

References:

- Aschroft, Bill et al. *Post Colonial Studies: Key Concepts*. London: Routledge, 1998. Print.
- Bhabha, Homi. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994. Print.
- "*Signs Taken for Wonders*". *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994. Print.
- Foreword. Franz Fanon. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press, 2004. Print.
- Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin, White Masks*. Trans. Charles Lam Markmann. New York: Grove Press, 1967. Print.
- Huddart, David. *Homi.K Bhabha*. London: Routledge, 2006. Print.
- Ghandi, Leela. *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*. New York: Columbia UP., 1998. Print.
- Kamboureli, Samaro and Robert Zacharias. Ed. *Shifting the Ground of Canadian Literary Studies*. Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier UP, 2012. Print.
- Loomba, Ania. *Colonialism / Post colonialism*. London and New York: Routledge, 2005. print.
- Mabardi, Sabine. "Encounters of a Hetro Geneous Kind". *Reconstructing Hybridity/ Postcolonial Studies in Transition*. New York: Routledge, 2007. Print.
- Maldonado-Torres, Nelson. *Against War: Views from the Underside of Modernity*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2009. Print.
- Naipaul, V.S. *A Bend in the River*. New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1979.
- Parry, Benita. *Postcolonial Studies*. New York :Routledge, 2004 .Print.
- Postcolonial Theory and Criticism*. New York: Routledge, 2004. Print.
- Rhys, Jean. *Wide Saragasso Sea*. New York: Norton, 1966. Print.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. London: Routledge and Keganpaul, 1978.
- Young, Robert. *White Mythologies*. London: Routledge, 2004. Print.
- Shimla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study, 1996. Print.

Conclusion: The objective of this this paper is to depict the concept of cultural identity as reflected in the critical writings of Bhabha. He is one of the most important thinkers in postcolonial criticism. He has contributed a set of challenging concepts such as: hybridity, mimicry, ambivalence, the uncanny, the nation and otherness to postcolonial theory. All these concepts reflect the ways of the colonized people to resist the unsecured power of the colonizer. He succeeds in showing histories and cultures of colonialism that try to transform our understandings of cross-cultural relations. He thinks that people should not see colonialism as only oppression, domination, or violence but also as a period of complex and varied cultural contact and interaction.

However, Parry prefers Frantz Fanon who focuses on the black man or the native as a specific historical subject empowered to violent revolt. Additionally, she critiques Bhabha's notion of hybridity as agency, mimicry and negotiation for ignoring the reality of "rebel agency" (16) which involves violent military action. She writes, "The effect of moving agency from the subject-as-insurgent-actor to textual performance is to defuse resistance as practice directed at undermining and defeating an oppressive opponent"(66).

Bhabha's sly strategies of resistance, mimicry, and hybridity are more appropriate methods of resisting colonial discourse that seeks to form and control the colonized. Yet, Parry prefers Edward Said's culture of resistance and opposition in *Culture and Imperialism* that, according to her, attends to "written and remembered stories of insubordination and revolt," acts which restore "agency as performed by conscious human subjects" (65).

Samaro Kamboureli, in her book *Shifting the Ground of Canadian Literary Studies* conceives agency in a way that is more similar to Bhabha's ideas than those of Parry. Kamboureli, like Bhabha, is interested in the process of hybridization, the maintenance of difference in postcolonial context, and the agency of the colonized. In accordance with Bhabha's idea of locating agency in the process of hybridization, she calls for a "Dialogue that would suspend oppositions that would eliminate the center-margin dialectic, would prevent assimilation" (129).

a particularly good example of attacks on post-colonial theory that emphasize what it omits from its accounts of anti-colonialism, and Bhabha has been perhaps her main target. (103)

Huddart thinks that Parry raises two ideas that are important for the analysis of hybridity in postcolonial writings: boundaries versus the erasure of boundaries, and the lived experiences of human colonized subjects versus textuality and discourse. Bhabha suggests that the power of hybridity to liberate the colonized peoples from colonial oppression, whereas Parry declares that violence, opposition, clear boundaries and a defined enemy to fight against are necessary for colonial rebellion and freedom. Parry further differs from Bhabha by emphasizing the real experiences of colonial peoples and criticizes Bhabha for his emphasis on discourse and textuality (120).

