



*Parvin Ghasemi

Faculty of Letters and Humanities, Department of Foreign Languages,
Shiraz University, 9th floor, Eram Square, Shiraz, Iran e-mail: pghasemi2000@yahoo.com

*Samira Sasani

Faculty of Letters and Humanities, Department of Foreign Languages,
Shiraz University, 9th floor, Eram Square, Shiraz, Iran
e-mail: samira.sasani21@yahoo.com

*Fatereh Nemati

Faculty of Letters and Humanities, Department of Foreign Languages,
Shiraz University, 9th floor, Eram Square, Shiraz, Iran
e-mail: nematiftrh@yahoo.com

A STUDY OF THE THIRD SPACE, HYBRIDITY, AND COLONIAL MIMICRY IN ATHOL FUGARD'S *MY CHILDREN! MY AFRICA!*

Abstract

South Africa, like many other Eastern countries, was a victim of the brutal phenomenon called colonialism. Its people suffered a lot but did not give up protesting against it. Literature was often used as a means to demonstrate the problems and realities of the society. Therefore, the literary texts can be considered an effective weapon in this battle. One of these influential people is Harold Athol Lanigan Fugard who is known for his anti-apartheid plays. This article scrutinizes the relation between the colonizer and the colonized in Athol Fugard's *My Children! My Africa!* based on Homi Bhabha's ideas. According to him, the relation between the whites and the blacks becomes reciprocal in the third space of enunciation. Despite their differences, they try to live peacefully. The mimicry strategy is employed by the colonized to prevent total resemblance. They are dependent on each other notwithstanding their opposition, and both are aware of this, which makes them stick together.

Keywords: Postcolonialism, Athol Fugard, *My Children! My Africa!*, Homi Bhabha

Introduction

South Africa, like many other Eastern countries, was a victim of the predominant mentality among British people who believed that Great Britain was destined to rule all over the world. They fostered the assumption that "British people were biologically superior to any other race..." (Bressler, 1994: 236). As Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin mentioned in their book *Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts*, the Europeans exploited the Africans and felt an absolute possession over them as their slaves. Although slavery was abolished at the beginning of the 19th century, it gave birth to racism (2000: 195-196). Race, which is a term used "for the classification of human beings into physically, biologically and genetically distinct groups," is thoroughly related to the rise of colonialism (Ashcroft, 2000: 180).

Postcolonial literature emerged as a result of this situation. "Postcolonial literature" was defined by Leela Gandhi in her book, *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*, as "a contentious

* **Parvin Ghasemi** is Professor of English Literature at Shiraz University, Iran.

* **Samira Sasani** is Assistant Professor of English Literature at Shiraz University, Iran.

* **Fatereh Nemati** is M.A. Graduate of English Literature at Shiraz University, Iran.

category which refers, somewhat arbitrary, to 'literature in English', namely, to those literatures which have accompanied the projection and decline of British imperialism" (1998: 141). Paul A. Cantor states that postcolonial critics are attracted to "Postcolonial" literature which is also known as "Third World" literature or "non-Western" literature. These critics focus on the works from areas which were once "colonized by European nations" and "articulate anti-Western views" (1999: 23). Therefore, postcolonial literature has been considered as a "blank screen" for postcolonial critics to show and demonstrate "their hatred of west" (Cantor, 1999: 24).

Unlike the other playwrights of that time, Fugard had the courage to write anti-apartheid plays, although the law made it illegal. Though he enjoys the freedom of expression as a white writer, he does not like the way people treat the blacks. The depiction of Fugard as a "sensitive, courageous, and energetic man" is ostensible in history of South Africa (Cohen, 1977: 75). He was born in the small Karoo town of Middleburg, Eastern Cape, South Africa, on June 11, 1932 to English and Afrikaner parents. The family moved to Port Elizabeth, where he has lived all his life. With his mixed heritage from an English father and an Afrikaner mother, Fugard claims his "'English tongue is speaking for an Afrikaner psyche'"(qtd. in Foley, 1996: 134). He is known for his deeply rooted and controversial anti-apartheid plays, which are suitable to be scrutinized under Homi Bhabha's theories. Although Homi Bhabha was influenced by Fanon and Said, he propagated his new ideas in his book *The Location of Culture*. In other words, his theories decentralize what has been considered as axioms of colonization.

