised past, they are subject to the continuous 'play' of history, culture and power" (p. 225). Unlike Bhabha, Hall insists on the role of origin in the negotiation of cultural identity. The origin of an individual plays a crucial role in shaping the self-perception as well as perception of other people.

Similarly, Frenkel (2008) underscores the role of origin, which he refers as "nationally embedded unit" even in the management of Multi National Company (MNC) and in the system of International Management (IM) in today's globalized commercial world. MNCs function in different nation-states in the chain organizational units. They exploit the differences between and among those nations to maximize efficiency and effectiveness and to gain access to resources and market (Bartlett et al., 2004). In such context, the parent company's national identity attempts to impose its home country's managerial practices on its foreign associates while the host country's national identity determines the extent to which it adopts and resists the imposed practices and knowledge (Ferner, 1997; Ferner, Quintanilla, & Varul, 2001; Rosenzweig & Singh, 1991). Frenkel (2008) critiques the western-style international management of multinational company, particularly the practices of

exclusion and silencing of the strange organizational knowledge of non-Western Others in the canon of management studies...the oversimplistic representation of the Other in Western management discourses... and the fallacies resulting from the application of Western notions and definitions in non-Western contexts. (p. 925)

In this sense, he emphasizes the need of acknowledging the role of origin even in the commercial world of international business. Besides the role of origin, Bhabha does pay much attention to the unequal material condition and its influence in the negotiation of third space.

INDIFFERENCE TO MATERIAL INEQUALITY

The colonial and neocolonial exploitation produces material inequality along with discourse and ideology that helps sustain such form of unequal relationship. It is pertinent to raise a question to the relevance of the negotiation in the third space in the subversion of such material inequality. The deconstruction of binary relationship may dismantle the hierarchy as created by the colonial relationship in its discourse. Such deconstruction would not guarantee to mitigate the material inequality between the East and the West, or the colonizer and the colonized. In this sense, the third space seems "to defuse resistance as practices directed at undermining and defeating an oppressive opponent" (Parry, 2004, p. 16). Bhabha's third space fails to make a decisive intervention

to subvert the relation of exploitation for economic and social justice for the underprivileged. At present, we face a challenge of subverting the inequalities constructed and sustained by neocolonialism.

In its emphasis on the cultural negotiation, Bhabha's third space remain silent to global expansion of capitalism and neocolonial exploitation of the third world countries (Kapoor, 2002, p. 657). Bhabha does not give a significant space to capitalism in his analyses of the third space. The very title of his books *The location of culture* (1994) and *Nation and narration* (1990) reflects his preoccupation with his cultural agenda and indifference to the economic issues. He occasionally refers to "multinational capital" and the "multinational division of labour" (1994, p. 241), but he gives priority on semiotics and discursivity. This is obvious in his explanation as "popular rebellion and mobilization are often most subversive and transgressive when they are created through oppositional cultural practices" (1994, p. 20). Thus, he foregrounds a cultural agenda by ignoring the economic exploitation of the colonized people.

Another point of contention in Bhabha's conceptualization is its lack of attention to the ground realities of inequalities among the heterogeneous inhabitants of the third space of the metropolis and diaspora. In Moore-Gilbert's (1997) words, "Bhabha assumes that the effective economies of mimicry and ambivalence operate equivalently for all colonial subjects irrespective of their positioning in the social hierarchy" (p. 168). In this context, we may raise a question, "does the colonised subject's status in the capitalist economy not impinge on her/his ability to represent or negotiate, or on how forcefully s/he can represent or negotiate in relation to another subject?" (Kapoor, 2002, p. 658-659). The cultural negotiation in the third space remains silent in this aspect of heterogeneities of marginalized groups. The third space of cultural encounter is "differentially occupied, and that it was contested space, being the site of coercion and resistance, and not of civil negotiation between evenly placed contenders" (Parry, 2004, p. 19). Bhabha seems to be taking his own position as a privileged immigrant as a case of point in his conceptualization. Parry (2004) elaborates:

In representing the productive tensions of its own situation as normative and desirable, the privileged post-colonial is prone to denigrate affiliations to class, ethnicity, and emergent nation-state which continue to fashion the self-understanding and energise the resistances of exploited populations in the hinterlands of late imperialism, as well as of immigrant labourers living on the outskirts of one or other metropolis. (p. 21)

In the intercultural and international third space, the inhabitants do not occupy an equal space and may not undergo a uniform experience of cultural negotiation. For instance, the unskilled and illegal immigrants, the immigrants running business and the immigrants studying in the prestigious universities on scholarship have different experiences while leading their lives in the diaspora. Moreover, the differences in gender and generations remain detrimental in the cultural negotiations of immigrants in the diaspora. Bhabha's postulations fail to address the heterogeneities of class, occupation, legal status and gender of the inhabitants of the third space.

