

# Hybridity: The Effect of Imperialism in Rudyard Kipling's *Kim*

Fatemeh Ghasvand<sup>1</sup> and Bahman Zarrinjooee<sup>2\*</sup>

- 1- MA Student, Postgraduate Department of English Language and Literature, College of Humanities, Boroujerd Branch, Islamic Azad University, Boroujerd, Iran
- 2- Assistant Professor of Postgraduate Department of English Language and Literature, College of Humanities, Boroujerd Branch, Islamic Azad University, Boroujerd, Iran

**Corresponding author:** Bahman Zarrinjooee

**ABSTRACT:** This paper deals with Rudyard Kipling's (1865-1936) *Kim* (1901) based on Edward Said (1935-2003) and Homi K. Bhabha's (1949- ) postcolonial theories, regarding 'the Other' and 'hybrid identity'. Moreover, this paper shows how Kipling is in favor of imperialism in order to support the British Empire in India. The whole novel depicts the British administrators' desire for power in order to provide their supremacy politically, economically and culturally. Based on Bhabha's theories, the present paper investigates how concepts like 'liminality,' 'ambivalence,' and 'hybrid identity' of the colonial subject are constructed in a space that is called 'Third Space of enunciation'. By considering the conditions of hybrid characters like Kim and Babu, the British imperial power attempts to educate and reform them as agents for its own desire. Through the process of reformation, although the hybrid characters endeavor to adapt the British habits, behaviors, values, language and culture, they are involved in the mimicry structure of behavior and in-between situation. They feel a sense of threat and remain in liminal or in-between position. In this regard, this in-between position questions the certainty of imperial power through constructing a 'Third space of enunciation'. Consequently, it is shown how imperialism and imperial powers are the main reasons for identity crisis of the colonial subject in India.

**Keywords:** Other; Hybrid Identity; Liminality; Ambivalence; Mimicry.

## INTRODUCTION

Joseph Rudyard Kipling (1865-1936), an English poet, short story writer, and novelist who is mainly remembered for his admiration of British imperialism, stories and poems of British soldiers in India, and his stories for children. He is the first English writer who received the Nobel Prize in literature in 1907. His father, John Lockwood Kipling, was an anthropologist and curator who inspired the character of the curator of the Wonder house in *Kim*. Kipling was born in Bombay, India, but educated in England.

*Kim* (1901) is Kipling's last novel which is the story of an Irish boy who grows up independently in India. Although he is from Irish descent, he grows up as a native and has the ability to communicate with many groups in India. When he meets the Tibetan Lama, they take a journey around India. Kim's journey throughout India gives him opportunity to obtain knowledge in order to describe many peoples and cultures. Then Kim goes to army regiment where his father worked for some years. Because of his hybrid identity, intelligence and being influenced by various aspects of different cultures, he is hired to work as a check man, mapmaker for the British Empire.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### **Homi K. Bhabha's Hybridity and Third Space in Postcolonial Discourse**

Bhabha argues that all cultural statements and systems are constructed in a space that he calls the "Third Space of enunciations" which is the prerequisite for the "articulation of cultural difference" (38). Hybridity refers to the creation of new "transcultural forms" within the contact zone produced by colonization (Ashcroft et al 108). Hybridity

plays a crucial role in Bhabha's theory closely connected with his other concepts such as "Third Space." Bhabha asserts that cultures are not pure in themselves and are in "liminal or in-between position" of colonial subject—the colonizer and the colonized as the "Third Space of Enunciation" (37). Bhabha asserts that the "split-space of enunciation" opens the way to conceptualize an "international culture" based on the "inscription and articulation of culture's hybridity" (38). David Huddart declares that Bhabha is one of the important postcolonial scholars considering some challenging concepts of postcolonial theory, including "hybridity, mimicry, difference, [and] ambivalence" (1). These terms describe how colonized peoples resist against the power of colonizer which is not as secure as it appears to be. Furthermore, Bhabha argues that colonialism is not something "locked in the past," but its history and culture permanently interferes with the present time (ibid).