Homi K. Bhabha's take on Third Space, Hybridity, and Colonial Mimicry

Homi K. Bhabha begins his influential book, *The Location of Culture* (1994), by introducing the concept of "Third Space of enunciation". According to him "all cultural statements and systems are constructed in this contradictory and ambivalent space of enunciation" (55). He also adds "[i]t is that Third Space, though unrepresentable in itself, which constitutes the discursive conditions of enunciation that ensure the meaning and the symbols of culture have no primordial unity or fixity; that even the same signs can be appropriated, translated, rehistoricized and read anew" (55). In other words, as Ilan Kapoor argues, the third space is a "non-dialectical space standing in between the binary structures of orientalist representations and imperial power" (2003: 566). Ikas and Wagner in the introduction to their book *Communicating in the Third Space* note that "the encounter of two social groups with different cultural traditions and potentials of power as a special kind of negotiation or translation . . . takes place in a Third Space of enunciation" (2009: 2). Accordingly a new identity will appear. Bill Ashcroft in his article "Caliban's Voice: Writing in the Third Space" mentions that "this space is also a transcultural space, a 'contact zone,' . . . that space in which cultural identity develops. . . . the space of postcolonial transformation" (2009: 108). In fact, the third space is the appropriate space for the interaction of the main characters, who are in need of a mutual colonial relationship to get along. The colonizer and the colonized in the Third Space try to interact.

Bhabha's concept of the third space was initially used by Van Gennep "in his tripartite taxonomy of 'separation; margin (or limen); and reaggregation' which he saw as the characteristic of all rites of passage, liminality, or limen, simply means the middle 'state', a stage of transition, or a border zone" (Kalua, 2009: 23). Then, it was developed and adopted by Victor Turner who named it "Liminality" "meaning a consciousness of borderlands, seeing it as central in explaining the nature and importance of various forms of space that can be identified in human cultural experience" (Kalua, 2009: 23). According to Fetson Kalua, Homi Bhabha theorizes this concept of the third space by expanding what was said by Fanon and Said in a postcolonial context.

This concept is a postcolonial phenomenon which includes Bhabha's other concepts such as liminality, mimicry and hybridity. According to Bhabha, all these happen because the power is spread equally between the parties in the space of their encounter. Philipp Schorch mentions that the third space "makes the structure of meaning and reference an ambivalent process" (2013: 69). He also argues that in the third space "there is no *a priori*" (69). In other words, in this space no party has priority over the other.

Paul Meredith also mentions that "this hybrid third space is an *ambivalent* site where cultural meaning and representation have no 'primordial unity or fixity'" (1998: 3). So the established assumption of Eurocentrism and whites' uniqueness was shaken by the concept of hybridity. Ian Baucom, in his article "Narrating the Nation", mentions that "identity of the colonized is concurrently less stably re-formed, as mimesis of European original, than the colonial authorities wish (less than one), and is threateningly exhibited as a mask of mimicry of the colonial presence (double)" (Baucom, 1992: 147). Baucom's definition also emphasizes the authority of the colonizer which is shaken by Bhabha's theory of hybridity. The colonizer's power is threatened by its double, the colonized.

Referring to Franz Fanon's writings, Bhabha stipulates that "[he] is the purveyor of the transgressive and transitional truth" (57). According to him, Fanon depicts "the problem of colonial cultural alienation in psychoanalytic language of demand and desire" (1994: 61). Scrutinizing Fanon's *Black Skin, White Masks*, Bhabha states that "Fanon's *Black Skin, White Masks* reveals the doubling of identity: the difference between identity as an intimation of reality, or an intuition of being, and the psychoanalytic problem of identification that always beg the question of the subject: 'What does a man want?'" (72). He believes that "[s]uch binary, two-part, identities function in a kind of narcissistic reflection of the One in the Other. . . ." (72).