Similarly, Bhabha "does not focus on capitalist transactions or economically orientated subversive agency by the subaltern or migrant (e.g. non-payment of colonial taxes, revolts against landlords, action against inhuman working conditions, etc)" (Kapoor, 2002, p. 659). Rather, he emphasizes the politics of representation by prioritizing the agency. As a result, he is often criticized for ignoring an important material condition like the economic exploitation, distribution and poverty (Sylvester, 1999, p. 703; Pieterse & Parekh, 1995, p. 13; Rajan, 1997, p. 615). Rather, his notion of third space serves the agenda of neocolonial exploitation in today's the third world

countries. Abou-Agag (2021) reveals how the multinational organization like WTO and SMNs, which operate in the conceptual ground of the third space in creating transcultural and transnational connectivity functions in favour of the powerful nations by sustaining and reinforcing the neocolonial oppression in the present context.

NEOCOLONIALISM AND THIRD SPACE

The multinational corporations, non-governmental organizations, SMNs and international economic institutions like WTO create the third space by increasing the cultural, economic and political connectivity beyond the national territories. They exercise power over the third world countries or the former colonies. Abou-Agag (2021) explicates:

The World Trade Organization brings all the member countries into agreements that would ensure that trade, money, goods, services, and labor power move around the world according to terms, approved by member governments, that grant multinational corporations sovereignty similar to that of national government. Politics, in this case, can happen at a level above state governments; through global political and economic integration programs and organizations such as the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the World Trade Organization. (p. 32)

WTO offers its member countries an opportunity of global reach for the international trade within agreements approved by the government of the member countries for the flow of goods, services, money and people.

Similarly, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) (1994), which is based on the GATT agreements of 1947 gives:

[T]he contracting parties the same advantages, favors, and privileges to all like products originating in or destined for the territories of all other contracting parties, with the possibility of imposing an internal tax or an anti-dumping or countervailing duty within the provisions of the GATT. (Abou-Agag, 2021, p. 39)

These international agreements allow the free movement of goods, money, people and culture in a kind of the third space beyond national boundaries and authorities. In such international interactions, the First World countries take an extra privilege. Apparently, all the countries signed in such international treaty are not treated equally, "since some parties are more privileged because they belong to the part of the world where industry takes place. Other parties are at a disadvantage and they turn into markets for the major industrialized parties" (Abou-Agag, 2021, p. 32). In a sense, such international dynamics perpetuates the old economic relations of the former colonial power and newly independent countries.

The international trade mechanisms function as apparatuses of feeding the ideology and product of the West to the East, which implicitly reinforces the neocolonial exploitation. Abou-Agag (2021) explains:

Via the WTO agreements the lives of millions of people in many parts of the world are controlled and shaped by the discourse of consumerism. Hence, the space created by the WTO for trading freely around the world is not fair to all parties involved in the processes of international trade. It is dominated by the Neocolonial powers and it makes of the less privileged countries open markets for the goods and services the more advanced countries produce. (p. 32)

The international trade zone created by the WTO agreements is a kind Bhabhasque third space as it is beyond the national and cultural boundaries with a constant interaction and negotiation of people, goods and cultures. However, "in this Third Space, the

negotiations are always conducted in a way that benefits the highly advanced and the highly industrialized countries" (Abou-Agag, 2021, p. 39). The third world countries function simply a market place of the goods and services, and even ideology of the First World countries. Like WTO, the transnational and transcultural space created by information technology render the subjugation of the underprivileged groups and countries.

On the cultural level, the SMNs like Facebook, Twitter, WhatsApp, WeChat and Instagram create a space of the circulation of ideas and information beyond the national territory. The connectivity of people and cultural product in the cyber space create the third space as envisioned by Bhabha. While interacting in the cyber space, the users also bring their culture, which they interact with the culture of other users. The users of such media do not only express their opinion and information, they are also representing their different identities while socializing in the space. Abou-Agag (2021) explains: "digital technology has made it possible for users to present facets of their selves or identities on different platforms" (p. 40). It is a fluid third space that ushers the multiplicities and pluralities of its users.