The "authority of dominant nations and ideas" is never complete and accompanied by anxiety, "something that enables the dominated to fight back" (ibid). Bhabha's works find the "gaps and anxieties" in the colonial situation and they show how the colonized were able to resist against the dominant power; in other words, Bhabha emphasizes the "active agency of the colonized" (ibid). In this way, he demonstrates how "distinctions between the colonizer and colonized" are never possible because the West is disturbed by "its doubles, [...] the East" (ibid). Thus, these doubles compel the West to clarify "its own identity and to justify its rational self-image"; in fact, "colonial doubling" upsets the "self-image of the colonizer" (ibid 2). Because cultural meaning is not simply conveyed by the colonizer, the "colonizer's cultural meanings" are at the expense of transformation by the colonized culture like "any text, the meaning of colonial text cannot be controlled by its authors" (ibid). When the colonizer and colonized interact, there is a "negotiation of cultural meaning"; simply, Bhabha explores how language transforms "the way identities are structured" when the colonizer and colonized interact, they depend on each other (ibid).

In addition, Huddart explains that Bhabha produces the concept of "hybridity" which slowly weakens the difference between "self and other"; therefore, he puts emphasis on the hybridity of cultures, "the mixed-ness, or even impurity of cultures" in order to show that cultures are not pure (4). As Bhabha says, "cultures are never unitary in themselves, nor simply dualistic in the relation of Self to Other" (35-36). He believes that a "cultural text or system of meaning" is not enough in itself because of the "act of cultural enunciation"—the "place of utterance"—is placed by the "difference of writing" (ibid). In other words, the difference in the process of language is important in "the production of meaning" (ibid 36). If one understands that "all cultural statements and systems are built in the contradictory and ambivalent space of enunciation, the hierarchical claims regarding the originality or purity of cultures are untenable" (ibid 37).

Equally, Huddart clarifies that "cultures are not discrete phenomena," but they are always in contact with each other, and the result is "cultural mixed-ness" (4). That is why many novelists use "hybrid cultural forms" to undermine the purity or authenticity of cultural identities or forms (ibid). Actually, Bhabha states that cultures are not pure, and he tries to show "what happens on the borderlines of cultures" demonstrates "what happens in-between cultures"; thus, he thinks about this process through "what he calls the liminal" (ibid). It means that "what is in-between" creates "cultural forms or identities—identities like self and other—that is important to create "new cultural meaning" (ibid 5). For this reason, liminality undermines "solid, authentic culture in favor of unexpected, hybrid, and fortuitous cultures" (ibid). Indeed, the originality or purity of cultures are "untenable" because "The Third Space of enunciations" constructs a non-fixed identity which produces a new sense of identity for the colonial subject that maybe "almost the same, but not quite" (ibid 86). In brief, Bhabha puts emphasis on "hybridity and liminality" because colonial discourse mostly attempts to establish "distinction between pure cultures" through dividing "the world into self and other" (ibid 5).

### ***Mimicry, Ambivalence and the Sense of Phobia***

If colonial discourse fixes peoples' identities, this goes for everyone who is involved in it, those who speak, the colonizers, and those who are spoken about, the colonized people. In this regard, Bhabha examines the impact of 'ambivalence' in colonial discourse. Huddart explains that Bhabha's analysis of the stereotype puts emphasis on the "anxiety which stereotypical representations" creates in the colonizer's identity; in other words, Bhabha's attention is on "agency of the colonized" and the "anxiety of the colonizer" and he states that anxiety makes the colonized resist colonial discourse (39). Similarly, Huddart explains that the "comic quality of mimicry" is necessary because the discourse of colonialism is "serious, and solemn, with pretensions to educate and improve" (ibid). The colonial mimicry is a form of mockery in postcolonial theory that its comic status undermines the colonial discourse of power as Bhabha states:

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

He believes that mimicry undermines the “colonial discourse authority” by an indecisiveness, in the same way, mimicry reveals the representation of an unusual quality which is in a “process of disavowal” (ibid). In short, because the identity of colonizer is slipping away, it is undermined by this process of ‘mimicry’. It means that ‘mimicry’ causes an ambivalent situation which the colonial subjects, both colonizer and colonized, cannot recognize to which culture they belong.