In *Postcolonial Theory and Criticism*, Parry summarizes Bhabha's agenda as follows: he seeks to dismantle colonialist knowledge by rejecting the notion of "the colonial relationship as a symmetrical antagonism," (14) instead of the ambivalent colonial relations which are "interdependent, conjunct, and intimate" (14). This means that colonized peoples do not have access to the same power and resources as the colonizers. Moreover, Parry disapproves of Bhabha as a discourse-based critic who seeks to "dissolve the binary opposition of colonial self/colonized other"(15) that enables colonial domination. She, instead, advocates Frantz Fanon a libertarian who maintains the dichotomy to provide a "dialect of conflict and a call to arms" (15). Parry, thus, critiques Bhabha for ignoring the material realities of colonial subjects by emphasizing textual paradigms, ideologies and discourses, which in turn disable colonial resistance.

the same trap you set. The people
were maline because they lived
with the knowledge of men as
prey. (62)

The failure of the colonial mimic men is further determined by hybridity, which according to Bhabha subverts the narratives of colonial power and dominant cultures.

Bhabha's concept of hybridity has been largely criticized by many postcolonial critics such as, Benita Parry. In "Overworlding the Third World", Ania Loomba also describes her own and other critics' initial criticisms of Bhabha's work. Loomba focuses on "all that Bhabha does not care to see" in "socio-economic terms" and in the "production of hegemony" (174) that she sees as the fundamental elements of colonial discourse and the colonial experience that need to be addressed. Loomba comments on Bhabha's concept of hybridity. She criticizes Bhabha's work for its lack of specificity. She writes, "Despite Bhabha's hybridity thesis, the colonial subject in his work is remarkably free of gender, class, caste or other distinctions" (182). She also adds that, Bhabha's analysis focuses on the articulation of culture and the discourse of subjectivity and thus provides the tools for investigating the representation of culture and subjectivity.

Benita Parry, an important postcolonial critic, responds to Bhabha's theory of hybridity in negative terms. According to David Huddart in his book entitled *Homi K. Bhabha*:

The work of Benita Parry has reminded us that anti-colonial and nationalist writings were central in the struggles against colonial rule for a long time before post-colonialism ever appeared in Western universities. Her work has been

destabilizing effect of the postcolonial mimicry as:
"The mimicry of the post-colonial subject is therefore always potentially destabilizing to colonial discourse, and locates an area of considerable political and cultural uncertainty in the structure of imperial dominance. (142)

Bhabha refers in his book *The Location of Culture* to V. S. Naipaul whose works trace the origin and emergence of postcolonial mimic men who are ambivalent due to the effect of "a flawed colonial mimesis in which to be Anglicized is emphatically not to be English" (125). The problem of mimicry lies in the fact that it "repeats rather than it represents" (126) which further leads the mimic man to realize his nothingness and insignificance according to Naipaul in his novel: "We pretend to be real, to be learning, to be preparing ourselves for life, we mimic men of the new world, one unknown comer of it, with all its reminders of the corruption that came so quickly to the new" (116). In Naipaul's *A Bend in the River*, Salim, the protagonist of the novel relies too much on the representation of the colony by Europeans. Salim asserts: "All that I know of our history and the history of the Indian Ocean I have got from books written by Europeans...without Europeans I feel, all our past would have been washed away." (18)

This excessive reliance on the colonizers, according to Bhabha in his book "*The Location of Culture*", exhibits the popular colonial belief that "the black man stops being an actional person for only the white man can represent his self-esteem" (126). This feeling has made the natives become conscious of their eventual frustration, Salim comments on the fate of the mimic men:

I was in the history of the land:
here man had always been prey.
You don't feel malice towards
your prey. You set a trap for him.
It fails ten times; but it is always

protagonist of Naipaul's novel *A Bend in the River* (1979), expresses his enjoyment for colonial mimicry when he wishes to desert his roots. He says: "I wanted to break away .To break away from my family and community also meant breaking away from my unspoken commitment..." (31).For Homi K. Bhabha, "colonial mimicry is the desire for a reformed, recognizable 'Other', as a subject of difference that is almost the same, but not quite" (86). However, most of the postcolonial critics agree that it is precisely mimicry that disrupts the colonial discourse by double vision or double articulation. In other words, Bhabha in his book, *The Location of Culture*, finds mimicry to be characterized by double articulation. For example, Salim, the protagonist of Naipaul's most celebrated novel *A Bend in the River*, acknowledges the significance of powerful 'Other' for the people of decolonized African colony when he asserts:

When I was a child, Europe ruled my world...Europe no longer ruled. But it still fed us in a hundred ways with its language and sent us its increasingly wonderful goods, things which, in the bush of Africa, added year by year to our idea of who we were, gave us that idea of our modernity and development, and make us aware of another Europe-the Europe of great cities, great stores, great buildings, great universities. To the Europe only the privileged or the gifted among us journeyed. (146-47)

It is in this context that Bhabha finds the simple presence of the colonized within the colonial discourse as sufficient indication of the ambivalence of the colonial text. Ashcroft in *Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts* elaborates the

myth of purity and originality of both cultures of the colonizer and the colonized. The hybrid identity is described as "bastard" (159) by Bhabha to symbolize and suggest the impure cultural mixedness. In this respect, Sabine Mabardi in *Encounters of a Hetrogeneous Kind* argues that hybridity "is a threat to colonial and cultural authority; it subverts the concept of pure origin or identity of the dominant authority through the ambivalence created by denial, unsettling, repetition, and displacement" (6).

Another important term to which Bhabha pays much attention is "agency" (134). Bhabha's definition of the colonized people's agency is relevant to his several concepts of mimicry and hybridity. In this chapter agency is explained in Bhabha's own words and those of the critic David Huddart and summarizes postcolonial critics' responses and critiques of Bhabha's theory of hybridity. It is important to consider how the colonized possesses agency by using mimicry and hybridity as strategies of resistance to the ambivalent colonial desire to form the colonized in the colonizers' image and thus control and administer them. Huddart, in his book *Homi K. Bhabha*, mentions that Bhabha explains the postcolonial agency by revealing the anxiety of the colonizer created by the mimicry of the colonized, which opens "a space for the colonized to resist colonial discourse" (39). These strategies used by Bhabha are important for the examination of how the colonized can mimic and locate themselves in in-between cultural space in order to resist ideological and cultural imposition of the colonizers.

This part of the paper is an attempt to study V. S. Naipaul's novel entitled *A Bend in the River* through the lens of Homi K. Bhabha's concepts such as mimicry. It also intends to explore the theoretical framework which may be applied in the reading of the novel with special focus on one of the most prominent thinkers; Homi K. Bhabha. Salim, the

never really coherent imagined communities; the colonized's mimicry of the colonizer's discourse rearticulates the whole notion of identity and alienates it from essence; cultures are always already hybrid formations. This social fact is the basis on which a subversive political project can be conducted to destroy the binary structure of power and identity. (144)

Bhabha, in his book *The Location of Culture*, stresses the idea that all cultural systems and statements are constructed in what he calls the "Third Space of enunciation" (122). This space is an effort to open up the notion of a hybrid culture based "on the inscription and articulation of culture's hybridity" (126).

By exploring this "Third Space" (78), Bhabha goes on to say, "We may elude the politics of polarity and emerge as the others of ourselves" (56). Moreover, Ashcroft et al., in *Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts* states:

Hybridity and the power it releases may well be seen as the characteristic feature and contribution of the post-colonial, allowing a means of evading the replication of the binary categories of the past and developing new anti-monolithic models of cultural exchange and growth. (183)

In *The Location of Culture*, Bhabha says that the maintenance of cultural authority relies on "discrimination between the mother culture and its bastards, the self and its doubles, where the trace of what is disavowed is not repressed but repeated as something different—a mutation, a hybrid" (159). The process of hybridization challenges the authority and

In *The Location of Culture*, Bhabha thinks that the process of writing is a self-representation that refuses to be presented by another or in another's image. The colonized people write back to the colonial discourse, which previously marginalized their roles. This writing rejects the idea that the colonized people would want to deny their difference and become like other "white" (125) colonizers. From the above mentioned quotation, one can conclude that what Bhabha wants to say is that Mimesis or imitation is incomplete, but it contains power in itself as it is a rejection of the colonizer's claim to authority, originality and superiority.