Besides Frantz Fanon, Bhabha also uses Said's theories as one of the influential precedents. He refers to his book *Orientalism* in order to challenge the fixed assumption of the stability of the stereotypes. Bhabha's emphasis is also on the "process of *ambivalence*" which is thought to be "central to stereotypes . . . as it constructs a theory of colonial discourse" (95). To give a brief definition of colonial discourse, he notes: "It is an apparatus that turns on the recognition and disavowal of racial/cultural/historical differences. . . . The objective 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". (Bhabha, 1994: 100-101)

The fourth chapter of Bhabha's book is devoted to one of the most important concepts which he calls "Colonial Mimicry". Bhabha introduces mimicry as an anxiety while the colonized uses it as a resistance strategy. Colonial mimicry or "sly civility" as he calls it later, "is the desire for a reformed, recognizable Other, as a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite" (1994: 122). He also mentions that "the discourse of mimicry is constructed around an ambivalence; in order to be effective, mimicry must continually produce its slippage, its excess, its difference" (122). Bhabha argues that mimicry "emerges as the representation of a difference that is itself a process of disavowal. Mimicry is, thus the sign of a double articulation; a complex strategy of reform, regulation and discipline, which 'appropriates' the other as it visualizes power"(122). The colonizer's anxiety has everything to do with the perceived "menace" posed by notions of mimicry. "The *menace* of mimicry is its double vision which in disclosing the ambivalence of colonial discourse also disrupts its authority" (126). Because of the power that the colonizer feels he has as the superior agent, he conveys this feeling to the colonized and consequently makes the colonized internalize the inferiority and makes him mimic him. At the same time, the thought of having a double makes him anxious. So, the colonizer tries to make the other the same, but with a slight difference. This process "fixed the colonial subject as a 'partial' presence" (123). By "partial" Bhabha means "incomplete" and "virtual". This desire "articulates those disturbances of cultural, racial and historical difference that menace the narcissistic demand of colonial authority" (126). Sasani states that "[s]ince becoming quite the same means that the colonizer's authentic identity is paradoxically imitable, so the colonizer is troubled by the colonized or the colonizer's double" (2015: 458). Huddart believes that Bhabha has emphasized "the agency of the colonized" and "the anxiety of the colonizer"; Huddart argues that mimicry is an "an exaggerated copying of language, culture, manners, and ideas. This exaggeration means that mimicry is repetition with difference, and so it is not evidence of the colonized's servitude" (2006: 39). According to the previously established assumptions, the colonizer's power is not imitable. Therefore, colonial mimicry denotes a desire and an anxiety, simultaneously.

Hybridity is one of the other concepts which was emphasized by Bhabha. He defines hybridity as "the name of this displacement of value from symbol to sign that causes the dominant discourse to split along the axis of its power to be representative, authoritative" as well as "a problematic of colonial representation and individuation that reverses the effects of the colonialist disavowal, so that other 'denied' knowledges enter upon the dominant discourse and estrange the basis of its authority - its rules of recognition" (162). Bhabha also defines it as "the sign of the productivity

of colonial power, its shifting forces and fixities; it is the name for the strategic reversal of the process of domination through disavowal (that is, the production of discriminatory identities that secure the 'pure' and original identity of authority). Hybridity is the revaluation of the assumption of colonial identity through the repetition of discriminatory identity effects. It displays the necessary deformation and displacement of all sites of discrimination and domination"(159). According to Haj Yazdiha "hybridity arose out of the culturally internalized interactions between 'colonizers' and 'the colonized' and the dichotomous formation of these identities" (2010: 31). In his article "Hybridity and Cultural Rights: Inventing Global Citizenship", David Huddart states that "Bhabha believes that hybridity calls into question traditional analyses of colonialism, which tend to merely reverse the terms of colonial knowledge. Again, hybridity is not a consequence of other, apparently 'pure' positions that have been, for one reason or another, thrust together" (2007: 23). By the beneficial interaction of the two parties in the third space, a new identity, for each of them, is shaped. None of them are quite the same as they were before entering the space.