Moreover, mimicry is “the sign of a double articulation”; it is a “complex strategy of reform, regulation and discipline” that emerges to “appropriate the Other as it visualizes power” (ibid). Mimicry is the “sign of inappropriateness” because it bothers the normality of the dominant discourse or colonial power and that is why it is a permanent threat for the western “normalized knowledge” and power (ibid). Because of “the area between mimicry and mockery, the reforming, civilizing mission” of colonial discourse is endangered (ibid). In fact, this mimicry behavior and exaggerated copy of the colonizer’s behavior is a kind of mockery which threatens both the colonizer and the colonized. Thus, mimicry is the process through which the dominated subject emerges as “the ambivalence of mimicry (almost the same, but not quite)”; i.e., this process not only ruptures the normality of discourse but also is transformed in doubt that makes the colonial subject as a fixed and “partial presence” (ibid). Accordingly, the “partial presence” of colonial subject is “incomplete and virtual” in a way that its appearance needs some explanations or strategic limitation within the authoritative discourse; i.e., the process of mimicry is accompanied with “resemblance and menace” (ibid).

Ashcroft and others state that mimicry is the process through which the colonizer “encourages the colonized subject to mimic” or implements the colonizer’s behavior, but the result is a “blurred copy” (124-25). Similarly, Huddart explains that mimicry is an “exaggerated copying of language, culture, manners, and ideas”; thus, mimicry is “repetition with difference” (39). Furthermore, Huddart clarifies that mimicry is one of the imperial goals as Bhabha exemplifies Thomas Babington Macaulay’s 1835 Minute to Parliament which is about education in India. Macaulay puts emphasis on the need to educate Indians in English schools. In other words, they raise the mimic men through European learning and colonial power in order to employ them as a class of the “interpreters—a class of people who are Indian in blood and color, but English in opinions”—between Europeans and Indians (ibid 41).

In fact, the objective is to raise mimic men in order to help Europeans in governing India, however, this figure of mimicry is not safe enough for Europeans and undermines the colonial discourse authority. Bhabha talks about the partiality of presence in colonial discourse as he states that “the desire to emerge as authentic through mimicry—through a process of writing and repetition—is the final irony of partial representation” (88). He, further, declares that “mimicry conceals no presence or identity behind its mask [...] the menace of mimicry is its double vision which in disclosing the ambivalence of colonial discourse also disrupts its authority” (ibid). Above all, he elaborates the question of the colonized’s agency, and stresses that the question of the representation of difference is the problem of the colonial authority. He argues that ‘mimicry’ damages not only “narcissistic authority” via the repetitive “slippage of difference and desire” but also makes the fixation of the colonial in a way that it increases the question of the colonial authority (ibid 90).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### ***Hybrid and Ambivalent Identity: Kim and Babu***

Bhabha considers the instability and ambivalent nature of colonial discourse for imposing its domination over other people. He considers the inconsistency which exists in the colonial discourse through studying the concepts such as ambivalence, liminality and “homogenized Other” (52). In Kipling’s *Kim*, Kim is defined as the child of a “young colour-sergeant of the Mavericks, an Irish Regiment” (Kim 2). He acts as a native and sahib at the same time. Although Kipling moves towards the direction of imperial discourse, he has an ambivalent sense about India. Kim is also similar to Kipling and he is engaged in this ambivalent sense. By drawing on Bhabha’s view, both Kipling and Kim live “in the unhomely world” and this causes their “ambivalencies and ambiguities” (18). Their affection and love for India where they were born and their imperial narratives in *Kim* demonstrate how they are involved in an ambivalent position as colonizers. Contradictions in Kipling’s colonial discourse raises a sense of ambivalence.

Similarly, both India and British Empire cause the problem of identification for the colonial subjects. Kipling’s ability in using the native language demonstrates his affinity with India and his familiarity with its culture and language. Thus, his ability in using the native language places him in a liminal position to see both cultures as an outsider. Based on postcolonial perspective, Kim is an ambivalent character who denies the ideas of inferiority and superiority as Bhabha calls the “concept of ‘fixity’ in the ideological construction of otherness” in the colonial discourse (66). Kim is able to speak both native and English languages at the same time. Kipling describes him in this way:

There was some justification for Kim,—lie had kicked LalaDinanath’s boy off the trunnions,—since the English held the Punjab and Kim was English. Though he was burned black as any native; though he spoke the vernacular

by preference, and his mother-tongue in a clipped uncertain sing-song; though he consorted on terms of perfect equality with the small boys of the bazar; Kim was white- a poor white of the very poorest. (Kim 1)

He has an identity of sahib and a native and is an in-between character whose hybrid identity has made him see both cultures at the same time. Because of his hybrid identity, he behaves like the natives: "An hour passed, and Kim, with the best will in the world to keep awake all night, slept deeply. Now and again a night train roared along the metals within twenty feet of him; but he had all the Oriental's in-difference to mere noise" (Kim 221). Furthermore, Kim "for his own ends or Mahbub's business, [...] could lie like an Oriental" (Kim 87). As an ambivalent character who is in-between place, and based on his hybrid identity Kim "entertains difference without an assumed or imposed hierarchy" (Bhabha 1994). When he takes a journey on the Grand Trunk Road, he is an Indian chela for Lama. However, throughout the novel, his position and identity is changed and behaves as an Englishman:

After all, this was the newest of his experiences. Sooner or later, if he chose, he could escape into the great, gray, formless India, outside tents and padres and colonels. Meantime, if the Sahibs were to be impressed, he would do his best to impress them. He too was a white man. (Kim 150)

These contradictory descriptions of shifting identities show the hybrid identity of different Indians. This kind of description is used repeatedly by Kim in the novel. He likes to be loved by Indians as a "little friend of all the World", and simultaneously he wants to be a sahib (Kim 169). According to Edward Said, "being a white man was therefore an idea and a reality. It involved a reasoned position towards both the white and the nonwhite worlds. It was a form of authority before which nonwhites, and even white themselves, were expected to bend" (1978). Equally, Kipling portrays the British-Indians, including Kim, as the authority before the Indians or even the English:

There was some justification for Kim, [...] he had kicked Lala Dinanath's boy off the trunions, [...] since the English held the Punjab and Kim was English. Though he was burned black as any native; though he spoke the vernacular by preference, and his mother-tongue in a clipped uncertain sing-song; though he consorted on terms of perfect equality with the small boys of the bazar; Kim was white. (Kim 1)

Regarding this, Kim, from an Irish family, is able to have an appropriate relationship with the natives by adapting elements of Indian culture and integrating himself into the Indian community. Therefore Kim is an in-between character whose interstitial position is needed to empower the desire of imperialism, and this "estranges any immediate access to an originary identity" (Bhabha 2). Kim is described as a person who "borrowed right- and left-handedly from all the customs of the country he knew and loved" (Kim 116). All these exemplifications put emphasis on the hybrid identity of Kim. When Lurgan Sahib, a chain-man in the 'Great Game', examines to hypnotize Kim, Kim takes benefit of being a white man. Again, his British power to differentiate the world of reality from superstition is evident below:

So far Kim had been thinking in Hindi but a tremor came on him with an effort like that of a swimmer before sharks, who hurls himself half out of the water, his mind leaped up from a darkness that was swallowing it and took refuge in — the mul-tiplication table in English! (Kim 243)

Indeed, Kim is able to empower himself through resisting against the trick, as Lurgan Sahib confesses, "you are the first that ever saved himself" (Kim 245). Therefore when he takes benefits from his British identity for overcoming the illusion, he uses features of British culture. This illustrates that Kim's hybrid identity enables him to impose his power and resist against hypnotism and Eastern superstition.

Because he was born and grew up in India, he has extremely complete knowledge of Indians' culture; therefore, he says: "certain things are not known to those who eat with forks. It is better to eat with both hands for a while" (Kim 204). In different situations, he can adapt different identities; in other words, he has a hybrid identity that supports his relationship with different groups that he meets including a native, a British, even a spy, and that is why he is called as a "Little Friend of all the World" several times in the novel (Kim 4). The question of identity is important for Kim and he asks: "who is Kim- Kim-Kim?" (Kim 290). Clearly, this question shows that Kim is in a liminal or in-between position. Furthermore, he questions: "I am Kim. I am Kim. And what is Kim?' His soul repeated again and again." (Kim 331). He explicitly questions his identity. He is loyal to the British Empire, and "he has maintained a sahib's status while remaining a graceful child of the bazaars and the rooftops" (qtd. in Said 1994: 140). Because he is not able to determine the location of his culture, he suffers from his various identities, his ambivalent hybrid identity which is caused by imperialism. As Kim investigates his own identity, "his head swam" (Kim 187).