As David Huddart in his book entitled *Homi K. Bhabha* states that Bhabha's words, in his book *The Location of Culture*, echo Lacan's ideas on the intersection of camouflage and mimicry. According to Lacan, "The effect of mimicry is camouflage...It is not a question of harmonizing with the background, but against a mottled background, of becoming mottled" (121).

In short, mimicry maintains difference: it resembles or imitates, but not identical. As David Huddart mentions that Bhabha suggests that colonized peoples preserve an element of themselves separate from the colonizers whom they imitate by merely re-producing and displaying certain aspects of the colonizers' beliefs, values and ideas. Bhabha, according to Huddart, uses the term camouflage; a blending in with a background that is not fully present, to show how "mimicry performs and exceeds colonial authority" (68). Bhabha sees the postcolonial project as one of refusal of binary divisions.

Therefore, hybridity is the textual and cultural equivalent of Homi Bhabha's attack on binary divisions. Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri in their book *Empire* elaborate Bhabha's position as follows:

Social identities and nations were

mimicry represents itself more in the form of a "menace" than "representation" or "resemblance", a "rupture" than consolidation (132). It looks like the original that it copies, but also contains a threatening element of difference that refuses to be erased and through its existence threatens the colonizer's right to ideological domination and control. Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin explain in their book *Key Concepts*, "The copying of the colonizing culture, behavior, manners and values by the colonized contains both mockery and a certain "menace" (86).

To sum up, mimicry, as Bhabha says in his book *The Location of Culture*, has this effect of changing the roles of the two sides of a power relationship. Thus, the colonized natives had the power to fight back with the colonizer using the colonizer's own weapons. It is not only a tool for self-defence but also for some natives the only way to cope with the oppression. Bhabha claims that the colonized natives have to be in harmony with the colonizer because otherwise they would have been lost. The power of the dominant culture was so huge that the colonized in some societies or cultures had no other choice than imitating the colonizer either to fight them with equal powers or just to live comfortably. Additionally, in relation to mimicry, Bhabha speaks of a "flawed colonial mimesis," (125) which differentiates between being Anglicized and being English. In other words, to be Anglicized is not to be English or "white" (125). According to Bhabha:

What emerges between mimesis and mimicry is a writing, a mode of representation, that marginalizes the monumentality of history, quite simply mocks its power to be a model, that power which supposedly makes it imitable" (125)

habits, assumptions, institutions and values, the result is never a simple reproduction of those traits. Rather, the result is a blurred copy of the colonizer that is quite threatening. That is because mimicry is never very far from mockery, since it can appear to parody whatever it mimics. (139)

Mimicry, thus, is the mocking imitation, which on the surface appears like assimilation, but underneath contains a threatening element of difference and rejection; the colonized do not actually want to be completely like the colonizer.

Thus, mimicry, as Bhabha suggests in *The Location of Culture*, harshly dismisses the colonizer as worthy of complete imitation and partially avoids their dominance and control. Bhabha argues that the colonial discourse can be disrupted by "doubling" (122) it through an act of "mimicry" (122). In Bhabha's discussion of the concept of colonial mimicry, he states:

Colonial mimicry is the desire for a reformed, recognizable Other, as a subject of difference that is almost the same, but not quite. Which is to say, that the discourse of mimicry is constructed around ambivalence; in order to be effective, mimicry must continually produce its slippage, its excess, its difference. (122)

For Bhabha, this hybrid mimicry highlights "doubleness or splitting of the subject"(125) that strengthens the argument for cultural, linguistic and hybridity. Thus, Mimicry is "a double articulation" (125). It is a strategy through which the colonial subjectivity is de-stabilized and its purity corrupted. In that act of repetition, originality is lost, and centrality de-centred. Hence,

implies the meaning of imitation (*mimesis*) in order to make people laugh. Hence, the sense of mockery is embedded in such a meaning. Secondly, the word is used in biology as imitation of the appearance of something or someone as a defense mechanism (182). Thus, it implies a way of resistance. In the postcolonial context, the two meanings are used to identify the relationship between the colonizer and the colonized. According to Huddart in his book *Homi K Bhabha*, mimicry is an exaggerated feature. However, he thinks:

This exaggeration means that mimicry is repetition with difference, and so it is not evidence of the colonized's servitude. In fact, this paying with difference and mockery: mimicry is also a form of mockery, and Bhabha's post-colonial theory is a comic approach to colonial discourse, because it mocks and undermines the ongoing pretensions of colonialism and empire. (39)

Huddart then explains that the ironic quality of mimicry is important because colonial discourse is characterized by seriousness, with claims to educate and improve the ridiculous, unimportant stereotyped colonized. The irony of postcolonial situation involves that the colonizer's seriousness with its civilizing mission is ridiculed. Thus, mimicry allows resistance to the colonial discourse since it "represents an ironic compromise" (86) between two main ideas: imitation and mockery. Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin in *Key Concepts* define mimicry as follows:

When colonial discourse encourages the colonized subject to mimic the colonizer, by adopting the colonizer's cultural

enlightenment. The colonial discourse, at once, demands both similarity and difference in the figures of the colonized.

In *Location of Culture*, Bhabha suggests that colonial mimicry is the primary principle that the colonizer employs to give the colonized the definition of their existence. "Colonial mimicry is the desire for a reformed recognizable Other, as a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite" (86). Thus, from the above mentioned definition, one can conclude that the colonizer admits the inferior existence of the colonized. The colonized is always defined as the follower of the master or, in other words, he is regarded as the subordinate to the master. However, this is not the whole picture. Since hybridity is a sign of reaction and resistance against domination, then mimicry is a means of resistance as well. Bhabha also considers mimicry "as a site of successful resistance by the colonized subject to the dominant" (181). Mimicry is encouraged by the colonizer at the beginning as a tool for control, because it would have been easier to control the colonized when they were copying the colonizer's culture. However, it turned out to be "an anti-colonial tool" (178).

Bhabha's concepts of mimicry and hybridity can explain how struggles for agency, as represented in literature, have been shaped and compromised. They can also show how these struggles are determined by the ideology of the dominant culture. Bhabha's mimicry illuminates the agency of the colonized as well as the anxiety of the colonizer. According to Bhabha, by following the colonizer's culture, the colonized, through mimicry, opens a space for himself to resist colonial discourse. This mimicry involves strategic imitation whose aim for the colonized is to be present and visible in the dominant culture in a way that subverts any claim for purity or originality.

As Bhabha puts it in *The Location of Culture*, the word mimicry implies two meanings. First, it

Introduction as:

But mimicry is also the sly weapon of anticolonial civility, an ambivalent mixture of deference and disobedience. The native subject often appears to observe the political and semantic, imperatives of colonial discourse...In other words; 'mimicry' inaugurates the process of anti-colonial self-differentiation through the logic of inappropriate appropriation. (149-150)

Bhabha expects that an anxiety of colonizer has to open a space for the colonized to resist colonial discourse. According to Bhabha, mimicry is an exaggerated copying of language, culture, manners and ideas and this exaggeration means that mimicry is repetition with difference. Mimicry is also a form of mockery as Bhabha's postcolonial theory is a comic approach to colonial discourse because it mocks and undermines the aims of colonialism and empire. In short, mimicry is a response from the colonized side to the stereotypes imposed on them by the colonizer side. Homi Bhabha finds mimicry as central to colonial discourse. He defines it, in *The Location of Culture*, as:

Colonial mimicry is the desire for a reformed recognizable Other, as a subject of difference that is almost the same, but not quite which is to say, that the discourse of mimicry is constructed around an ambivalence; in order to be effective, mimicry must continually produce its slippage, its excesses, its difference. (86)

Colonizer's discourse expects the colonized to be like the colonizer or identical. Homi Bhabha argues that mimicry is never quite accurate. It undermines colonialism's discourses of humanism and

amuse people (420)". As mentioned by Bill Ashcroft and others in their famous book *Post-Colonial Studies, Key Concepts*:

When colonial discourse encourages the colonial subject to "mimic" the colonizer, by adopting the institutions and values, the result is never a simple reproduction of those traits. Rather the result is a blurred copy of the colonizer that can be quite threatening. (139)

On reading *The Location of Culture*, one can conclude that Bhabha's concept of mimicry is a strategy of colonial power and knowledge which has a desired goal for the inhabitants of approval and changed outlooks in terms of inclusion and exclusion. Inclusion aims at the acceptance of "good natives" (85) as the colonizers programmers and exclusion puts the goal of disavowal and denouncing the majority "bad natives" (86). Bhabha further defines mimicry in terms of ambivalence as similar and dissimilar. Similarity defines its resemblance to the masters, colonized subjects to be like masters and dissimilarity: "a difference that is almost the same, but not quite" (86).

Mimicry in Bhabha's terms is the colonial strategy to create the people "to be Anglicized is emphatically not to be English" (132). It is also clear that Bhabha's concept of mimicry is a repetition not a representation, yet this resemblance is threatening to the basis of power and discrimination as "there is a distinctive quality of English civilization" (132). The term mimicry as Bhabha sees it is a part of a larger concept of the postcolonial situation. It is considered as a kind of binary opposition between authority and oppression. He further asserts that mimicry can be taken as a way of challenging control that also gives rise to postcolonial analysis by subverting the colonial master's authority and hegemony. Leela Gandhi explains the term mimicry in her book, *Postcolonial Theory: An*

trace their historical movements of hybridization. Further, he states that two different cultures are “not the source of conflict” (70), but are instead “the effect of discriminatory practices” (71). He also points out that cultures are effects of stabilization produced by authority. In short, Bhabha’s idea of hybridity suggests that cultures come after the hybridizing process. He proves that, in colonial relationships, this is just as true of the colonizer as of the colonized. Bhabha reminds the readers that cultures are part of an ongoing process. He further suggests that majority liberal cultures must view themselves through the post-colonial perspective. Bhabha’s theory of hybridity has important consequences for discourses of the right. Moreover, Bhabha points out that minority cultures have tended to be ignored or, alternatively, asked to assimilate.

Bhabha in his book *The Location of Culture* argues that a new hybrid concept of culture is necessary to develop a truly international culture, and to face systems of cultural dominance, but he argues that this new concept should be centered on "cultural difference"(207) rather than "cultural diversity"(207). Bhabha, drawing on post-structuralist theory, cites the inability of language to accurately represent the world and therefore claims that "all cultural statements and systems are constructed in this contradictory and ambivalent space of enunciation"(208). For Bhabha, this space is a "Third Space" (78) in between cultures that are often thought to be opposed. This space is a site where cultural difference can be articulated and postcolonial people can renegotiate their own identities outside of binaries.

The aim of this section is to explain the meaning of mimicry with relation to the study of postcolonial criticism and theory in Bhabha’s book *The Location of The Culture*. According to *Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary Fifth Edition*: "Mimicry is the art of mimicking somebody/something” (420). To mimic is to copy "somebody’s voice, gesture, etc. in order to

Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts states, that even under oppression that distinctive aspects of the culture of the oppressed can survive and become an integral part of the new formations which rise. Ashcroft says how

hybridity and the power it relates may well be seen as the characteristic feature and contribution of the post-colonial, allowing a means of evading the replication of the binary categories of the past and developing new anti-monolithic models of cultural exchange and growth. (183)

Bhabha expresses his view on the relation between culture and hybridity. According to him, just like colonial culture, contemporary culture is also hybrid. Hybridity is an idea which characterized the mechanism of the colonial psychic economy. Thus, he adds further that cultural hybridity is not something absolutely general and so hybridity appears in all cultures. He makes it more clear in the following passage of the essay, "Signs taken for Wonders":

Colonial hybridity is not a problem of genealogy or identity between two different cultures which can then be resolved as an issue of cultural relativism. Hybridity is a problematic of colonial representation and individuation that reverses the effects of the colonialist disavowal, so that other 'denied' Knowledge enter upon the dominant discourse and estrange the basis of its authority-its rules of recognition. (114)

Here Bhabha stresses two things: we do not start with two or more cultures, more or less pure and

colonial authority but to demonstrate the power with something different from its original presence. This strategy helps the colonizers rationalize their discrimination toward the identities and power of the colonized. By describing the colonized with such identities, the colonizer can still situate in the position that enables him to escape from the name of hegemonic oppressor.

Robert Young in his famous book *White Mythologies* notes how it was influential in imperial and colonial discourse in giving damaging reports on the union of different races. Young would argue that at the turn of the century, "hybridity" (9) had become part of a colonialist discourse of racism. In Jean Rhys' novel *Wide Sargasso Sea* (1966), the words "Creole" (16) or "hybrid" (29) were essentially negative. They were used throughout the book as lazy and dangerous. Young wants to mention that this word has a negative connotation. However, Ashcroft has focused, in an article in his book, *Post-Colonial Studies: The Key concepts*, on the hybridized nature of post-colonial culture as a point of strength rather than weakness. It is not a case of the oppressor subjecting the oppressed or the colonizer silencing the colonized.

In other words, Bhabha wants to say that this process is a mutual one. The clash of cultures can impact as much upon the colonizer as the colonized. On reading *Child of Happy valley: A memoir*, one can receive that impression. Juanita Carberry, the protagonist, grew up as a Swahili speaker and played with the wild animals against her father's wishes, her experience was essentially more African than English. Juanita was the daughter of a white settler in the White Valley in Kenya. She was brought up by her father's black servants and white governesses, who lived on the estate.

Clearly, throughout the novel, readers can get a taste of the hybridized nature of her childhood and her life. It is a proof, as Bill Ashcroft in his book,

is formed in a space of in-betweenness and liminality. Moreover, what Bhabha calls the "Third Space of enunciation"(78); the liminal space between the cultures of the colonizer and the colonized. It is discussed to show how a process of hybrid identification can subvert any fixed sense of identity. Further, the present chapter proceeds to include and respond to some issues raised by famous critics such as Benita Parry concerning Bhabha's theory of cultural identity.

In *The Location of Culture*, Bhabha introduces the idea of ambivalence as he discusses the production of the stereotype in colonial discourse. He argues that if "the object 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"(101), then the stereotype is a key apparatus of dominance used by the colonial administration. Thus, Bhabha begins his discussion of the stereotype by linking it to the idea of "fixity"(93). In order to sustain dominance, the colonial discourse is dependent "on the concept of fixity in the ideological construction of otherness"(94).

Ambivalence, claims Bhabha, has been overlooked as "one of the most significant discursive and psychological strategies of discriminatory power" (66). Thus, ambivalence sometimes comes to be used as an alternative to Bhabha's hybridity. According to Fanon, the colonial context is characterized by the Manichean condition of two opposing sides that know no possibility of co-existence. This condition gives Bhabha the chance to fashion the concepts of hybridity in reference to colonial otherness. The colonizers have to secure their original authority through denying and discriminating the colonized. However, hybridity provides the transformation of discrimination. It also reveals the necessity of displacing the domination. Bhabha believes that to perform the strategy of hybridity is not to erase the

use of English language on the part of the colonized is a threat to orientalist structure of knowledge in which oppositional distinction is made. The mimic men in relation to the colonizers, "almost the same but not quite" (89) is what Bhabha thinks as a source of colonial resistance. Mimicry gives rise to postcolonial analysis by subverting the colonial master's authority and hegemony. It is a weapon of anti-colonial civility, an ambivalent mixture of deference and disobedience. Leela Gandhi, in her book *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction* says: "mimicry inaugurates the process of anti-colonial self-differentiation through the logic of inappropriate appropriation" (150).

Another term used by Bhabha for the first time in the Postcolonial field is the term "hybridity"(73). This term has been most recently associated with the work of Homi K. Bhabha, whose analysis of colonizer /colonized relations stresses the interdependence and mutual construction of their subjectivities. Hybridization is a kind of negotiation, both political and cultural, between the colonizer and the colonized. Like Bhabha, Edward Said also, in his book *Orientalism*, underlined the importance of cultural hybridity .Being an integral part of postcolonial discourse, hybridity, in Said's opinion, may bridge the gap between West and the East (17).