According to Mizutani, the concept of hybridity that Bhabha has used in his book "is not intended to serve as a moral ground for favoring racial mixture over the imperialist ideology of racial purity" (2013: 30). He believes that the reason which caused Bhabha to know hybridity as an anxiety for the colonizer is that "[h]ybridity helps the postcolonial critic to upset the discourse of imperialism that would otherwise remain "unmixed," uninfluenced by anything other than itself" (30). But why? The colonizers, the "white subject" or the "English gentleman" has always been considered as the "center", "ever present". "He existed, always and anywhere. Like a 'light,' the white subject would reach every corner of the colonized land, its every spot of 'darkness'" Mizutani believes (2013: 31). These assumptions would be tenable till they weren't "influenced by the object he colonized" (31). Now this question comes to mind - "would it ever be possible for the white subject to stay completely aloof from the land he colonizes?" (31) Accordingly, as it was predicted, "this logical contradiction made the colonial discourse of enlightenment equivocal and internally split" (31); the change sets an anxiety among the white subjects. Then, the hybrids created out of these phenomena try to mimic their originals; "albeit in an incomplete and disturbing manner". "The Eurasian subject as mimicry would exist only by relating himself to the original – the white subject" (2013: 35) Mizutani states. Thus, the "supposed 'extra-racial' quality of the white subject would become perverted as he was mocked by somebody who was 'white, but not quite'" (2013: 35). Therefore, as Mizutani argued in his article, this concept of hybridity challenges the "logic of permanent presence, or of never-changing identity" (2013: 36) of the colonial discourse.

My Children! My Africa!

Since the focus of this study is on the relationship between the colonizer and the colonized in a colonial environment, Fugard's *My Children! My Africa!* has been chosen as the play to be scrutinized in the light of Bhabha's theories. In this play, the writer gives a real description of the reality of the relation between the blacks and the whites. The play provides an opportunity for the reader to get to a new perspective about the texts and the postcolonial theories.

Living in South Africa, under the difficult situation of the policy of Apartheid, Fugard becomes obsessed with this issue and tries to show his discontent in his plays. As a result, most of his plays are dealing with this issue in the background. As Russell Vandenbrouck mentioned in his *Truths the hand can touch: The theatre of Athol Fugard*, "Fugard will be called a South African playwright in the same spirit that Faulkner is considered a Southern novelist, for both are 'regional' writers who use the details of a specific time and place, and their experience in that place, to explore general conflicts and quandaries" (1985: 14).

Apartheid is an Afrikaans term meaning "apartness" or "separation" and was operated in South Africa from 1948 until the early 1990s. Gina Wisker mentioned in *Key Concepts in Postcolonial Literature* that apartheid "separated people in South Africa on the basis of their ethnic origins and skin color"(Wisker, 2007: 11). Within this policy, the government of South Africa segregated whites from non-whites. Later, more acts were the offshoots of this policy such as the Immorality Act, the Group Areas Act, the Mixed Amenities Act, the Population Registration Act, and the Bantu Education act (Wisker, 2007: 11-12). Mahlauli, Salani, and Mokotedi state that apartheid as

a "legalized system of racial discrimination" imposes "separation or segregation of blacks and whites in the areas of government, labor market and residency" (2015: 205).

One of the issues or better said restrictions imposed on Africans under Apartheid policy was Bantu Education Act which was passed by the government in 1953. According to this act, the government determined the materials to be taught to the black students. In other words, this was the white government who controlled the education system for black students; lack of facilities, low salaries for teachers, crowded classrooms, poor teachers' training, and few hours of school in a day were some of its restrictions. As it is argued by Vuyisile Msila, "Bantu Education for black South Africans had been a means of restricting the development of the learner by distorting school knowledge to ensure control over the intellect of the learners and teachers, and propagating state propaganda" (2007: 149). Therefore, by having control over the education of the students, the government has control over their future.