SMNs allow to hide the real identity of users and to create multiple identities as per their personal and professional need and interest. For instance, a user may share his or her professional information in his or her professional account. The same user may share his personal photos, ideas and comments in his or her personal account. Moreover, the user may exploit the social media for public awareness, political campaign, environmental campaign, social protest and the like. In this sense, social media can:

be viewed as a Bhabhasque Third Space in the sense that it brings together users from different parts of the world and provides them with the opportunity to contribute to the creation of a new collective identity which enjoys the power to make changes in the real world. (Abou-Agag, 2021, p. 40)

The users can use SMNs for various purposes: personal, social, professional and business. On the surface, SMNs seem to be an open and democratic space with easy accessibility of even underprivileged groups. The underprivileged groups can even advance the social changes by raising their concerns and grievances in the cyber space. In essence, the users can only enjoy restricted and guided freedom within the space designed to serve the interests of few industrialists.

The seemingly open and democratic space of SMNs is controlled, manipulated and defined by few capitalists: the owner of these companies who are mainly from the First World. We can raise the question whether the users of SMNs are really free to choose the ways they want to represent themselves or express their ideas. In this context, Abou-Agag (2021) explains:

Similar to Bhabha's notion of Third Space, Social Media Networks do not seem to be a democratizing tool. Users are usually subject to advertisements that pop up all the time to attract their attention to either a cause or a commodity. The power of the technology companies running Social Media Networks is similar in this case to the privileges multinational corporations enjoy in the world of business and trade according to the WTO agreements. (pp. 39-40)

Through the new form of interactive spaces: WTO, SMNs and other multinational organizations, the former empires indirectly are still in control of politics and economy of many Third World countries.

Such international and intercultural connectivity "compromises the ability of former colonies to formulate their identity independently and to design their agendas for development" (Abou-Agag, 2021, p. 25). In fact, the third space of connectivity and interaction best serve the interest of neocolonial power by limiting the power of taking

an independent decision of the former colonies and underprivileged groups. Abou-Agag (2021) elaborates:

With the establishment of economic interconnectedness, and social and cultural interaction via Social Media Networks within the framework of globalization, it has become more difficult for the less privileged entities/nations/countries to walk towards progress, aware of their cultural identities and taking their economic interests into consideration. (p. 32)

The underprivileged groups can enjoy their freedom within the limit set by others. The interactions in these spaces sustain and reinforce the relation of oppression in an indirect manner.

Bhabha in his conceptualization of the third space in resisting the colonial domination is serving the neocolonial agenda. The transnational space created by WTO and SMNs like that of Bhabha's third space renders the subjugation of the third world countries. Abou-Agag (2021) asserts that WTO and SMNs which function by creating an interactive space like that of Bhabha's third space “stress the dominance and supremacy of Western culture and provide non-Western nations and peoples with little scope to create and assert their identities” (p. 42). Hence, they may all be seen as tools of producing and sustaining the relation of exploitation in new forms.

CONCLUSION

Bhabha's notion of the third space aims to subvert the colonial domination by proposing an in-between space of cultural negotiation, which produces hybridity. This hybridity undermines the colonial discourse of essentialist identity on the basis of the binary opposition of the colonizer and the colonized, or the East and the West. Such subversion of colonial enterprises may help for the psychological and spiritual liberation such as the decolonization of the mind. However, it ignores the material conditions and the role of ideology that structures the exploitative relationships between the colonizer and the colonized. In the same way, his notion remains silent about the heterogeneities of the suppressed groups. The unequal access to opportunities and resources may lead to varied experiences in the negotiation of the colonized and underprivileged groups. Moreover, the powerful groups and nations harvest more benefits in the negotiation in the transcultural and transnational third space of various types. The economic, social, cultural and technological connections created by WTO and SMNs in their functioning in the international and transcultural space provide an extra leverage to the First World countries to create and sustain a new form of neocolonial exploitation of the Third World countries. In this sense, Bhabha's third space inadvertently serves the very agenda of colonial and neocolonial exploitation, which it purports to subvert.

To sum up, the process of resistance should acknowledge both the unequal material condition and the discourse of exploitation. The colonial power produces and circulates discourses of their inherent superiority against the inferiority of the colonized people and their culture. Such discourse functions as a form of power in creating the hegemony of the colonizers by ensuring the voluntary submission of the colonized people. Bhabha's third space aptly deconstructs such discourses of the colonial authority. However, his notion fails short in subverting the material condition and human relationship, which have been produced by an unequal power relationship of the colonizer and the colonized, or the First World and the Third World people and culture. Precisely, resistance is a process of transformation from the social, cultural and material oppression with a new social relationship of mutual interdependence.