Furthermore, through the discussion between Kim and the Lama about Kim's identity, Kim remains in a split place and reminds the Lama that "it vexes me. I am not a Sahib. I am thy chela, and my head is heavy on my shoulders" (Kim 433). Despite Kim asserts that I "do not want to be a Sahib," he also says that I am "a Sahib and the son of a Sahib and, which is twice as much more beside, a student of Lucknao" (Kim 170, 238). Actually, his hybrid identity and his knowledge of the natives give him power to communicate with natives and the English simultaneously. For this reason, he is sent to St Xavier, a big school there for the sons of sahibs—and half sahibs, where he is able to acquire the appropriate and especial English knowledge for hiring as a chain-man in the 'Great Game'. Colonel

Creighton, the British supervisor of the chain men, permits Kim to enter the school of sahibs for preparing his imperial career as a chain-man, "the Survey of India as a chain-man" (Kim 187). Regarding Bhabha's view, "all cultural statements and systems are constructed in this contradictory and ambivalent space of enunciation [...] the inherent originality or purity of cultures are untenable" as well as there is "no primordial unity or fixity" (37).

Therefore his hybrid identity makes him "change swiftly" (Kim 144). It is through the 'Third Space' that Kim is considered as the important tool for British imperial power as Kipling describes him "bearing two faces—and two garbs" (Kim 63). Mahbub Ali tells him "remember this with both kinds of faces. Among Sahibs, never forgetting thou art a Sahib; among the folk of Hind, always remembering thou art, he paused, with a puzzled smile" (Kim 227). Hurree Babu is another hybrid character whose complex behavior might originate in the fact that he stands between two cultures. Although he grew up in Bengal in India, he is totally committed to the British government and institutions. When Babu encounters the foreign agents, he resorts to his hybrid identity to gain the agents' trust:

'Decidedly this fellow is an original' said the taller of the two foreigners. 'He is like the night-mare of a Viennese courier. 'He represents in petto India in transition – the monstrous hybridism of East and West,' the Russian replied. 'It is we who can deal with Orientals.' He has lost his own country and has not acquired any other. Be he has a most complete hatred of his conquerors. Listen. He confided to me last night. (Kim 382)

In brief, Hurree Babu is in an in-between place and what Bhabha calls, "unhomely lives" (1994: 8). Similarly, Kipling writes about Hurree that "he has lost his own country and has not acquired any other" and represents "the monstrous hybridism of East and West" (Kim 382). This kind of description shows that both the colonizer and the colonized are in a liminal position where they do not know to which culture they belong. Because of their imitation, they are involved in an ambivalent and mimic behavior.

### **'Third Space of Enunciation' in Kim**

Kim's multilingual and multicultural context is characterized by diversity of cultures and identities, which might support the different cultures and identities. Bhabha calls the liminal space between two different cultures of the colonizer and the colonized as the "Third Space of Enunciation" (37). Using postcolonial notion of third space is to examine that "cultures are not unitary in themselves, nor simply dualistic in the relation of Self to Other" (ibid 35-36). In the same way, there is an in-between space or third space in the cultures and identities of characters in Kim. Kim lives in Indian society which helps him to obtain wide knowledge of the society. He improves his knowledge of the cultural diversity of India through his mastery of the Hindi language, and his geographical knowledge of the whole land. As it is evident below:

India was awake, and Kim was in the middle of it, more awake and more excited than any one, chewing on a twig that he would presently use as a toothbrush; for he borrowed right- and left-handedly from all the customs of the country he knew and loved. There was no need to worry about food — no need to spend a cowrie at the crowded stalls. He was the disciple of a holy man annexed by a strong-willed old lady. All things would be prepared for them, and when they were respectfully invited so to do they would sit and eat. (Kim 116)

Clearly, it demonstrates how Kim is fascinated by the variety of Indian customs, rituals, and beliefs. In the novel, the museum in Lahore is described as "the Ajaib-Gher, the Wonder House!" (Kim 7). It shows that India cannot be explained and it is like a wonder with diversity of cultures; i.e., the "originality or 'purity' of cultures are untenable" (Bhabha 37). In this regard, there is no fixity in the description of the museum. Based on postcolonial perspectives, Kipling's narration is mostly changing from the English to native language, what Bhabha calls, "it is this difference in the process of language that is crucial to the production of meaning" (ibid 36).