Homi K. Bhabha *has played* a significant role in theoretical discussions of hybridity. His work in postcolonial cultural criticism draws much attention to the notion. His literary theories of hybridity, mimicry, ambivalence and agency develop the field of postcolonial cultural studies. This chapter examines Bhabha's major contribution to understanding the notion of hybridity. Therefore, the chapter gives a close reading of Bhabha's major work, *The Location of Culture*. This book is considered to be one of the best books that display many aspects of the Postcolonial theory. It shows how the intercultural space, where hybrid identity,

cultural clash, meet in between; in a liminal "Third Space"(78) that is neither Colonizer nor Colonized. In *The Location of Culture* Bhabha says that "the production of meaning requires that two places be mobilized in the passage through a Third Space"(78). Within this Third Space, colonizer and colonized negotiate their cultural difference and create a culture that is a hybrid, which "is the revaluation of assumption of colonial identity" (112) of both colonizer and colonized. So in this way, their negotiation is dialectic, but a dialectic that remains ambivalent.

Mimicry is also an important term in the post-colonial theory, because it has come to describe the ambivalent relationship between the colonizers and the colonized. When colonial discourse encourages the colonized subject to mimic the colonizer, by adopting the colonizers' cultural habits, assumptions, institutions and values, the result is never a simple reproduction of these traits. Rather, it results, as Bhabha assumes in his book *The Location of Culture*, in "a blurred copy" (139) of the colonizer that can be quite threatening.

Bhabha, in his book *The Location of Culture*, describes mimicry as "one of the most effective strategies of colonial power and knowledge" (35). For example, British wanted to create a class of Indians who should adopt English opinion and morals. These figures were just like Fanon's French educated colonials depicted in *Black Skin, White Masks*. They are "mimic men" (85) they learn to act English but do not look English nor are they accepted as such. As Bhabha explains in the same book "to be Anglicized is emphatically not to be English" (132).

According to Bhabha, in his book *The Location of Culture*, Mimic men are not absolutely "slavish"(80). They also have power, to some extent, to "menace"(82) the colonizers. He says that, the

Bhabha's theory mainly speaks of the process of creating a new cultural identity from the perspective of the in-between spaces. Bhabha himself can be considered as a hybrid product from an in-between society; India as a postcolonial world and Britain as an imperial world. He himself is considered to be a living example of the process of creating culture of which he describes and explains, as seen in the postcolonial discourse and as it will hopefully be illustrated in the fourth chapter of this thesis. Bhabha in his book *The Location of Culture* begins to describe the process of creating a hybrid identity by underestimating the idea of a nation or people as being pure. Bhabha says:

Cultures are never unitary in themselves, nor simply dualistic in the relation of Self and Other...The reason a cultural text or system of meaning cannot be sufficient unto itself is the act of cultural enunciation-the place of utterance-is crossed by the difference of writing...It is in the process of language that is crucial to the production of meaning and ensures, at the same time, that meaning is never simply mimetic and transparent.

(36)

In other words, Bhabha wants to say that a national culture can never be pure because its meaning, like other products of language, is open to interpretation by the audience which is different from the originator's intention. Thus, in the postcolonial discourse, the colonizer's culture, as well as the colonized people's culture, is open to ambivalence. He goes on saying that the two sides, the colonized and the colonizer, in order to gain the meaning of this

Homi K. Bhabha: Creating Hybrid Identities¹

Abstract:

Homi K. Bhabha has used, for the first time, some new terms such as mimicry, hybridity, ambivalence and third Space in the postcolonial field. He expresses his opinion about this cultural issue by introducing the idea of hybridity. It has become a feature of Bhabha's post-colonial writings. This paper also contains the main ideas of Bhabha and the most famous attacks or criticism of other famous critics such as Benita Parry and Ania Loomba to Bhabha's theory of hybridity.

Key Words: Hybridity, Third Space, Mimicry and Cultural identity.

¹Wael Mohamed Abdel Baky -PHD researcher- Faculty of Arts - Aswan University

**Homi K. Bhabha: Creating Hybrid
Identities**