Msila also goes further by stating that Bantu Education Act was declared "as a way of maintaining the black South Africans in a permanent state of political and economic subordination. The educational system had been an obvious instrument of control to protect power and privilege" (2007: 149). All these ideas are traceable in the play. In scene six of the first act, the students show their objection to the restrictions of Bantu Education Act. They protest against the educational program of the regional "Inspector of Bantu schools" (Fugard, 1990: 55), who propagates the education which "nurtures an image of the European world by claiming that Europe was the center of the universe and Africa was discovered by Europe" (Shihada, 2007: 30).

This abbreviated introduction to Bantu Education Act was given because the play focuses on Bantu Education under the policy of Apartheid. Fugard emphasizes the power of education and also its importance in this play. By choosing subjects such as Apartheid and Bantu Education, Fugard tends to show his hope and optimistic view towards the future of his country. He believes in the power of education and the changes the new generation will bring about.

Written in June 1989, *My Children! My Africa!* is set in a classroom at Zolile High School in autumn 1985 in Camdeboo, South Africa during the first years of "the beginning of the boycott of schools by African, Indian and Coloured pupils in reaction to the establishment of the tricameral parliament" (Foley, 1996: 270). The school is managed based on the Bantu Education Act. *My Children! My Africa!* revolves around three major characters: Anela Myalatya (Mr. M), Isabel Dyson, and Thami Mbikwana. Anela Myalatya or simply Mr. M., as his students call him, is a 57-year-old black teacher at Zolile High School in Brakwater. Still a bachelor, he has devoted his life to learning and teaching. He is a "Confucian" (Fugard, 1990: 32) and his goal is to propagate this style of living. He is an idealistic, intellectual, smart and, at the same time, a traditional teacher who believes in words rather than actions. Because of his naïve and plain personality he is loved by his students especially Thami and Isabel.

Isabel Dyson is a white girl from a posh white school who visits Zolile High School for a debate. She is also a witty, intelligent, open-minded and optimistic girl who enters the black world dauntlessly. She comes from a wealthy white family in which she is considered a "rebel" (Fugard, 1990:15), because she sees things differently from her family. Thami Mbikwana, an 18-year-old black boy from the Location who has an interminable passion for learning, is the complete opposite of Mr. M. with a totally different and distinct viewpoint. Smart and young, Thami believes in actions rather than words. Fed up with the pressure and the injustices Apartheid has imposed on them, he and a group of his friends set up a group to show their discontent. He is the representative of the new generation of the youths of Africa while Mr. M. is the representative of the old generation.

The play begins with a debate between Thami Mbikwana, from Zolile High school and Isabel Dyson a white girl from the white school of Cambedoo. Isabel won the debate about the female students' rights in having the same syllabi as the male students'. After the debate, despite their differences, a friendship strikes up between Isabel and Thami. The friendship and cooperation go further until Mr. M. suggests Isabel and his protégé, Thami, to participate in an English literature competition. Both of them accept to show that two people of different races can work together. On the other hand Thami, getting frustrated by the policy of Apartheid and studying under the Bantu Education Act, joins a group of youths who decides to operate a boycott to show their protests. Mr. M. tries to warn him, according to his Confucian beliefs, which the words are much more powerful than actions, but he does not succeed. Mr. M. insists on "[i]f the struggle needs weapon give it words,

Thami. Stone and petrol bombs can't get inside those armored cars. Words can." while Thami shows his discontent by saying "struggle doesn't need the big English words you taught me how to spell" (Fugard, 1990: 64). Despite all his aversions Thami tries to show Mr. M's innocence—to obstruct the disaster—but he does not succeed. Later on, feeling regret for the death of his beloved teacher, Thami leaves the country to join the movement.

The debate, at the beginning of the play, is the central motif of the play. It is between two students, a black boy and a white girl, Thami and Isabel, so it can be seen as a microcosm of the real world with the brutal encounters of blacks and whites. The debate in this play is not only between blacks and whites, inferiors and superiors, powerful and powerless, but also between tradition and revolution, old and young, language and action. When the discussion was done, Mr. M clarifies the importance of it for the students. He says "[i]f you believe that we have the right to vote out there in the big world, then show here in the classroom that you know how to use it" (11).

The play deals with the union of blacks and whites. The relation and friendship between Thami, the black boy, and Isabel the white girl, and also the question of how and why this relationship has been formed is central to this play. Thami is considered an agent of the whole black society of Africa and Isabel the agent of the white society. In fact, their relation can be viewed as a microcosm of a more complex relation.

According to Said's ideas "[t]he relationship between Occident and Orient is a relationship of power, of domination, of varying degrees of a complex hegemony. . . ." (Said, 1978: 5). Said believes that the only goal of the West is to have power over the Orient. So this makes the relationship between the colonizer and the colonized, an authoritative relation, from top to bottom. In his book *Orientalism* (1978) he tried to ascertain some of the assumptions of Western world which lead to misinterpretations of the cultural symbols of the Orient. He also emphasized the fact that the Orient has been created by the Western imagination. Said believes that "European culture gained in strength and identity by setting itself off against the Orient as a sort of surrogate and even underground self" (3). So, Orientalism refers to the distinctions between "the Orient" and "the Occident". "The relationship between Occident and Orient is a relationship of power, of domination. . . ." Said concludes (5). He states that dominating an inferior country needs "knowledge and power" (32). In order to have authority over a country you should have the knowledge about that country. More knowledge gives you more power and more power brings more control. According to Said, Orientals are shown to be "gullible", "devoid of energy and initiative", "lethargic and suspicious", "oppose the clarity and directness;" and also an oriental "generally acts, speaks, and thinks in a manner exactly opposite to the European" (39). Being "irrational, depraved (fallen), childlike, 'different'" were also counted as the characteristics of Orientals. This is often seen as the main point of discrepancy between the theories of Said and Bhabha. As it will be discussed, the colonizer and the colonized can be profitable for each other in the third space proposed by Bhabha.

The third space in *My Children! My Africa!*

The central figures and characters are: Isabel, who represents the colonizer, and Thami and Mr. M, as the Other or the colonized. From the beginning of the play, their difference is apparent; and even they themselves are aware of it. The blacks' inferiority had been internalized in them long before. They are aware of it and they accept it. On the other hand, the whites' superiority, authority, and control over the other are also internalized in them. The black students had been educated under the Bantu Education Act for years which testifies to their acceptance of their inferiority. They were also segregated to rural undesirable regions and slums. They live in a bad situation, "quite an eyesore" (Fugard, 1990:21).

Being forced to live in such a dreadful place and having no right to protest against it shows their acceptance of their inferiority. In scene six of the first act, Thami states what he feels about the whites and his blackness:

THAMI. . . . I see a generation of tired defeated men and women crawling back to their miserable little pondocks at the end of a day's work for the white baas or madam. And those are the lucky ones. They've at least got work. Most of them

are just sitting around wasting away their lives while they wait helplessly for a miracle to feed their families, a miracle that never comes. Those men and women are our fathers and mothers. We have grown up watching their humiliation. We have to live everyday with the sight of them begging for food in this land of their birth, and their parents' birth ... all the way back to the first proud ancestors of our people. (Fugard, 1990: 55)

Accepting their situation and inferiority, the blacks are ready to enter the third space in order to be able to build a mutual relationship with the whites. From the beginning of the play the entrance of the characters to what Bhabha calls the third space, is clear. In the third space, as Bhabha proposes, no party has authority over the other and there is a reciprocal relationship between the blacks and whites. They both try to get closer to each other, since they both have benefits for each other. The colonial relation between Thami and Isabel is that of the colonized and the colonizer. In order to use each other's ability, and the facts that the colonizer lets the Other become like him, Mr. M as the Other asks Isabel to use her power and abilities to participate in an English literature competition with one of his students, Thami. In scene three of the first act, Mr. M asks her to participate in the competition which can be interpreted as the newly formed interaction taking place in the third space.

The fact that the colonized desires to participate in a competition with the colonizer is what Bhabha calls colonial mimicry strategy through which the colonized tries to be the same as the colonizer. This strategy creates anxiety in the colonizer since he does not want the Other to become quite the same. Huddart states that mimicry is "an exaggerated copying of language, culture, manners, and ideas. This exaggeration means that mimicry is repetition with difference, and so it is not evidence of the colonized's servitude" (2006: 39). In justifying the colonizer's anxiety he also believes that "colonial discourse wants the colonized to be extremely like the colonizer, but by no means identical. If there were an absolute equivalence between the two, then the ideologies justifying colonial rule would be unable to operate" (40). In scene four of the first act, the reader confronts Thami who tries his best to emulate Isabel in having information about English history. Participating in an English competition gives him the sense of equality with the colonizer. Both parties are satisfied with this mutual relation. In scene five of the first act, Mr. M is talking with Isabel about the newly formed relation between her and Thami:

MR. M. You're right. I can't see him doing that. You've become good friends, haven't you?
ISABEL. The best. These past few weeks have been quite an education. I owe you a lot you know. I think Thami would say the same.... (Fugard, 1990:36)

In spite of this newly formed reciprocal relationship between the colonizer and the colonized, the colonized uses some strategy to prevent total similarity. At the end of the play, Thami leaves the competition since he feels that maintaining mimicking the colonizer will put him under the colonizer's control and authority. Employing mimicry strategy, he confesses that blacks "don't want any mixing with the whites" (Fugard, 1990: 62). According to Huddart "Bhabha's close textual analysis finds the hidden gaps and anxieties present in the colonial situation. These points of textual anxiety mark moments in which the colonizer was less powerful than was apparent, moments when the colonized were able to resist the dominance exercised over them. In short, Bhabha's work emphasizes the active *agency* of the colonized" (2006: 1). Therefore, in order to show his own power, the colonized, Thami, leaves the competition. By leaving the competition he ascertains that English literature should not be the privileged one. In other words, he is showing his dissatisfaction.

As another way of showing his resistance, at the end of the play, he starts to use his own indigenous language which is not used in the beginning. The use of native language can also be considered another strategy to resist the control of the colonizer. At the end of the first act, Thami declares in his monologue, "I don't need to go to university to learn what my people really need is a strong double-dose of that traditional old Xhosa remedy called Inkululeko. Freedom" (Fugard, 1990:53). Using vernacular rather than formal English shows his protest. This use of the native language marks the beginning of his resistance. At the end of the second act, when Thami is talking with Isabel, the colonizer, he says:

ISABEL. Do you need any money?
 THAMI.No. Sala Kakuhle, Isabel. That's the Xhosa goodbye.
 ISABEL. I know it. Asispumla taught me how to say it. Hamba Kakhule, Thami.
 (THAMI leaves.) (Fugard, 1990: 83).

In Bhabha's view "[h]ybridity is the sign of the productivity of colonial power, its shifting forces and fixities; it is the name for the strategic reversal of the process of domination through disavowal (that is, the production of discriminatory identities that secure the 'pure' and original identity of authority)" (1994: 159). He also defines hybridity as "the name of this displacement of value from symbol to sign that causes the dominant discourse to split along the axis of its power to be representative, authoritative" (162). So with the emergence of the hybrid, the authority of the colonizer has been destroyed. The entrance of Thami and Isabel, who are respectively the representatives of the colonizer and the colonized in the third space results in the appearance of the hybrid. The reciprocal relation between them leads to the emergence of hybridity as it is emphasized by Bhabha.

Conclusion

Bhabha emphasizes the reciprocal, mutual, beneficial and constructive relationship between the colonizer and the colonized. According to Bhabha, in the third space of enunciation, the relation between the whites and the blacks becomes reciprocal. He shows that both the colonizer and the colonized depend on each other and none of them can be considered a separate and independent entity. Thami plays the role of the black or the Other while Isabel is the White or, in other words, the colonizer. Both the blacks' inferiority and the whites' superiority have been internalized in them for a long time. Despite their differences, they try to live peacefully in the third space which is naturally constructed. The mimicry strategy is employed by the colonized to prevent total resemblance. They are dependent on each other notwithstanding their opposition, and both are aware of this, which causes them to stick together. Accordingly, the mutual relation between the colonizer and the colonized, which Bhabha emphasizes, is totally apparent. It has been proven to both parties that to avoid conflicts and collisions, it would be better for both of them to live under the regulations of the third space.

