“colonial mimicry is the desire for a reformed, recognizable Other, as a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite.” (114)

I find this idea that a desire of mimicry is to create not only a recognizable other, but a reformed other interesting because while there is the desire to reform in the likeness of the colonizer, there is still the need to keep the reformed separate. I find this reminiscent of Bourdieu’s concept of distinction, which is one way in which groups in a field, despite their similar positioning in a field, will create a difference amongst themselves to separate from the pack, but still make themselves recognizable to others in their group. This desire of mimicry differs from distinction, because the reformed other does not possess power within the system it is created for, and the reformed are unlikely to fully understand, or take advantage of the shallow nature of the colonizers ways. If it is seemingly easy to replicate, the complexities of the colonizers must be overstated. If I understand this correctly, the this paints colonialism as a somewhat flimsy system, but no less powerful. Even when given the space to be as similar as possible to the colonizers the subtle differences keep the colonized from possessing an amount of agency, or power, to demonstrate the shallow nature of the colonizers practices.

“in order to be effective, mimicry must continually produce its slippage, its excess, its difference”