Kipling's ability to speak Hindi language makes his English language, the language of the colonizers, hybrid, reconstructed in the 'Third space', for example, in the Babu's conversation with Kim: "By Jove [...] why the dooce do you not issue demi-offeecal orders to some brave man to poison them [...] That is all tommy-rott" (Kim 355). Kim does not distinguish his own language from that of the other characters. When he describes the first appearance of the Lama, he says "he knew all castes, had never seen. He was nearly six feet high, dressed in fold upon fold of dingy stuff like horse-blanketing, and not one fold of it could Kim refer to any known trade or profession" (Kim 10). Kipling translates Babu's English in an unorthodox spelling such as "dooce" for "deuce" in order to show how the English language is translated in the Bengali's non-British accent; i.e., the English language is reconstructed in the 'Third space'. It means the production of meaning needs two languages "be mobilized in the passage through a Third Space" (Bhabha 36). Kim starts questioning his identity several times: "What am I? Mussalman, Hindu, Jain, or Buddhist? That is a hard knot" (Kim 227).

Actually, this kind of question represents the cultural hybridization of India. It means that India is a place where cultures interact in "Third Space of Enunciation" which is "the articulation of cultural difference" (Bhabha 1994: 38). In the same way, Kim asks: "Oh, Mahbub Ali, but am I a Hindu?" said Kim in English" (Kim 801). Even Mahbub Ali

asks the Lama about Kim's "country — his race — his village? Mussal-man—Sikh—Hindu—Jain—low caste or high?" 'Why should I ask? There is neither high nor low in the Middle Way' (Kim 31-32). Therefore his hybrid identity makes him be in the liminal or in-between space which creates the new form of identity for him. The description of the road, Grand Trunk Road, is symbolically the road for the creation of new culture. Through entering the road, Kim meets different groups of people, "sometimes Hindu, sometimes Mussalman" (Kim 98). During his travel on the road, he encounters various customs like "a marriage procession would strike into the Grand Trunk with music and shoutings" (Kim 98). These exemplifications describe the potentiality of the road in order to transform different cultures.

In the same way, Kipling says Kim "was in the seventh heaven of joy" (Kim 99). This demonstrates that Kim is really happy to see the people on the road where there is the "clash of civilization" (qtd. in Huddart 2). Kim's travel on the road gives him an opportunity to enter the 'Third Space'. It means that entering the road makes him construct an unstable identity and it creates a new sense of identity as Kipling states: "Kim felt these things, though he could not give tongue to his feelings, and so contented himself with buying peeled sugar-cane and spitting the pith generously about his path" (Kim 100). Therefore the road is like a 'Third Space' where it is a mixture of various classes and customs. Through travel on the road, his identity is constructed in a new form mostly accompanied by anxiety. Furthermore, the river is considered as the entrance of meeting various cultures when Kim says "all Mussalmans fell off Zam-Zammeh long ago! [...]. The Hindus fell off Zam-Zammeh too. The Mussalmans pushed them off" (Kim 6). The river is considered as the liminal position in which the colonial subject, the colonizer and the colonized are affected. The writer describes this position in this way :

This broad, smiling river of life, he considered, was a vast improvement on the cramped and crowded Lahore streets. There were new people and new sights at every stride — castes he knew and castes that were altogether out of his experience. They met a troop of long-haired, strong-scented Sansis with baskets of lizards and other unclean food on their backs, the lean dogs sniffing at their heels. (Kim 96)

This description represents the diversity of cultures in India. It demonstrates how various cultures are influenced by each other and there is no pure culture. The clash of different cultures shows the presence of different castes that are near together.