Works Cited

- Ashcroft, B., G. Griffiths, and H. Tiffin. 2000. *Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts*. New York: Routledge.
- Ashcroft, B. 2009. "Caliban's Voice Writing in the Third Space". In K. Ika, G. Wagner (eds.), *Communicating in the Third Space*. New York: Routledge. 107-22.
- Baucom, I. 1992. "Narrating the Nation." *Transition* Vol 55. 144-53.
- Bhabha, H. K. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Bressler, C. E. 1994. *Literary Criticism: An Introduction to Theory and Practice*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Cantor, P. A. 1999. "A Welcome for Postcolonial Literature." *Academic Questions* Vol 12, no. 1.22-29.
- Cohen, D. 1977. "A South African Drama: Athol Fugard's 'The Blood Knot'." *Modern Language Studies* Vol 7, no. 1. 74-81.
- Foley, A. J. 1996. "Liberalism in South African English Literature 1948-1990: A Reassessment of the Work of Alan Paton and Athol Fugard." Unpublished D. Phil Thesis, Durban: University of Natal.
- Fugard, A. 1990. *My Children! My Africa!* New York: Samuel French.
- Gandhi, L. 1998. *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*. Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Huddart, D. 2006. *Homi K. Bhabha*. London: Routledge.

- - - . 2007. "Hybridity and Cultural Rights: Inventing Global Citizenship." In J. Kuortti and J. Nyman (eds.), *Reconstructing Hybridity: Post-Colonial Studies in Transition*. New York: Rodopi. 21-41.
- Ikas, K., G. Wagner. 2009. "Introduction." In Ikas, K., Wagner, G. (eds.), *Communicating in the Third Space*. New York: Routledge. 1-7.
- Kalua, F. 2009. "Homi Bhabha's Third Space and African identity." *Journal of African Cultural Studies* Vol. 21, no. 1. 23-32.
- Kapoor, I. 2003. "Acting in a tight spot: Homi Bhabha's postcolonial politics." *New Political Science* Vol 25, no. 4. 561-77.
- Mahlauli, M. B., E. Salani, and R. Mokotedi. 2015. "Understanding Apartheid in South Africa through the Racial Contract." *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, Vol. 5, no. 4. 203-19.
- Meredith, P. 1998. "Hybridity in the Third Space: Rethinking Bi-cultural Politics in Aotearoa/New Zealand." Te Oru Rangahau Maori Research and Development Conference, 7-9 July 1998, Massey University. Conference.
- Mizutani, S. 2013. "Hybridity and History: A Critical Reflection on Homi K. Bhabha's Post-Historical Thoughts." *Ab Imperio* Vol. 4. 27-48.
- Msila, V. 2007. "From Apartheid Education to the Revised National Curriculum Statement: Pedagogy for Identity Formation and Nation Building in South Africa." *Nordic Journal of African Studies* Vol. 16, no. 2. 146-60.
- Said, E. 1978. *Orientalism*. London: Penguin Classics.
- Sasani, S. 2015. "A Postcolonial Reading of Athol Fugard's "Master Harold" . . . and the Boys." *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* Vol. 6, no. 3. 458-65.
- Schorch, P. 2013. "Contact Zones, Third Spaces, and the Act of Interpretation." *Museum and Society* Vol. 11, no. 1. 68-81.
- Shihada, I. M. 2007. "My Children! My Africa!: Athol Fugard's Vision for a Non Racial South Africa." *Al-Aqsa University Journal* Vol. 11, no. 2. 24-37.
- Vandenbroucke, R. 1985. *Truths the Hand Can Touch: The Theatre of Athol Fugard*. New York: Theatre Communication Group.
- Wisker, G. 2007. *Key Concepts in Postcolonial Literature*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Yazdiha, H. 2010. "Conceptualizing Hybridity: Deconstructing Boundaries through the Hybrid" *Formations* Vol. 1, no. 1. 31-38.