**Summary of Segment (pp. 35 - 41)**

In the final segment of “Four Theses on Posthuman Feminism”, Braidotti argues the case for “sexuality as a force beyond, beneath and after gender,” focusing on how each prefixed preposition impacts posthuman vital feminism in turn. Prior to her thesis statement, she sets the context of how differences are quantized at the microscopic cellular level in a world of advanced capitalism – a far cry from the conventional view of difference as “visually verifiable” and “anatomical.” Such a quantized view of difference leads to a postgender world where boundaries of discrimination exist, but are “significantly blurred.” Rejecting an approach by queer theorists to celebrate the postgender world, and use the apparent wiping away of gendered difference as a political praxis, Braidotti offers a three-fold thesis to view sexuality (not gender) as the focus of posthuman feminism.

Firstly, Braidotti postulates that sexuality is a deep and innate phenomenon, terming it “beyond gender.” Comprehending this “depth” requires both an appreciation of sexuality with its “generative powers of female embodiment” and a recognition of gender as a shifting mesh of chains, a “historically contingent mechanism of capture” of sexuality. Contrary to social constructivist notions, she argues that “sexuality may be caught in the sex-gender binary, but is not reducible to it,” implying richer, deeper philosophical value in forming the self.

Secondly, Braidotti reinforces the depth of sexuality by taking on her characteristic nomadic tone, with her thread of “beneath gender.” She imagines sexuality as chaotic crucible of churn (mystic imagination being a key pillar of nomadic thought), a “vital force par excellence” that is “inscribed into a sex-gender dichotomy… for the purpose of disciplining and punishing the social body.” Gender becomes the “socially-coded behaviour” that nomadic thought must resist, and the actualization of the myriadly-sexed female body becomes the vehicle of this resistance, termed “becoming-woman.” Braidotti marks a transition to “after gender” and to the politics of empowerment with her discussion of McCormack, Parisi and Margulis, who view sexuality as a force, and sexual difference as a self-generative (“schizogenesis”), positive (“autopoiesis”) and corporeal manifestation of sexuality.

Finally, an exuberant Braidotti moves from the body to the body politic through her case for a posthuman feminist politics based on an “experiment with intensities” that reject binaries and Self/Other disjunctions – an experiment “after gender”. She grounds this “experiment” on her premise that “bodily matter ... is always already sexed,” and importantly, sexed in a multiplicity of ways. “After gender” implies a “before gender” where sexuality was captured by gender in a “binary machine,” leading Braidotti to claim that “we no longer know what our sexed bodies can do.” She caveats this experimentation with positive sexual difference by pointing out that it can be maligned into “polarized sexual differences” as in the case of homo-nationalism. Cognizant of the complexity theory surrounding sexuality and sexual difference, Braidotti concludes with a reinforcement of difference as central, non-essential yet innate, and generating alliances with other Others, as well as with other critical studies.

**Critical Assessment of Segment**

In introducing her fourth thesis, Braidotti argues that advanced capitalism has obfuscated conventional gendered differences, claiming that “the technologically mediated world is … [not] male-female … [and] advanced capitalism is a postgender system” but maintaining that the world is profoundly sexist. An adversarial sceptic would naturally ask – how does this sexism operate in a post-gender world? Is it different from conventional sexism, and how so? While Braidotti has written about the same in her essay “Theories of Gender,” terming gender a “vicissitude of the English language,” her detailing of the “capture” mechanism of gender later in her fourth thesis becomes problematic. Here, Braidotti argues that gender shackles sexuality, for a patriarchal purpose of “disciplining and punishing the [female] social body.” This implies that sexuality and sexual differences could run free and exultant – reconnect with *zoe -* if not for the asphyxiating choke of gender. But if advanced capitalism provides a post-gender world (as Braidotti outlines earlier), yet “extreme forms of polarized sexual difference are stronger than ever” (38) then what exact obstacle now prevents sexuality from “returning to the polymorphous,” as posthuman vital materialist feminists aim to do? Braidotti leaves this thread unexplained, leading to an less clearer motivation behind her fourth thesis.

Secondly, in her political call, Braidotti argues for viewing a positive difference as the principle of “not-One,” encouraging counter actualizations of the self, complexity, a multiplicity of voices and “cross-fertilizations” with sexuality said to “consolidate [this] feminist genealogy.”. While this view is infused with situated thought, *pathos* and theoretical rigour, it lacks political expediency, because it casts sexuality as either a deeply personal endeavour - an experimentation which presupposes agency on the subaltern’s part, or as a movement of solidarity with “multiple Others” – which lacks a singular voice, which Noel Sturgeon considers a precondition for meaningful political action. In other words, while Braidotti’s “web of complexity” might be generative and productive to both human and nonhuman life, its lack of a singular voice (which it specifically eschews) might dent its impact.

Thirdly, she also claims that sexuality as a force is both “non-essential” yet “ontological” and a “constitutve force” for the organization of human desire. While this leads to another paradox – how can a force be a fundamental constituent of a body yet not essentialize it - a contextual reading of Braidotti’s work (and her mentor, Irigaray’s) and its attack of “sexual symmetry” (prominent in Beauvoir’s *The Second Sex)* can offer a reconciliatory view. It is important to note that Braidotti is in fact attacking an Othered-essentialism that sexual symmetry instils – the woman and her sexuality is viewed as the inferior, mirror image of the man, and she is essentialized to this warped image. Further, Braidotti’s ideal of a “multiplicity” of sexual differences further seems to put the paradox to rest. However, another problem emerges – does a body always have to be sexed to be free from oppressive gendered Othering by way of warped symmetry? In this respect, Braidotti offers only a passing mention of sexed beings of “cyborgs” and “nonhuman *zoe* life” – and even then, an abstract notion of sexuality doesn’t explicate their link to sexuality and the anthropocentric concept of gender.

**Application to “The Hunt”**

With Braidotti’s fourth thesis and conclusion in mind, this analysis will examine how sexuality is represented in Mahasweta Devi’s “The Hunt.” Both Braidotti’s world of advanced capitalism with its deconstructed gender reality, and Mary’s desocialized reality as a mixed-race woman, offer opportunities for the female body to experiment with its sexuality. Mary is the epitome of “becoming-woman,” a female body and mind willing to “experiment with intensity,” with her character arc proving to the reader “what our sexed bodies can do.” The tribal woman can move with panache “as a queen,” have “countless admirers” – relationally feminine traits – and yet wield her machete as an extension of her arm, with “everyone … afraid of [her].” Exuding complexity in her race, gender, class and behaviour, she subverts the oppression of the Oraon people not by becoming-masculine – which Braidotti terms “counter-identity formations,” but by hunting the patriarchal male and leaving Kuruda, a quite literal manifestations of Braidotti’s call for “pure dislocation of identities.”

How does Mary gain this experimental agency, to subvert the masculine and hunt the hunter? It is through a web of positive differences – her white blood is connoted to be “strong” by Prasadji and Tehsildar, her unconventional independence as tribal woman attracts Jamil, and her mixed-race unshackles her from the socialized Oraon identity. Further, as Braidotti predicts, Mary does not merely use her experimental agency to liberate herself – she feels a strong sense of solidarity and kinship with the class-exploited tribal people, “bind[ing her] to the multiple ‘Others.’” Finally, “The Hunt” also has techno-capitalist elements accompanying the protagonist. The *train* and *railway tracks* bring Mary in and out of the story’s narrative, suggesting the tightly coupled relationship between women and capitalism – a key theme in Braidotti’s fourth thesis.
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