REFERENCES

- Abou-Agag, N. (2021). Homi Bhabha's third space and neocolonialism. *Global Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 9(3), 25-43. <https://www.eajournals.org/wp-content/uploads/Homi-Bhabhas-Third-Space-and-Neocolonialism.pdf>
- Bartlett, C. A., Ghoshal, S., & Birkinshaw, J.M. (2004). *Transnational management: Text, cases, and readings in cross border management*. McGraw-Hill.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1990). *Nation and narration*. Routledge.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. Routledge.
- Boehmer, E. (2005). *Colonial and postcolonial literature: Migrant metaphors*. Oxford.
- Byrne, E. (2009). *Homi K. Bhabha*. Palgrave.
- Easthope, A. (1998). Bhabha, hybridity and identity. *Textual Practice*, 12(2), 341-348. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09502369808582312>
- Ferner, A. (1997). Country of origin effects and human resource management in multinational companies. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 7, 19-37. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.1997.tb00271>
- Ferner, A., Quintanilla, J., & Varul, M. Z. (2001). Country-of-origin effects, host-country effects and the management of HR in multinationals: German companies in Britain and Spain. *Journal of World Business*, 36, 107-127. https://www.academia.edu/10220462/Country_of_origin_effects_host_country_effects_and_the_management_of_HR_in_multinationals_German_companies_in_Britain_and_Spain
- Frenkel M. (2008). The multinational corporation as a third space: Rethinking international management discourse on knowledge transfer through Homi Bhabha. *The Academy of Management Review*, 33(4), 924-942. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20159453>
- Hall, S. (1994). Cultural identity and diaspora. In P. Williams & L. Chrisman (Eds.), *Colonial discourse and postcolonial theory: A reader* (pp. 222-237). Columbia University Press.
- Ikas, K. & Wagner G. (Eds.). (2009). *Communicating in the third space*. Routledge.
- Jeffress, D. (2008). *Postcolonial resistance: Culture, liberation and transformation*. University of Toronto Press.
- Kapoor I. (2002). Capitalism, culture, agency: Dependency versus postcolonial theory. *Third World Quarterly*, 23(4), 647-664. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0143659022000005319>
- Lazarus, N. (2004). *The Cambridge companion to postcolonial literary studies*. Cambridge.
- Moore-Gilbert, B. (1997). *Postcolonial theory: Contexts, practices, politics*. Routledge.
- Nuyen, A. T. (1989). Derrida's deconstruction: Wholeness and différance. *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy, New Series*, 3(1), 26-38. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25669901>
- Papastergiadis, N. (2001). Tracing hybridity in theory. In P. Werbner & T. Modood (Eds.), *Debating cultural hybridity multicultural identities and the politics of anti-racism* (pp. 257-281). Zed Books.
- Parry, B. (2004). *Postcolonial Studies: A materialist critique*. Routledge.
- Pieterse, J. N. & Parekh, B. (1995). *The decolonization of imagination: Culture, knowledge and power*. Zed Books.
- Rosenzweig, P. M., & Singh, J.V. (1991). Organizational environments and the multinational enterprise. *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 340-361. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258865>

- Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and interpretation of culture* (pp. 271-313). University of Illinois Press.
- Spivak, G. C. (1990). Poststructuralism, marginality, postcoloniality and value. In P. Collier & H. Greyer- Ryan (Eds.), *Literary theory today* (pp. 219–244). Polity Press.
- Rajan, R. S. (1997). The third world academic in other places; Or, the postcolonial intellectual revisited. *Critical Inquiry*, 23(3), 596–616. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1344037>
- Sylvester, C. (1999). Development studies and postcolonial studies: Disparate tales of the “third world.” *Third World Quarterly*, 20(4), 703–721. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3993584>
- Xiaowei Zhou, X. V., & Pilcher, N. (2019). Revisiting the ‘third space’ in language and intercultural studies. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 19(1), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2018.1553363>

To cite this article [APA style, 7th edition]:

Bhandari, N.B. (2022). Homi K. Bhabha's third space theory and cultural identity today: A critical review. *Prithvi Academic Journal*, 5, 171-181.