### ***Mimic Characters: 'Almost the same but not Quite' in Kim***

At the second half of 19th century when Kim appeared in British India, the English colonial authority in India encountered the natives' claims for self-government and the British Empire was still preserving its imperial power. The British authority desires a system of reformation in order to educate the colonized natives such as the male Hindu elites by giving English training and preparing them to be at the service of imperial interests. However, through the mission of civilizing native people, the process of "mimicry" and mockery creates a sense of fear for the British administrators. Actually, producing an in-between sense of belonging in half-educated natives is to assist the political domination of the British colonizers. Although the colonial discourse desires reformation and regulation of the colonized Indians, the natives are not completely equal to their reformers or British administrators. Although Kim is British, his English is awkward:

There is a river in this country which he wishes to find so verree much. It was put out by an arrow which—Kim tapped his foot impatiently as he translated in his own mind from the vernacular to his clumsy English 'Oah, it was made by our Lord God Buddha you know, and if you wash there you are washed away from all your sins and made as cotton-wool.' (Kim 141)

Kim's hybrid identity makes him imitate the native language clumsily. He speaks in such a way that is "forked, not false" (Bhabha 85). However, his desire for reformation makes him a mimic man whose English is "almost the same but not quite" (ibid 86). In this way, this clumsiness of his language "appropriates the Other as it visualizes power" (ibid). Mahbub Ali says: "It needs only to change his clothing, and in a twinkling he would be a low caste Hindi" (Kim 171).

Also, Kim "found it easier to slip into Hindu or Mohammedan garb when aged on certain businesses" (Kim 5). Said states that Kim is a person capable of changing his appearance quickly like a "chameleon-like character" (1994: 155). The effect of the process of mimicry makes him be in an in-between position. Thus, Kim, in such an ambivalent position, is not able to make a decision to be a native or a sahib with "the dignity of a letter and a number — and a price upon his head" (Kim 256). Therefore he is in a liminal space which creates his anxiety; i.e., he suffers from a sense of phobia.

## **CONCLUSION**

In *Kim*, Kipling puts emphasis on the instability or changeability of Kim's identity. By creating a hybrid character like Kim, Kipling intends to employ this hybrid identity for the British imperial power intentionally. Kim is a double agent, an Irish orphan who thinks in Hindi and acts like a native. Kipling uses the name of this hybrid character, Kim, for his novel to show the diversities and wonders in India. This hybrid character and some other hybrid characters like Babus are represented in the novel to show how the aims of British imperial power in India will be fulfilled. These hybrid characters are supposed to be reformed based on British education in order to be at the service of British Raj. Through the process of adapting the British value, behavior, dressing, habits, and language, these hybrid identities suffer from the sense of anxiety. The construction of these hybrid identities are considered as a kind of threatening for the power of colonial discourse because they question the authority.

When Kim and Babus start speaking in English, there are many mistakes in their speeches. Actually, the British colonizers' language is at the expense of transformation by the colonized culture. In addition, through the process of adapting the British behaviors, language and cultures, the English language changed the identities of these hybrid characters reciprocally. The mimic character like Babus in the novel remains in a liminal or in-between space without being considered as a complete member of the British class. By considering the concept of mimicry, Kipling creates Indians as 'the Other' in order to show the supremacy of the British people. He explores the imperfections in the Indian characters by describing them not to be completely reformed from their native behavior.

Kim suffers from the effect of mimicry and this process destabilizes his identity and puts him in an ambivalence position. He is involved in the liminal or in-between place where he does not know to which culture he belongs. In addition, during his journey around India, he encounters various groups of people from diverse cultures. Mimicking the languages, behavior and ideas of various cultures show that the English language and culture is not the only spoken language in the world of Kim. He speaks and communicates with them. He starts questioning his identity several times, and suffers from the crisis of identity. Kim may be considered as the symbol of India whose questions indicate the cultural hybridization of India. It demonstrates how India is a space where cultures interact, and transform from each other in a split edge. When Kim speaks about himself, simultaneously he describes the whole India and shows the diversity of cultures in it.

## **REFERENCES**

- Ashcroft B. 2000. *Key Concepts in Postcolonial Studies*. London: Routledge.  
Bhabha Homi K. 1994 *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994.  
Huddart D and Bhabha Homi K. 2006. London: Routledge.  
Kipling Rudyard K. 1913. London: Macmillan.  
Said E. 1994. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage.