OTHERING AND HYBRIDITY IN JOSEPH CONRAD'S *ALMAYER'S FOLLY*

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

FERRUH ÇİĞDEM TURASAN

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LITERATURE

FEBRUARY 2013

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Prof. Dr. Gölge Seferoğlu
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master Arts.

Assist. Prof. Margaret J.M Sönmez
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Meral Çileli (METU,FLE) _____
Assist. Prof. Dr. Margaret J.M. Sönmez (METU,FLE) _____
Assist. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Kırca (ÇANKAYA,DTIS) _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name : Ferruh Çiğdem Turasan

Signature:

ABSTRACT

OTHERING AND HYBRIDITY IN JOSEPH CONRAD'S *ALMAYER'S FOLLY*

TURASAN ÇİĞDEM, Ferruh
M.A., English Literature
Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Margaret J.M. SÖNMEZ
January, 2013, 83 pages

This thesis studies Joseph Conrad's *Almayer's Folly* in terms of two theoretical concepts; othering and hybridity. The first theoretical concept, othering, is analysed from various perspectives for three main reasons: 1) The question of "Who is other to whom?" cannot be answered thoroughly because there is a continuous power struggle between the European and the non-European characters. 2) The theme of othering in the novel is based on a view of humanity and its conflicts that is radically ambivalent, and thus cannot be analyzed from one perspective only. 3) Conrad's world view which is reflected in the novel is not limited to one group of people, but tends to be universal. The second theoretical concept, hybridity, is analyzed under three subtitles: ambivalence, mimicry and hybridity.

Keywords: Othering, Hybridity, Joseph Conrad, Post-colonial, Ambivalence

ÖZ

JOSEPH CONRAD'IN *ALMAYER'S FOLLY* ADLI ROMANINDA
ÖTEKİLEŞTİRME VE MELEZLEŞTİRME

TURASAN ÇİĞDEM, Ferruh
Yüksek Lisans, İngiliz Edebiyatı
Tez Danışmanı : Yard. Doç. Margaret J.M. SÖNMEZ
February, 2013, 83 sayfa

Bu tezde Joseph Conrad'ın *Almayer's Folly* adlı romanı ötekileştirme ve melezleştirme kavramları açısından analiz edilmiştir. Ötekileştirme kavramının farklı açılardan ele alınmasının üç nedeni vardır: 1) "Kim kimi ötekileştiriyor?" sorusunun kesin bir yanıtı yoktur, çünkü hem Avrupalı hem de Avrupalı olmayan karakterler arasında sürekli devam eden bir güç çatışması vardır. 2) Romandaki ötekileştirme kavramı sadece tek bir açıdan incelenemez, çünkü roman insanlık kavramının ve de yaşanılan çatışmaların belirsizliğine dayanmaktadır. 3) Romanda yansıtılan Conrad'ın hayata bakış açısı belli bir grupla sınırlandırılamaz, çünkü evrenseldir. Melezleştirme kavramı üç ana başlıkta incelenmiştir: belirsizlik, taklit ve melezleştirme.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Ötekileştirme, Melezleştirme, Joseph Conrad, Post- koloniyel, Belirsizlik

TO MY MOTHER, HUSBAND AND FUTURE DAUGHTER…

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Margaret J.M. Sönmez, Prof. Dr. Meral Çileli and Prof. Dr. Nursel İçöz for their guidance, advice, criticism, encouragement and insight throughout the process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Joseph Conrad has been one of the most prominent figures in the development of post-colonial literary studies. Many scholars such as Edward Said, Homi Bhabha and Gayatri Spivak were directly or indirectly influenced by his novels and the perspectives they opened on issues such as imperialism, colonialism, human rights and equality. As Khushu-Lahiri points out, "Joseph Conrad's fiction has generated a vast body of critical commentary, which can be broadly categorized as political, cultural and psychological" (95). The reason why Conrad and his fiction produced a wide range of commentary was that he dwelled on the controversial issues of the 19th century. One of these is imperialism defined as "the practice, the theory and the attitudes of a dominating metropolitan center ruling a distant territory" and the other is colonialism, which means "the implantment of settlements on distant territory" (Said 9).

Under the influence of imperialism and colonialism, 19th century Europe produced some ideologies which supported the superiority of the white race and undermined the authority of the non-white. One of these ideologies was racism, which Todorov defines as "a type of behavior which consists in the display of contempt or aggressiveness toward other people on account of physical differences" (qtd. in İçöz 248). The other one is social Darwinism, which made European nations assume that they were, in Jaffe's words, "the fittest to survive and to rule in order to achieve a higher form of human organization in the rest of the world" (ibid 247). Having the notion that they are superior to the rest of the world, that is, "the white man must rule because he is elevated by many, many steps above the black man" in Milner's words, the Europeans colonized the so-called underdeveloped countries in Asia or Africa. (qtd. in Khushu-Lahiri, 97)

19th century colonial literature reflected the above-mentioned movements and ideologies. It presented the "stereotypes of the colonial other" who were claimed to have features like "indolent maligners, shirkers, good for nothings, cunning, wily and

indulgent in intrigues" (ibid 98). Similarly, its language was full of vocabulary items such as "inferior, subject races, subordinate peoples, dependency, expansion and authority." (ibid 98).

Conrad belonged to this colonial literature. Nevertheless, he was different from his contemporaries because he had the ability to understand the human side of the non- Europeans and was "skeptical about the so-called heroism" of the Europeans. (Khushu-Lahiri 100) His fiction was nourished by his travels in Asia and Africa where he encountered the European colonizers and witnessed their imperialist actions. As stated in his biography, he went to the Malay Archipelagico as a sea merchant:

> in 1880s, he was a sea merchant in the *Vidar*, which was a steamship owned by an Arab, commanded by an English man, captain Craig, and sailing under the Dutch flag. She was based on Singapore and used to do a voyage in Malay Archipelagico. (Baines 88)

As a result of his experiences, Conrad wrote his first novel *Almayer's Folly* in 1895, followed by two other Malay novels *An Outcast of the Islands*, a year later and *The Rescue* in March 1896, all of which formed the Malay trilogy (Simmons 27). In his writings, he reflected the real events and problems of his time as well as the people he encountered. To better understand to what extent he was influenced by his travels in Malay Archipelagico and the problems related to colonialism and imperialism, it is worth dwelling on some important historical facts of the Malay Islands:

> Between the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries, the Malay Archipelago gradually came under the domination of Western imperial powers: the Portuguese, the Spanish, the Dutch and the British. […] The Portuguese settled in Malacca in 1509 and […] concentrated on establishing trading posts from which to control local trade and strategic sea routes. […]Like the Spanish, they were known for their religious intolerance and zeal to convert the Asian populations into Catholicism. […] The Dutch were present in the Southeast Asia […] in 1596. […] Like the Portuguese, [they] were more interested in establishing control over local trade and in acquiring vast territories. […] In 1786, the British gained a foothold on the Malay Island of Perang and in 1795 they acquired Malacca. (Acheraiou 13,15)

As recorded in history, the Malay Islands were invaded by European powers whose main aim was to establish political and economic power over in the territory. When Conrad visited the Malay Archipelagico, it was under the British rule whose interests were mainly "commercial and strategic until the mid-nineteenth century" (ibid 16). Conrad reflected the history of the territory in *Almayer's Folly* by dwelling on the problems stemming from colonialism, imperialism and racism. He created a fictional place, Sambir, which is ruled by the Malay ruler Lakamba, but exploited by the English traders such as Tom Lingard and the Dutch regional government as well as the Arab traders like Abdulla. In pursuit of money and power, Tom Lingard, the representative of the British colonial mind in the novel, discovers a trade route in the Pantai River through which he aims to make money. Similarly, the Dutch regional government uses the river for gunpowder trade. However, it must be noted that Conrad does not only criticize the Dutch authorities and British traders for their materialistic ambitions and colonial practices but also presents the flaws of the non-European people. For instance, the Arab trader, Abdulla, the Malay ruler, Lakamba and the Balinese Prince, Dain are all presented as individuals whose primary goal is to yield power in the region and generate money out of gunpowder trade.

The fact that Conrad presents the weaknesses of both the Europeans the non-Europeans shows Conrad's skeptical and ambiguous nature as a writer and leaves the question "Is Conrad a pro- or anti- colonial?" unanswered. On the one hand, he questions the European mind and is "skeptical and ultimately critical of the European imperial endeavor and its claim to moral improvement and civilizing mission" (Khushu-Lahiri 98) On the other hand, he presents non-European characters with their follies and flaws. Furthermore, in his early fiction, Conrad reflects his world view that individuals suffer from a "modernity where processes of […] globalization have turned the world into a single economic system" (Hawthorn 208). In *Almayer's Folly*, for instance, the reader is informed about to what extent the colonial powers have an authority over the so-called impoverished areas:

> The deliberations conducted in London have a far-reaching importance, and so the decision issued from the fog-veiled offices of the Borneo Company darkened for Almayer the brilliant sunshine of the Tropics, and added another drop of bitterness to the cup of his disenchantments. (17)

As well as reflecting his skeptical view on humanity by dwelling on the actions of the colonial powers and the flaws non-Europeans, Conrad employs some real characters in his early writings. During the years he spent in the *Vidar,* Conrad came across some people through whom he reflected the local color in his novels. One of these people was William Charles Olmeijer. When he started writing his first novel in 1889 in London, he recorded all his feelings and ideas in *A Personal Record* in which he states that "[he] had seen him [Almayer] for the first time four years before from the bridge of a steamer […] moored to a Bornean river" (74). This encounter was very significant for Conrad as he provided him with the inspiration to write his first novel *Almayer's Folly.* As Conrad himself points out, "if [he] had not got to know Almayer pretty well, it is almost certain there would never have been a line of [his] in print" (ibid 87). As stated in *Joseph Conrad,* one of his biographies:

> William Charles Olmeijer was a Dutch half-caste, born in the East Indies in 1848. He arrived in Berau in 1870, married a Malay […] and had five sons and six daughters. He maintained close relationships with the head-hunting Land Dyaks, which aroused the suspicions of the Dutch authorities, and he did construct an oversized house locally known as The Folly. (Meyers 77)

The fictional Almayer depicted in *Almayer's Folly* bears some similarities and differences with the real one. While Olmeijer is half Dutch and half Indian, Almayer in the novel is a pure Dutch, born out of Dutch parents. Similar to Olmeijer, Almayer marries a Malay woman, but has only one half-caste daughter, Nina rather than five sons and six daughters. Moreover, both Olmeijer and Almayer have close relationships with the non-Europeans in Malay Archipelagico. Like Olmeijer, Almayer builds a big house named Almayer's Folly, which symbolizes his follies. Similar to Almayer who is in pursuit of money, Olmeijer has ambitions as he "boasted that he owned the only flock of geese on the east coast of Borneo and revealed his grandiose ambitions by importing a pony, although the settlement had only one quarter-mile path that was suitable for such an animal" (ibid 77,78). Though the fictional Almayer has some differences from the real one, he plays a significant role in showing Conrad's critical attitude towards humanity. Through such characters as Almayer, Conrad attacks the flaws of individuals whose only purpose in life is to make money.

Tom Lingard is another character through which Conrad attacks the flaws of humanity, especially the devastating effects of colonialism on the individuals. As pointed out in *Joseph Conrad: A Biography:*

> Olmeijer traded in gutta-percha, rattan and rubber, and shipped his products through his benefactor, Captain William Lingard, an important trader who owned a schooner and had good business connections in Singapore. […] William Lingard, the model for Tom Lingard in Conrad's Malayan novels, is described as a personage of almost mythical renown, a sort of ubiquitous sea-hero, perhaps at times a sort of terror to evildoers. (Meyers 79)

Although Lingard is described as a hero in Conrad's Malayan novels, he is described as an anti-hero in *Almayer's Folly* as he goes to Europe for trade and disappears leaving Almayer alone and shattering his dreams to be a rich tradesman. The employment of Lingard indicates Conrad's critical attitude towards colonialism, which made him "attracted to the theme of the degeneration of the white men in the tropics" (ibid 89). As he himself claims in *A Personal Record,* "the necessity which impelled [him] was a hidden, obscure necessity, a completely masked and unaccountable phenomenon" (68). Lingard is the epitome of the British colonialism and imperialism whose expansion and brutalities made Conrad's skepticism about "the moral improvement of the civilizing endeavor deeper" (Stape 184). Nevertheless, Conrad's skepticism is not one-sided as he also portrays the flaws of the non-Europeans. In *A Personal Record,* Conrad highlights the importance of imagination, which he defines as a means to achieve truth:

> Only in man's imagination does every truth find an effective and undeniable existence. Imagination, not invention, is the supreme master of art as of life. An imaginative and exact rendering of authentic memories may serve worthily that spirit of piety towards all things human which sanctions the conceptions of a writer of tales, and the emotions of the man reviewing his own experience. (25)

Heart of Darkness is another novel in which Conrad reflects his critical attitude towards humanity. In 1890, Conrad participated in the ivory trade in the Congo, which he later described as "the vilest scramble for loot that ever disfigured the history of human conscience" and he wrote his short novel *Heart of Darkness* as a result of his experiences. (qtd. in Baldwin, 184). In *Heart of Darkness*, he questions "the politics of dehumanization which reduce the human beings to the merely bestial,

or the truly monstrous" (ibid 184) Conrad's attitude towards humanity is also ambivalent in *Heart of Darkness.* He, on the one hand, criticizes the whites who exploit the Congo for ivory; on the other hand, he describes the white protagonist of the novel Marlow heroically: "He had sunken cheeks, a yellow complexion, a straight back, an ascetic aspect, and, with his arms dropped, the palms of hands outwards, resembled an idol" (*Heart of Darkness* 6). Marlow is portrayed as a man who is physically strong and beautiful. Nevertheless, the black people of the Congo River are presented as creatures who are inferior to the white men:

> Black rags were wound round their loins, and the short ends behind waggled to and fro like tails. I could see every rib, the joints of their limbs were like knots in a rope; each had an iron collar on his neck, and all were connected together with a chain whose bights swung between them, rhythmically clinking" (ibid 22).

The black people are portrayed as lesser beings and reflected as the other.

Conrad's critical attitude and ambiguity led to discussions in the literary world. Starting in the 1940s, there was a hot debate on whether Conrad's novels show a racist attitude or not, as he mostly dwelled on colonialism and its influence on the colonized in much of his fiction. As Andrea White points out,

> the antithetical responses to his fiction ranged from those who view Conrad as committed to a conservative view of imperialism to those who see him as skeptical of imperialism and a supporter of anti-colonial revolts" (qtd. in İçöz 245)

Some writers, especially, Chinua Achabe labeled Conrad as 'a bloody racist', claiming that in "*Heart of Darkness*, the very humanity of the Africans was totally undermined by the mindlessness of its context and the pretty explicit animal imagery surrounding it" (Khushu-Lahiri 95). Furthermore, Benita Parry stated that Conrad's earlier writings like *Almayer's Folly* and *An Outcast of the Islands*

> can be read as illuminations of the imperialist imagination rather than as critical reflections of the corporate consciousness of imperialism, for the demystification of colonialist benevolence is eclipsed by the mystification of the East as a source of primal evil […] the "quagmire of barbarism" in which the peoples of the Archipelagico are sunk. (ibid 96)

Contrary to the arguments above, critics like Edward Said, Hunt Hawkins, Peter Nazareth and Ezekiel Mphahlele claimed that "one cannot simply write Conrad off

as a racist" (ibid 96). Said argued that "in *Heart of Darkness*, Conrad dates imperialism and hence has the foresight and vision to show its contingency" (ibid 96). Similar to Said, Hunt Hawkins was of the opinion that Conrad is "critical of racism" (ibid 96).

The question whether Conrad is a pro- or anti- colonial cannot be given a definite answer because Conrad has an ambivalent nature as a writer, as pointed out by Terry Eagleton: "Conrad neither believes in the cultural superiority of the colonialist nations nor rejects them outright. […] His viewpoint disturbs imperialist assumptions to the precise degree that it reinforces them" (qtd. in İçöz 249). Having an ambivalent attitude towards colonialism, he produces fiction in which the majority of the characters depicted are ambiguous, the themes employed are inexplicit and the messages given to the reader are indirect and implied. Because Conrad regards explicitness as "fatal to the glamour of all artistic work, robbing it of all suggestiveness, destroying all illusion", the majority of his writings both seem to support the colonial mind and at the same time criticize its outcomes (Watts 138).

The ambiguous nature of Conrad's writings is already evident in *Almayer's Folly* (henceforth *A.F*). *A.F* can be categorized as an anti-colonial novel if Conrad's own comment is taken into consideration: "If I had not got to know Almayer pretty well, it is almost certain there would never have been a line of mine in print" (qtd. in Simmons 25). Conrad argues that he was well aware of the European colonialist mind embodied in Almayer, a Dutch-borne protagonist of the novel who consistently dreams of becoming rich through trade. The representation of such a character indicates that Conrad can be critical towards colonialism. On the other hand, there are some critics who argue that Conrad's ultimate aim is not to criticize the colonial mind, while he articulates the suffering of the colonized people in his novels, he reduces them to lesser beings. As Francis B. Singh states, "as long as Conrad associates the life of depravity with the life of the blacks [non-Europeans in *Almayer's Folly*] then he can hardly be called anti-colonial" (qtd. in Khushu-Lahiri 95). Although Conrad has been labeled as pro- or anti- colonial, he is "the artist of ambivalence and the divided mind; and thus, it would not be very appropriate to categorize [him and his fiction] as either pro- or anti- colonist." (İçöz 245)

The ambivalence in Conrad's *A.F* is also evident when two post-colonial concepts, othering and hybridity, are used to analyze his novels. Three main questions arise before starting such an analysis: "What is othering?", "Who is othering who?" and "What is hybridity?". The aim of this study is to examine Conrad's ambivalence in *A.F* through a detailed analysis of the post-colonial concepts of othering and hybridity in *A.F*.

In the first chapter of this thesis, the term 'othering' is going to be defined from philosophical, psychological and post-colonial perspectives. Lacan's, Sartre's, Said's, Spivak's, Bhabha's definitions of the term will be given. Moreover, the term 'hybridity' will be defined: Bakhtin's, and Bhabha's definitions of the term will be given. In chapter two, Joseph Conrad's novel *Almayer's Folly* is going to be analyzed in terms of othering. In chapter three, it will be analyzed under the title of hybridity. In the last chapter, chapter four, the concepts of othering and hybridity will be questioned in the light of all the preceding information as well as the writer's concluding remarks on whether these concepts dominate the novel or merely contribute to its meaning. In addition, the strengths and weaknesses of these terms in terms of the plot and characterization will be analyzed.

1. 2. WHAT IS "OTHERING"?

1. 2.1. OTHERING FROM PHILOSOPHICAL POINT OF VIEW

The term othering can be defined from philosophical, psychological and post-colonial perspectives. From the philosophical point of view, Hegel was among the first to define the concept of othering. In his book, *The Phenomenology of the Mind,* Hegel claims that the existence of the other is significant for "the existence of my consciousness as the self-consciousness" (qtd. in Sartre 235). For Hegel,

> It is self-consciousness in general which is recognized in other self-consciousnesses and which is identical with them and with itself. The mediator is the Other. The Other appears along with myself since self-consciousness is identical with itself by means of the exclusion of every Other. […] It is by the very fact of being me that I exclude the Other. The Other is the one who excludes me by being himself, the one whom I exclude by being myself. (ibid 236)

Thus, othering is a two-fold and reciprocal process as both the Self and the Other need each other to exist because the Self recognizes his own self-consciousness in its distinction from other self-consciousnesses. Both exclude the Other, seeing him or

her as necessarily external to and different from their own existence. Hegel expounds on the concept of othering as follows:

> I am myself only an Other. In order to make myself recognized by the Other, I must risk my own life. To risk one's life is to reveal oneself as not bound to the objective form or to any determined existence- as not bound to life. But at the same time, I pursue the death of the Other. This means that I wish to cause myself to be mediated by an Other who is only Other- that is by a dependent consciousness whose essential characteristic is to exist only for another. This will be accomplished at the very moment when I risk my life. […] On the other hand, the Other prefers life and freedom while showing that he has not been able to posit himself as not bound to the objective form. Therefore, he remains bound to external things in general. He appears to me and he appears to himself as non- essential. He is the *Slave* I am the *Master;* for him it is I who am essence. (ibid 237)

According to this, the self risks his life and seems indifferent to life or any form of existence so that the Other recognizes him. The self begins to exist only when he is recognized by the Other. The Other and the Self are dependent on each other, but at the same time they wish the death of each other. The self wants to be mediated by the Other whose existence is bound to the existence of others. While the Other wishes for freedom and life, he cannot separate himself from a being to which he will be attached. For this reason, he acts like a Slave and there appears the "Master-Slave" relationship between the Self and the Other (ibid 237).

Hegel's approach to othering can be interpreted from two perspectives. If the self is taken as a life-risker, he values neither himself nor the Other and therefore he is indifferent to the death of the Other. If the self is taken as the one who expects to be recognized by the Other, his existence depends on the existence of the Other. Only when the Other recognizes him does he feel valued. Similarly, the self recognizes the Other only when he risks his life. However, by doing so, he risks his life because he values the Other more than himself and prefers to be recognized by the Other rather than freedom. For Hegel, the relationship between the self and the Other is paradoxical and involves both the existence and the death of the Other.

Sartre goes into the details of Hegel's concept of the Other as it is of great importance in the formation of his existentialist philosophy. In *Being and Nothingness*, Sartre explains how the self is constructed (221-222). For Sartre, the Self exists for itself, however, it is composed of many modes of consciousnesses,

which are bound to an ontological structure; that is, “mine” (ibid 221,222). Sartre gives the example of the sense of shame, which in his primary source is “shame before somebody” (ibid 221,222). In the solitary religious practices of shame, where the presence of another in my consciousness is incompatible with the reflective attitude, the Other is the indispensable mediator between myself and me as “I am ashamed of myself as I appear to the Other” (ibid 221,222). The Self needs the Other because it is a mediator, which enables the Self to realize his existence fully. Only when the Other looks at him, can the Self be aware of his own existence.

According to Sartre, the Self creates a concrete [sense of] the Other. He points out that the Self can never understand the relationship between itself and the Other; nevertheless, it wants to reach “the Other’s feelings, the Other’s ideas, the Other’s volitions, the Other’s character” because the Self not only sees the Other, the Other also sees the Self (ibid 228). However, it cannot be successful in its attempt because they are out of reach. The Self gradually understands that to the Other it [the Self] is an object among many objects.

Simone de Beauvoir refers to the term othering in *The Second Sex* in which she analyses the phases of a woman’s life as the child, the young girl and the married woman. For the young girl, “man incarnates the other, as she does for the man; but this *Other* seems to her to be on the plane of the essential, and with reference to him as she sees herself as the inessential” (69).

Taking Hegel’s idea that there is a master-slave relationship between the Self and the Other, De Beauvoir shows its inversion in gender relations, suggesting that for the young girl it is the male Other who becomes the master as she “delivers herself up, passive and docile, into the hands of a new master” (ibid 69), which results in her sense of inferiority and “which gives rise to all her insufficiencies; that resignation which has its source in the adolescent girl’s past, in the society around her, and particularly in the future assigned to her” (ibid 69). De Beauvoir claims that the young girl’s sense of inferiority comes from the society and her background. She is seen as the other by the society and regarded as an inferior being. No matter how inferior she feels, she does not resist but submits: Her role as other and as slave is interiorized. De Beauvoir explains the rationale behind the young girl’s submissive attitude as follows:

> The other [the young female adolescent] simply submits; the world is defined without reference to her and its aspect is immutable as far as she is concerned. This lack of physical power leads to a more general timidity. […] She does not dare to be enterprising, to revolt, to invent. […] She can take in society only a place already made for her (72)

De Beauvoir argues that the young girl struggles to find a status in the society as a real human being, but she has a conflict between her desire to be the subject and the society's pressure, which turns her into a passive object:

> Her spontaneous tendency is to regard herself as the essential; how can she make up her mind as the inessential? But if I can accomplish my destiny only as the *Other*, how shall I give up my Ego? Such is the painful dilemma with which the woman-to-be must struggle" (ibid 77).

To overcome this painful struggle and to achieve her aims, the young girl uses her sexuality and becomes an erotic object. Aware of the fact that her sexuality turns her into a prey, the young girl cannot be herself. She has to exist outside, which makes her an outsider (ibid 78).

Emmanuel Levinas, a French philosopher, is similar to Hegel in explaining the relationship between the other and the self. He argues that the self has a responsibility for the Other. This responsibility makes the self approach the Other. In this way, the self diverges from nothingness. He exists by accepting the existence of the Other. Nevertheless, the self diverges from existing by approaching the Other (*Existence and Existents* 11).

For Levinas, the existence of the Other is paradoxical. On the one hand, he argues that "to be in the world is to be attached to things" (ibid 37). On the other hand, he states that "the existence of one submerges the Other" (ibid 61). Although the self needs the existence of the things [others], it sees the Other as a threat for his own existence.

Both Hegel and Levinas are similar in thinking that the Self and the Other need each other to exist. For both philosophers, existence requires risk taking because both the Other and the Self see each other as a threat to their own existence. Nevertheless, they are different in their interpretation of recognizing the Other. While Hegel thinks that the Self devalues himself and the Other by seeming indifferent to him and choosing his freedom, Levinas argues that being attached to the Other is a responsibility for the Self. For Hegel, the Self feels compelled to

recognize the Other and to be recognized by the Other since it is essential for his existence. For Levinas, approaching the Other is a kind of responsibility for the Self.

1.2.2 OTHERING FROM PSYCHOLOGICAL POINT OF VIEW

The term othering was also defined by the French psychiatrist Jacques Lacan. Lacan introduced a distinction between 'Other' and 'other'. In his seminars, Lacan distinguished between the two others: "We must distinguish two *others,* at least two- an other with a capital *O*, and an other with a small *o*, which is the ego. In the function of speech, we are concerned with the *Other*" (qtd. in Miller, 236). "The Other-with the capital 'O' has been called the *grande-autre* by Lacan, the great Other, in whose gaze the subject gains identity" (Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin 166). If the Lacanian distinction is taken into consideration, the construction of the Other is essential for the construction of the Self. However, the spellings can be used interchangeably ["O/other"] to show that the Other also depends on the other to assert his own existence (ibid 171,172).

In his seminar notes, Lacan dwells on the concept of othering by explaining the terms "*das Ding* and *die Sache*",both of which mean "thing" in German (qtd. in Miller 56). For Lacan, the ultimate aim of man is to reach *das Ding,* which is inherently unreachable:

> That object will be there when in the end all conditions have been fulfilled- it is of course clear that what is supposed to be found cannot be found again. It is in its nature that the object as such is lost. It will never be found again. The world of our experience, the Freudian world, assumes that it is this object, *das Ding,* as the absolute other of the subject, that one is supposed to find again. (ibid 56)

He points out that one tries to find the Other in order to rule it: "I believe that one finds in that word ["you"]the temptation to tame the Other, […] which suddenly threatens to surprise us and to cast us down from the height of its appearance." (ibid 56).

Lacan claims that the Other's existence depends on the existence of another by referring to Heidegger:

> There cannot be a two without a three, and that, I think, must certainly include a four,[…] to which Heidegger refers somewhere. […] The function of this place is to contain words […] in which the Other may discover itself as the Other of the Other" (qtd. in Miller 66).

The Other cannot exist without the Other which exists in somewhere. This place involves words through which the Other discovers that he is regarded as the Other by the Other.

In his article "Mirror Stage as Formative of the I Function", Lacan suggests that the little man who is at the *infanse* stage sees himself in the mirror and identifies himself with the other; that is, his image in the mirror. When the mirror stage ends, "the specular *I* turns into the social *I*" (Lacan, *Ecrits* 79). Lacan explains the relationship between the self and the other as follows:

> It is this moment [the end of the mirror stage] that decisively tips the whole of human knowledge into being mediated by the other's desire, constitutes its objects in an abstract equivalence due to competition from other people, and turns the *I* into an apparatus in which every instinctual pressure constitutes a danger." (ibid 79).

The self is governed by the other's desire when the mirror stage ends. The other starts to be threatening and dangerous for the self. Lacan associates the Other with language and speech as follows:

> If speech is founded in the existence of the Other, the true one, language is so made as to return us to the objectified other, to the other whom we can make what we want of, including that he is an object, that is to say that he doesn't know what he's saying. When we use language, our relation with the other always plays an ambiguity. In other words, language is as much there to found us in the other as to drastically prevent us from understanding him. (qdt. in Miller 244)

Similar to the philosophers like Hegel, Levinas and Sartre, Lacan regards the O/other as a threat for the self. However, he is different from them in his interpretation of the Self and the O/other as he expounds on the influence of language and speech in the othering process. For Lacan, language and speech make the relationship between the self and the O/other paradoxical. Language both enables the self to exist and also prevents him from understanding the O/other.

Lacan's ideas are of importance to analyse how individuals, groups or races devalue the other people, groups or races. According to Lacan, by using language the Self can create the O/other and makes him what he wants of. Similarly, in colonial discourse, the colonial powers can stereotype the colonized by using deregulatory remarks like the subordinates, inferior people or subject races. However, language

makes the relationship between the colonial powers and the colonized ambiguous and they do not understand each other.

1.2.3 OTHERING FROM POST-COLONIAL POINT OF VIEW

From the post-colonial point of view, Edward Said in *Culture and Imperialism* describes the relationship between the 'Other' and the 'Self' in Western literature follows:

> In European writing on Africa, India, Far East, Australia and the Carribean, one can always come across the descriptions of 'the mysterious East', the stereotypes about 'the African, Indian, Chinese mind, the notions about bringing civilization to primitive or barbaric peoples'. 'They' were not like 'us' and 'for that reason deserved to be ruled'. (Said xi)

Said argues that the gap between the colonial 'us' and oriental 'them' results from the differences between cultures. He believes that culture is regarded as an inseparable part of identity and all the problems between the colonial or oriental 'other' and the 'self' are posed by culture, which he defines as "a concept that include a refining and elevating element, each society's reservoir of the best that has been known and thought […] this differentiates "us" from "them" almost always with some degree of xenophobia" (ibid xiii). Since people associate culture with their own identity, they adhere to it fiercely and become biased against other cultures. They tend to uphold their own culture and undermine the culture of the others having the notion 'we are number one, we are bound to lead, we stand for freedom and order, and so on" (ibid xix).

Thinking that the other societies are inferior, the imperial powers assume that they have the right to govern other people. Said defines imperialism as: "thinking about, settling on, controlling land that you do not possess, that is distant, that is lived on and owned by others" (ibid 7). For Said, colonialism is a consequence of imperialism and is "the implanting of settlements on distant territories" (ibid 9). Said explains the rationale behind imperialism and colonialism as

> supported and even impelled by impressive ideological formations that include notions that certain territories and people require and beseech domination, as well as forms of knowledge affiliated with domination: the vocabulary of classical nineteeth century imperial culture is plentiful with words and concepts like "inferior" or "subject

> races", "subordinate peoples", "dependency", "expansion", and "authority". (ibid 9)

In this explanation, we see that these imperial powers regard the other races or groups of people as the slave-like other to the imperial master-like self thinking that they have all the power to govern and to claim superiority over them. As Ronald Jackson argues:

> Edward Said's theory of orientalism is directly related to the othering process. He argues that through colonialism, Western ideas and practices were privileged over those of the East or Arab countries. When deciding that Western beliefs or practices are better, the rest of the world, and specifically foreign cultures is [sic.] othered. (520)

Different from Hegel and Sartre who expound on othering in a more personal way, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, another post-colonialist theorist uses the Lacanian distinction between 'Other' and 'other' and defines the term othering as

> a process by which imperial discourse creates its 'others'. Whereas the Other corresponds to the focus of desire or power (the M-Other or Father- or Empire) in relation to which the subject is produced, the other is the excluded or 'mastered' subject created by the discourse of power. Othering describes the various ways in which colonial discourse produces its subjects. (qtd. in Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin 171)

According to Spivak and in line with all theories with otherness, "othering is a dialectical process because the colonizing *Other* is established at the same time as its colonized *others* are produced as its subjects" (ibid 171).

Spivak claims that colonial discourse participates in a process of Othering. For Spivak, othering is the way in which colonial discourse creates its subjects. In her essay "Can the Subaltern speak?", she claims that

> some of the most common criticism coming out of the West today is the result of an interested desire to conserve the subject of the West, or the West as Subject. This S/subject […] belongs to the exploiter's side of the international division of power. (qtd. in Nelson 24)

Spivak points out that the subject is created and protected by the West, "the exploiter" in the sharing of international power. However, in this "division of power", the subaltern cannot voice his/her ideas. Spivak directs the question "Can the sub-altern speak?" and answers it as follows: "there is no unrepresantable subaltern subject that can know and speak itself" (ibid 27).

Like Spivak, Homi Bhabha has been among the leading figures of post colonialism and is a follower of Said. He expounds on the concept of othering in *The Location of Culture* :

> In order to understand the productivity of colonial power it is crucial to construct its regime of truth, not to subject its representations to a normalizing judgment. Only then does it become possible to understand the productive ambivalence of the colonial discourse – that 'otherness" which is at once an object of desire and derision an articulation of difference contained within the fantasy of origin and identity. What such a reading reveals the boundaries of colonial discourse and it enables a transgression of these limits from the space of that otherness. (67)

The colonial power is constituted by creating a "regime of truth". It sets a set of truths "by producing knowledges of colonizer and colonized […] to construe the colonized as a population of degenerate types on the basis of racial origin, […] to justify conquest and to establish systems of administration and instruction" (ibid 70).

As Said had shown, the colonial power is constructed in discourse through which the colonizer asserts his own existence and claims superiority over the colonized. The colonial discourse enables the colonizer to argue that he is culturally, sexually or racially different from the colonized, which results in categorization of people and a hierarchy. Bhabha explains how the process of othering is carried out:

> The construction of the colonial power in discourse and the exercise of colonial power through discourse, demands an articulation of forms of difference – racial, sexual. […] The colonial discourse is crucial to the binding of a range of differences and discriminations that inform the discursive and political practices of racial and cultural hierarchization. (ibid 96)

Bhabha also suggests that "Colonial discourse produces the colonized as a social reality which is at once an "other" and yet entirely knowable and visible" (ibid 70,71). For Bhabha, the Westerner or 'the colonizing subject' both creates the colonized as the 'other' and domesticates the colonized subject. He has them interact with the western culture. Thus, the construction of the otherness is ambivalent as the colonized is both inside and outside of Western culture (ibid 101).

The concept of othering has thus been defined in different ways. The philosophers, psychologists and theorists above have defined othering from various perspectives. Thinking that Conrad is a pioneering figure in the development of the

theory of othering through the genesis of Said's own thoughts, the way he uses othering in his fiction is of great importance while defining the term. Conrad's fiction has an ambivalent nature because in it the question "Who is othering who?" is quite difficult to answer. Thus, the term othering cannot be given clear-cut definitions when Conrad's fiction is taken into consideration. That is why, there has been so much disagreement about his position vis-à-vis colonialism. The discussions given above mostly focus on the othering of the powerless, the inferior, the Asian, the women etc. However, the process of othering for Conrad is ambigious. The Self can reduce the other into a lesser being and may not be aware of the fact that the other may also regard him as the other.

In *A.F,* the process of othering cannot always be categorized into binary oppositions such as the colonizer/the colonized, the Self/the Other, or the strong/the powerless. In this respect, Derrida's deconstruction of these binary oppositions explains how the theme of othering is used in much of Conrad's fiction. According to Derrida,

> Thus it has always been thought that the center, which is by definition unique, constituted that very thing within a structure which while governing the structure, escapes the structurality. This is why, classical thought concerning structure could say that the center is, paradoxically, *within* the structure and *outside* it. The center is at the center of the totality, and yet since the center does not belong to the totality (is not part of the totality), the totality has its center elsewhere. The center is not the center. (qtd. in Lim, 117)

In much of Conrad's fiction, the center is decentralized as most of the characters he depicts blur the boundaries between the binary oppositions. The center, which can be regarded as the multiple colonial power in much of his fiction, is not the authority anymore as its authority is undermined by the periphery [the colonized].Therefore, the process of othering is multi-layered and there is multiplicity of othering in his fiction. Since there is no definite answer to the questions such as "Who is the authority?", "Who is the colonized or the colonizer?" and "Who is other to whom?", the concept of othering in much of Conrad's fiction is ambivalent.

1.3. WHAT IS HYBRIDITY?

1.3.1 DEFINITION AND HISTORY OF THE TERM

In horticulture, the term hybridity refers to "the cross-breeding of two species by grafting or cross-pollination to form a third, 'hybrid' species" (Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin 118). However, the term hybridity is not merely the mixture of two species as it is defined in horticulture. According to Ashcroft et al., hybridity in post-colonial discourse is defined as:

> the creation of new transcultural forms within the contact zone produced by colonization. […] Hybridization takes many forms: linguistic, cultural, political, racial, etc. […] It occurs both as a result of conscious moments of cultural suppression, as when the colonial power invades to consolidate political and economic control , or when settler invaders dispossess indigenous peoples and force them to 'assimilate' to new social patterns. (118, 183)

Hybridization in this definition is a process in which two different cultures are intertwined to form a third, mixed culture which has the qualities of both cultures. It can be in various forms such as linguistic, cultural, political or racial etc. Hybridity is a conscious activity and can happen in two ways; either the colonial power exploits a country to have economic or political control or the colonial invaders make the native people assimilate to new social patterns.

For a long time, hybridity had negative connotations as the concept of purity was central to the racialized theory of identity. Hybridity has served as a threat to the fullness of selfhood. Hybridity shadowed the theory of identity. In the nineteenth century discourses of racism, it was considered to be a negative consequence of racial encounters (Papastergiadis 169).

In the early nineteenth century, "the debates on the origins of mankind" used terms like "organic unity" and "racial purity". For this reason, the hybrid was regarded as a "thorn in the side of the white ideologies of domination and purity" (ibid 172). With the introduction of Darwinian principles, the negative approach towards hybridity started to be positive. "The crucial twist that was presented in Darwin's theory was that the notion of species was not a static construct. Species evolved, differences were formed and variations in types emerged" (ibid 172). Darwin explains the process of change and the formation of new types in *The Origin of Species*:

> When we compare the individuals of the same variety or sub variety of our older cultivated plants and animals, […] they generally differ more from each other than do the individuals of any one species or variety in a state of nature. […] Our oldest cultivated plants such as wheat, still yield variety, our oldest domesticated animals are still capable of improvement or modification. […] The results of the various unknown or dimly understood laws of variations are infinitely complex and diversified. (I&II)

Darwin's ideas on the mixed races have been influential in the development of the hybridization as a theory. He defines the differences between mixed races as "variety": "Practically when a naturalist unites by means of intermediate links any two forms, he treats the one as a variety of the other, ranking the most common, but sometimes the one first describes as the species and the other as variety" (ibid II).

Darwin points out that hybrids are fertile by referring to Gartner who made experiments on mixed races and found out that "hybrids from species which have long been cultivated are often variable in the first generation and more variable than those very distinct species." (ibid IX).

The term has gained considerable acceptance in cultural theory. In the twentieth century, "there is increasing recognition that people with one black parent and with one white parent do not necessarily suffer from identity confusion because they are neither black nor white. Instead, new, 'mixed' identities have emerged" (Tizard and Phoenix 89,102).

Bakhtin's theory of heteroglassia has made a contribution to the development of hybridity as a theoretical idea. Bakhtin says that:

> Heteroglossia, once incorporated into the novel, is another's speech in another language. Such speech constitutes a double -voiced discourse. It serves two speakers at the same time and expresses simultaneously two different intentions. (324)

Bakhtin supports the idea that there should be different languages in literary texts and characters should be able to express themselves in various discourses and from different perspectives. For Bakhtin, colonial discourse is not monological, but dialogic. He points out that any discourse in the relation between the self and the other is dialogical because the dialogue is a mediator between the two different poles

(qtd. in Lim 119). In *Problems of Dostoyevsky's Poetics,* Bakhtin defines "hybridization" as

> a mixture of two social languages within the limits of a single utterance, an encounter, within the arena of an utterance, between two different linguistic consciousnesses, separated from one another with an epoch, by social differentiation or by some other factor. (358)

By using the mixture of two different "discourses", the writers of literary texts can merge "two different linguistic consciousness's" within the limits of one utterance (ibid 358).

Bakhtin categorizes the process of hybridity as intentional or unintentional. Intentional hybridization happens "when one and the same word belongs simultaneously to two languages, two belief systems that intersect in a hybrid construction […], the word has two contradictory meanings, two accents" (ibid 305). He further comments that the unintentional, unconscious, organic hybridity is:

> one of the most important modes in the historical life and evolution of all languages. We may even say that language and languages change historically primarily by hybridization, by means of mixing of various 'languages' co-existing within the boundaries of a single dialect, a single national language, a single branch, a single group of different branches in the historical as well as the paleontological past of languages. (ibid 358,359)

Bakhtin suggests that hybridization in language is a natural process. It enables the languages to mix and therefore evolve. His theory of hybridity in language proves the idea that hybridity is a natural phenomenon and thus inevitable. It provides the improvement, development and co-existence of different languages. Intentional hybridity, on the other hand, occurs when two different cultures interact with each other. As a result of this interaction, one word belongs to two different languages at the same time and has different accents and meanings.

According to Stuart Hall, "cultural identity is always hybrid" (qtd. in Papastergiadis, 189), but he also states that a precise form of this hybridity will be determined by "specific historical formations" and "cultural repertoires of enunciation" (ibid 189). In this respect, Hall's approach towards hybridity is in parallel to Bakhtinian perspective of social transformation. Hall's understanding of social transformation is not constructed on oppositionality- where one position

demolishes its antagonist. For him, transformation occurs as a result of the interaction between ideas, world views and material forces (ibid 189).

Homi Bhabha has turned Bakhtin's intentional hybrid into "an active moment of challenge and resistance against a dominant culture" (qtd. in Young 23). Bhabha refers to this moment as "a hybrid displacing space", which develops as a consequence of the interaction between indigenous and colonial culture, "which has the power of depriving the imposed imperialist culture, not only of the authority that it has for so long imposed politically, […] but even of its own claims to authenticity" (ibid 23).

Bhabha extended the term and defined hybridity in his "Cultural Diversity and Cultural Differences", asserting that all cultural systems are constructed in a space which he defines as the 'Third Space of Enunciation'. Cultural identity is formed in this "ambivalent" third space:

> It is significant that the productive capacities of this Third Space have a colonial or a post-colonial provenance. For a willingness to descend into that alien territory […] may open the way to conceptualizing an international culture, based not on the exoticism of multiculturalism or the *diversity* of cultures, but on the inscription and articulation of culture's *hybridity*. (156, 157)

In other words, it is hybridity which forms the 'Third Space'. It is the 'in-between' space which gives a meaning to hybridity, which makes it productive and important. According to Bhabha, the hybrid is "neither the One, nor the Other, but something else besides which contests the terms and territories of both" (qtd. in Young, 23). Bhabha's definition of hybridity is different from Hall's in that while Hall argues that cultural identity is hybrid because it is determined by historical and cultural formations, Bhabha claims that it is ambivalent as it is determined by the diversity of cultures.

Bhabha also argues that "hybridity is the sign of the productivity of the colonial power, its shifting forces and fixities; it is the name for the strategic reversal of the process of domination through disavowal." (*The Location of Culture* 112) The colonial power produces subjects through rejection. In this way, it maintains its authority. Nevertheless, its authority can be undermined by the colonized who also rejects the power exercised by the colonizer. As a result of this rejection, the relationship between the colonized and colonizer becomes ambivalent.

Robert Young elaborated on the ambiguous meanings of hybridity. According to him, hybridity turns "sameness into difference" and vice versa. In this way, it blurs the boundaries between the same and the different because "the different no longer simply different" (27). The concept of hybridity is ambivalent in that the connection between the same and the different is not clear. As Young claims: "There is no single or correct concept of hybridity. It changes as it repeats, but it also repeats as it changes." (27)

Although the term hybridity has been defined in various ways by many theorists, Bhabha's definition of hybridity will be foregrounded in this thesis, not because the other theorists are not worth mentioning, but it is in parallel to Conrad's depiction of ambivalent and hybrid characters, who are in an in-between space. In *A.F*, there is a continuous power struggle between the characters, which makes the colonial power productive and the process of hybridity multi-layered.

CHAPTER II

OTHERING IN *ALMAYER'S FOLLY*

The theme of othering in *Almayer's Folly* cannot be analyzed through clear-cut definitions and categorizations due to three main reasons. First and foremost, Conrad's fiction is so ambivalent that the question of "Who is other to whom?" cannot be answered thoroughly. As Billy states, in *A.F* "among the whites and other races there is a complicated and fluctuating mixture of loyalties and hostilities" (72). In other words, although the novel includes characters of various origins such as "Dutch and English traders, Malay sultans, Arab rajahs, immigrant Chinese" (Stape 187), neither the loyalty nor the hostility between these nations can be deciphered.

The second reason why the theme of othering cannot be based on simple classifications is that Conrad's fiction most specifically attempts a depiction of the complicated nature of reality, of a view of human existence that sees it as deeply ambivalent itself. To quote White:

> Conrad's fiction was perceived as exotic, and disturbingly so, because its point of view was not purely insular. From the first, Conrad practiced a certain amount of ventriloquism and never situated himself easily in one character. Perhaps it took a Polish sailor finally to tell the story of the white man in the tropics from alternative points of views, for through Conrad's multiple tellings, the story of the Other and the white man in the outposts of empire became theirs as well as ours. (119)

Conrad presents the bitter realities of real characters rather than romanticizing the virtues of human beings as he points out in the "Author's Note" to the novel:

> I am speaking here of men and women- not of the charming and graceful phantoms that move about in our mud and smoke and are softly luminous with the radiance of all our virtues; that are possessed of all refinements, of all sensibilities, of all wisdom- but, being only phantoms, possess no heart. (qtd. in Eddleman 3)

Nevertheless, the theme of othering in the novel is based on a view of humanity and its conflicts that is radically ambivalent, and thus cannot be analyzed from one

perspective only, which makes its treatment in the novel multi-layered, complex and unidentifiable.

Thirdly, Conrad's world view which is reflected in *A.F* is not limited to one group of people, but tends to be universal. *A.F* employs universal themes such as man and his place in the universe, and the feelings of human beings, asserting existence through erasing the identity of the others and racial discrimination. In the "Author's Note" to the novel, Conrad refers to his aim in writing the novel as:

> I am content to sympathize with common mortals no matter where they live; in houses or in huts, in the streets under a fog or in the forests behind the dark line of dismal mangroves that fringe the vast solitude of the sea" (ibid 3).

While apparently focusing on one group of people, he is more deeply investigating the lives of all mortals. Therefore, the theme of othering in *A.F* should be analyzed from multiple perspectives since every character in the novel is explicitly presented as an "other" to each other. As White argues,

> no one group is idealized; rather our sense is of a succession of displacements and power struggles, internally and externally fuelled by a common human greed. It is a world of multiple viewpoints, rich and historic, not the homogeneous, self-congratulatory story of unenlightened, backward 'them' and heroic, progressive 'us'. (qtd. in Stape 187,188)

2.1 THE NON-EUROPEANS ARE OTHERED

All the non-Europeans in *A.F* are victims of the colonial mind as it is portrayed in the novel, which has the notion that the Europeans are heroic and enlightened, whereas the non-Europeans are seen by these characters as backward since they do not belong to the European culture. For this reason, the colonialists aim to bring civilization and light to the so-called "unenlightened territories" (Said, xi). In Said's post-colonial point of view, the conflict between the colonizer and the colonized mostly results from the differences between cultures and this is the rationale behind the colonial mind. Having the notion that the person who is not like me deserves to be labeled as the other, the white characters in the novel other the Malays, the Balinese and the Arabs considering that they are inferior, primitive and barbaric.

One of these white characters is Almayer, the protagonist of the novel, who has the notion that the non-Europeans are inferior beings: "Great rascals they are" (*A.F* 58). He feels displeased to live in the Malay Islands because he is of Dutch origin and regards the non-Europeans as inferior. The novel opens with a scene in which Almayer looks at the great river dreaming of "wealth and power away from this coast where he had dwelt for so many years." (ibid 1). Almayer's dreaming of a wealthy life away from the coast indicates that he is not content with his life in the Malay region and wants to escape from there. From the very beginning of the novel, Almayer is introduced as a character who is disappointed to live in the Malay Archipelago.

His disillusionment is more evident when he dreams about his half-caste daughter, Nina:

> They would live in Europe, he and his daughter. They would be rich and respected. Nobody would think of her mixed blood in the presence of her great beauty and of his immense wealth. Witnessing her triumphs he would grow young again, he would forget the twenty-five years of heart-breaking struggle on this coast where he felt like a prisoner. (1)

He also thinks that nobody in Europe would regard Nina as a half-caste due to her beauty and the great prosperity he fondly imagines will be his. Almayer's feelings towards Nina shows that he feels ashamed of Nina's mixed blood and reflects the European mind which demeans the non-Europeans. Because he considers his European culture as an inseparable part of his identity, he cannot accept Nina as she is. As Bala argues,

> The novel provides an intense description of racial discrimination in society and its effects upon […] a strong bond between a white father and his half-caste daughter. Almayer is an emissary of European civilization – a white man with a westernized outlook and dominated by the ideologies of the West. The world he builds for himself in Malaya is a microcosm of the world from which he has come. In spite of the ties of family and friends, in spite of man's religious and social ideals that all men are equal and should love each other, racial conflicts continue to flare up in this absurd, meaningless world. A sense of unresolved tension, the confrontation of one culture with another governs the novel. (52)

Racial conflict between the Dutch father and the half-caste daughter arises because the Self [Almayer] cannot tolerate the cultural differences between himself and the

O/other [Nina]. For Almayer, Nina is both Other as she is a projection of himself and other because she belongs to another race. The Self fiercely adheres to his culture, which Said defines as: "each society's reservoir of the best that has been known and thought" (xiii). For Almayer, his race is the best and it is what makes him different than the other races; thus, he cannot tolerate that his daughter is half Malay and feels ashamed due to her mixed blood. And we have seen that shame is a response profoundly connected to the consciousness' creation of an Other.

Racial conflict is also evident when Almayer remembers his youth in Java, an island in Indonesia, where he spent his young days with his family:

> The young man himself too was nothing loth to leave the poisonous shores of Java, and the meagre comforts of the parental bungalow, where the father grumbled all day at the stupidity of native gardeners, and the mother from the depths of her long easy-chair bewailed the lost glories of Amsterdam, where she had been brought up, and of her position as the daughter of a cigar dealer there. (2,3)

Almayer refers to himself as the young man whose only desire is "to leave the poisonous shores of Java and the meagre comforts of the parental bungalow" (2,3). The use of the words "poisonous" and "meager comforts" indicates that Almayer has never been content to live in Java, which is a non-European land. In Hannis' words, "his attitude towards Java as 'poisonous' invokes a metaphor of contamination that betrays his sense of racial purity, a conviction that proves to be immutable" (83). Moreover, his father's remarks about the natives such as "the stupidity of native gardeners" (*A.F* 3) is an expression of the racial conflict between the white and the non-European because he reduces the natives to lesser beings. As Hannis argues, "The attitudes and dynamics of the Almayer family are by no means unique but dramatize normative tropes and tendencies of colonial culture" (ibid 83). The colonial powers tend to prioritize their own culture and undermine the culture of the others thinking that "we are number one, we are bound to lead, we stand for freedom and order, and so on" (Said xix).

Almayer marginalizes the Malay people who need to be controlled by the so-called number one Europeans. At the beginning of the novel, he enters his house which is described as follows: "In the other corner, his head wrapped in a piece of red calico, huddled into a shapeless heap, slept a Malay, one of Almayer's domestic

slaves—"my own people," he used to call them" (7). The Malay in Almayer's house is described as "the domestic slave" and therefore is belittled. Furthermore, Almayer calls the domestic slaves "my own people" and patronizes them. The reason why Almayer constantly devalues the Malays is that he has been under the influence of "the impressive ideological formations" of his age, which are imperialism and colonialism (Said 9). In Said's words,

> neither imperialism nor colonialism is a simple act of accumulation and acquisition. Both are supported and even impelled by impressive ideological formations that include notions that certain territories and people require and beseech domination. (ibid 9)

Having this colonial mind, Almayer regards the Malay people as his own commodity and claims superiority over them. He [the Self] acts like the "Master" and wants to be recognized by his "Slave" [the Other] (Hegel qtd. in Sartre, 237).

Furthermore, Almayer shows his prejudice against the non-Europeans by making derogatory remarks about them when Dain, a Balinese ruler, approaches Almayer's house with his canoe to talk about their plans to find gold in Malay:

> Dain and Lakamba [the old ruler of Sambir] were both too much interested in the success of his scheme. Trusting to Malays was poor work; but then even Malays have some sense and understand their own interest. All would be well—must be well. (7)

As indirectly narrated, Almayer has a distrust of Malays as he argues that trusting to Malays was a poor work. He further points out that "It is bad to have to trust a Malay, […] but I [Almayer] must own that this Dain is a perfect gentleman" (9). Almayer claims that he has to trust a non-European [Dain] in order to achieve his aim, which is to find gold in the Malay region. However, he remarks that it is bad to depend on a Malay implying that Malay people are untrustworthy.

Moreover, Almayer looks down on Dain and Lakamba when he waits for Dain's return on his varendah:

> What did it matter? It was just his luck. Those two infernal savages, Lakamba and Dain, induced him, with their promises of help, to spend his last dollar in the fitting out of boats, and now one of them was gone somewhere, and the other shut up in his stockade would give no sign of life. (35)

Almayer stigmatizes both Lakamba and Dain since the former is a native and the latter is from another land, Bali and labels them as "infernal savages". By using language as a medium and particularly using deprecatory expressions, he claims superiority over them. That is, he exercises his power and implies that he is culturally and racially superior to the Malays through the belittling expressions such as "infernal savages". As Bhabha claims, "the construction of the colonial power in discourse and the exercise of colonial power through discourse, demands an articulation of forms of difference – racial, sexual" (*The Location of Culture* 96). Nevertheless, Almayer is unaware of the fact that he is exploited by Dain and Lakamba who persuade him to spend money on the fitting out of the boats and exploit his financial sources. As Hannis suggests, "Shattering illusions of autonomy and self-sufficiency, desire dismantles perceived oppositions between inside and outside, self and other" (76). Thus, Almayer sets aside his autonomous and self-sufficient nature as a white European. Lakamba and Dain are also required to trust a white man in this business without thinking about his origin, which they disregard when dealing with him for their own purposes in this limited business. Both sides approach each other in pursuit of money, their sole desire, which is "stultified and reified by imperialist exploitation and material interests" (ibid 78).

Almayer also demeans the Malays when the Dutch officers visit his house to arrest Dain. He welcomes the white lieutenanats, makes gin cocktails and offers them to the officers and talks on as follows:

> It is a great pleasure to see white faces here. I have lived here many years in great solitude. The Malays, you understand, are not company for a white man; moreover they are not friendly; they do not understand our ways. Great rascals they are. (58)

Almayer's welcoming attitude towards the Dutch officers and his hospitality also indicate his sympathy for the white Dutch lieutenants. The words Almayer uses to describe the Malays, such as "not company for a white man", "not friendly", and "great rascals" are verbal expressions of his racial discrimination against the Malays. For him, the Malays are so inferior that they cannot even be company for a white man and lack the capacity to understand their [the white men's] ways. However, he is unaware of the fact that his obsession with his race and its superiority has

drawbacks since "he encloses himself within a specific culture, limits himself and hems himself in" (Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* 17). His belief that the Europeans have their own ways leads to a conflict between the self and the other, which makes the former belittle the latter. By enclosing himself in one culture and its traditions, he isolates himself from the other. As a result of this isolation, he becomes the victim of the colonial mind. That he burns his house at the end of the novel shows to what extent he was victimized by the colonial mind. As pointed out by the narrator, he burns all the papers, books and shelves which he had intended to use to keep a record of his rising fortunes:

> He looked at all these things, all that was left after so many years of work, of strife, of weariness, of discouragement, conquered so many times. And all for what? He stood thinking mournfully of his past life till he heard distinctly the clear voice of a child speaking amongst all this wreck, ruin, and waste. He started with a great fear in his heart, and feverishly began to rake in the papers scattered on the floor, broke the chair into bits, splintered the drawers by banging them against the desk, and made a big heap of all that rubbish in one corner of the room. […]He heard a dry sound of rustling; sharp cracks as of dry wood snapping; a whirr like of a bird's wings when it rises suddenly, and then he saw a thin stream of smoke come through the keyhole. (98)

The things he burns belong to his past life and symbolize his hopes of being rich and powerful under the influence of colonization. The words such as "wreck", "ruin" and "waste" show that he ruined his life by believing in colonialism, which encouraged him to settle on a distant country, use the so-called unenlightened lands and make money there.

Being labelled as inferior by the colonial powers, the non-Europeans are controlled and governed by the Europeans. The Europeans exercise their authority to be the supreme power in the Malay region. Thinking that they have the right to control the non-European territories, the Dutch lieutenants other the Malays after "an Arab trader" [most probably Abdulla] informs the Dutch about Dain's gunpowder trade (59). When Dain escapes from the Dutch and takes refuge in Lakamba's house, he gives an account of how the Dutch had followed him:

> When I saw the Dutch ship I ran the brig inside the reefs and put her ashore. They did not dare to follow with the ship, so they sent the

> boats. We took to ours and tried to get away, but the ship dropped fireballs at us, and killed many of my men. But I am left, O Babalatchi! The Dutch are coming here. They are seeking for me. (38)

The Dutch officers set an ambush on Dain because he sells gunpowder to the Malay for possible use against the Dutch. During the ambush, Dain loses his boat and many of his men, which shows that the Balinese and the Malay are othered by the Dutch officers. They not only exploit the Malay territory, but also kill the Malays who are involved in the gunpowder trade. The Europeans other the Malays since they have been influenced by "the cultural forms dealing with peripheral non - European settings [which] are markedly ideological and selective [even repressive] so far as the natives are concerned" (Said 166). In other words, they "silence the Other, […] rule over and represent domains figured by occupying powers, not by inactive inhabitants" (ibid 166). The Europeans overpower the Malays to the extent that "they cannot voice their ideas" (qtd. in Nelson, 27).

Nevertheless, the non-European characters betray each other for their materialistic desires. Dain, for instance, exploits Sambir to get money out of gunpowder trade. By dwelling on the flaws of both European and non-European characters, Conrad questions one of the central professions of imperialism that the European civilization is superior and can illuminate the earth's dark places. Rather than bringing progress, trade has only increased the rivalries between both the European and the non-European nations (White qtd. in Stape 189). In fact, rivalry that results from the desire to be rich is a universal problem. Conrad presents the flaws of the characters from different nations since he aims to criticize the materialistic greed of people, which is one of the weaknesses of humanity.

In addition to the conflict between the non-European characters, there is also inter-European strife, Almayer acts for his own financial reward rather than as a loyal Dutch colonialist. Although he claims to be a member of the European colonialist powers, he gets involved in gunpowder trade with Dain and Lakamba against the Dutch officers. Furthermore, though he is of Dutch origin, he has been prepared to ally himself with an English adventurer [Lingard], against Dutch

interests and is in a power struggle with the Dutch regional government because of his desire for wealth.

The narrator, who is also a European, uses some deprecatory expressions while depicting some characters. In Spivak's words, by using "the colonial discourse, he participates in a process which is called Othering " (qtd. in Nelson 24). Dain, for instance, is one of these characters in the novel. When he is hiding in a wild forest to escape from the Dutch officers, he is described as follows:

> Only the parasites seemed to live there in a sinuous rush upwards into the air and sunshine, feeding on the dead and the dying alike, and crowning their victims with pink and blue flowers that gleamed amongst the boughs, incongruous and cruel, like a strident and mocking note in the solemn harmony of the doomed trees (82)

The narrator points out that only "the parasites feeding on their victims" can live in that forest. It connotes the idea that Dain is like a parasite hiding from his enemies "in a sinuous rush". He also uses words such as "incongruous" and "strident" (82) to describe the parasites, which is an implication of Dain's difference from the white race as a Balinese. Furthermore, Dain is described as a wild animal:

> Was he a wild man to hide in the woods and perhaps be killed there—in the darkness—where there was no room to breathe? […] He saw the bearded faces and the white jackets of the officers, the light on the leveled barrels of the rifles. What is the bravery of the greatest warrior before the firearms in the hand of a slave? (82)

Dain is othered by the narrator while he is hiding in the forest and waiting for Nina. He is labelled as a wild animal hiding in the forest and waiting to be killed helplessly, whereas the white officers are delineated in "white jackets" with "bearded faces". While he is claimed to be "a slave", the officers are the ones who demonstrate superiority over him.

Dain is also treated like a wild animal by Almayer when he finds Dain and Nina in the forest, while they are trying to elope. Almayer points a gun towards Dain: "Dain saw a hand holding some glittering object extended towards him" (86). He attempts to kill Dain not because he elopes with his daughter but because he is not white: "Dain saw a hand holding some glittering object extended towards him, heard Nina's cry of "Father!" and in an instant the girl was between him and Almayer's

revolver" (86). Interestingly enough, as it is cunningly showed by the narrator, Dain does not know what a gun is and cannot recognize one immediately even though he is trading in armaments/gunpowder. The narrator implies that he is not familiar with the revolver which is a novelty brought into the non-European lands by the colonial powers. Almayer acts as if Dain was a wild animal rather than a human being. Dain questions his value as a human being after Almayer points his gun towards him: "Am I a wild beast that you should try to kill me suddenly and in the dark, Tuan Almayer?" said Dain, breaking the strained silence" (86). As Linda Dryden suggests, "for Almayer Dain is a savage representative of an inferior race, just another Malay. As such, Almayer, with the arrogant assumption of racial superiority, stereotypes this 'native', believing he can manipulate him for his own purposes"(103). Almayer despises Dain in such a way that he regards Nina's elopement with a native as a nightmare, even though that native is respected by his own people and the Malays as a powerful young prince. He tries to persuade Nina in disillusionment: "Nina!" […], "come to me at once. What is this sudden madness? What bewitched you? Come to your father, and together we shall try to forget this horrible nightmare!" (189). For Almayer, Dain has such a subordinate status that Nina's elopement with him is nothing but a "nightmare".

Almayer maintains his negative attitude towards Dain and explicitly states that he is a lesser being due to his race and does not have the right to marry his half-white daughter Nina. He wonders how Nina wanted to marry a man of "an inferior race" and bombards Nina with the following questions:

> "Tell me," he said—"tell me, what have they done to you, your mother and that man? What made you give yourself up to that savage? For he is a savage. Between him and you there is a barrier that nothing can remove. I can see in your eyes the look of those who commit suicide when they are mad. You are mad. Don't smile. It breaks my heart. If I were to see you drowning before my eyes, and I without the power to help you, I could not suffer a greater torment. Have you forgotten the teaching of so many years?" (87)

Almayer's depreciatory attitude towards Dain is evident when he threatens Nina to inform against Dain if she does not go home with him: "If you do not go down at once to the creek, where Ali is waiting with my canoo, I shall tell him to return to the settlement and bring the Dutch officers here" (88). Almayer wants to

bring the Dutch regional government to the forest where Dain is hiding. As Nina points out, "now you [Almayer] want to give up to them the man that yesterday you called your friend [Dain]" (88). In Nina's words, Almayer betrays Dain: "instead of bringing you life I bring you death, for he will betray unless I leave you for ever!" (88). Although Almayer befriended Dain to achieve his materialistic aims such as smuggling and treasure hunting, when it comes to allowing him to have his daughter, he would rather he died at the hands of the Dutch officers.

Almayer demeans the Malay people and expresses his deep suffering after Nina's elopement with Dain:

> "It would be too great a disgrace. I am a white man." He broke down completely there, and went on tearfully, "I am a white man, and of good family. Very good family," he repeated, weeping bitterly. "It would be a disgrace . . . all over the islands, . . . the only white man on the east coast. No, it cannot be . . . white men finding my daughter with this Malay. My daughter!" he cried aloud, with a ring of despair in his voice." (90)

He feels superior to Dain thinking that he is a white man of a "good family even though he actually lacks the royal status that Dain has among his own people, implying that Dain does not have a "good family". He also feels ashamed of the fact that Nina is having an affair with a Malay and regards this marriage as a dishonorable behavior. Similarly, he feels a sense of disgust and dishonor when Reshid, the nephew of a rich Arab trader, is suggested as a possible husband for Nina: "Poor Almayer was nearly having a fit. Burning with the desire of taking Abdulla by the throat, he had but to think of his helpless position in the midst of lawless men to comprehend the necessity of diplomatic conciliation" (22). Nevertheless, by using the word "lawless", the narrator devalues the non-Europeans.

All the white characters in the novel as well as the narrator other the non-Europeans having colonial notion that the natives live in darkness and therefore should be enlightened. Because they are enslaved by their materialistic benefits, they betray the Malays. Almayer, the Dutch officers and the narrator, all of whom are proud of their white race, other the Malays through insulting verbal expressions, implications and depictions are seen to rationalize their exercise of power, as Bhabha described, by persuading themselves that they are "culturally, sexually or racially

different from the colonized" (Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* 96). Further, we find some evidence that they believe that culture is an indistinguishable part of identity and all the problems between the "Other" and the "Self" are posed by culture (Said xiii).

2.2 THE EUROPEANS ARE OTHERED

The non-European characters in *A.F* devalue the Europeans also by using speech and language. In this way, they have the ability to define the other however they want. In Lacan's words: "If speech is founded in the existence of the Other, the true one, language is so made as to return us to the objectified other, to the other whom we can make what we want of" (qtd. in Miller 244). Almayer is othered by Mrs. Almayer through the medium of language when she invites him to the dinner in her native language, Malay: "Kaspar! Makan!" The well-known shrill voice startled Almayer from his dream of splendid future into the unpleasant realities of the present hour" (2). The "well-known shrill voice" belongs to Mrs. Almayer, the orphaned daughter of Sulu brigands who was adopted by Lingard. Although Almayer is of Dutch origin and rarely speaks Malay, his wife addresses him in Malay, not in English, which is an epitome of his otherness and isolation in Sambir. Although Almayer prefers to communicate in English, Mrs. Almayer consciously rejects all the cultural and linguistic elements of Europe and insists on addressing Almayer in Malay. Through the medium of her native language, she gives the message that Almayer does not belong to her race, which makes Almayer "the other".

Mrs. Almayer uses speech as a medium and expresses her sorrow over her arranged marriage when Babalatchi goes to Mr. Almayer's house to secure Dain's life and to help Nina elope with Dain. Mrs Almayer talks to Babalatchi as follows: "Have I not lived many years with that man? Have I not seen death in that man's eyes more than once when I was younger and he guessed at many things. Had he been a man of my own people I would not have seen such a look twice; but he—" (65). Mrs. Almayer feels disillusioned since she is married to somebody who is not Malay. She implies that she could have seen such a look in a Malay husband's eye but then she would have known what to do, whereas with this foreign husband she does not know what to do, or fears taking action. That is, she would kill a husband

who dared to look at her like that, but since Almayer is a European, there might be repercussions if she were to kill him. Therefore, she racially discriminates against Almayer. However, this racial discrimination is not one sided as "Almayer despises his Indonesian wife, who, in turn, despises what she sees as his white man's weakness. The pattern tediously repeats itself in the criss-cross of mutually demeaning voices" (Krajka 263)

Mrs. Almayer's hatred towards Almayer is more obvious when Babalatchi and Captain Ford meet for a chat and talk about the news from Bali. Babalatchi informs Captain Ford about Mrs. Almayer as follows: "Yes, she lives in our Rajah's house. She will not die soon. Such women live a long time," said Babalatchi, […] "She has dollars, and she has buried them, but we know where" (102). Almayer is abandoned by Mrs. Almayer who is overwhelmed by her materialistic ambitions. Due to her love for money and hatred towards Almayer, she prefers to live in the Rajah's house and therefore others Almayer. Through such characters as Mrs. Almayer,

> Conrad makes the effects of inherited racial characteristics an important element in the novel: Mrs. Almayer quickly rejects the European veneer derived from her convent training and relapses into the morose ferocity of her Sulu pirate forebears" (Watt, *Conrad in the Nineteenth Century* 45).

Almayer is not only perceived as the other by his wife but also by his daughter Nina. When Nina tries to elope with Dain, Almayer sees them in the forest and tries to persuade Nina to leave Dain, but Nina, as the following quotation makes clear, rejects her father's race:

> Have you forgotten the teaching of so many years?" "No," she interrupted, "I remember it well. I remember how it ended also. Scorn for scorn, contempt for contempt, hate for hate. I am not of your race. Between your people and me there is also a barrier that nothing can remove. You ask why I want to go, and I ask you why I should stay" (87)

Almayer refers to Nina's "European" education because Nina was taken away by Lingard and brought up by Mrs. Vink in Singapore. Nina claims that she was marginalized there because "her teachers did not understand her nature, and the education ended in a scene of humiliation, in an outburst of contempt from white

people for her mixed blood" (20). For this reason and because her mother encourages her to identify herself with islanders, Nina rejects her father and his race, thinking that there is a great barrier between the European and the Malay, and again urged by her mother, she chooses Dain Maroola and his race. For Nina, the relationship between the self and the other is quite paradoxical. On the one hand, she wants to be attached to the other in order to exist; on the other hand, her existence is submerged by the existence of the other. Seeing that she has not been acknowledged by the European community, she rejects her white side and in this way erases the identity of her father, which she sees as a threat to her own existence. Nevertheless, as a subaltern woman who has already been turned into an eroticized prey by young men in Singapore, she "delivers herself up, passive and docile, into the hands of a new master" (De Beauvoir 69), needs the other's existence to exist and therefore prefers to live with Dain. As Bala claims:

> Nina's choice is between two kinds of society, between a world characterized by isolation and a world in which people are able to establish a real communion. These are represented by the civilized Almayer and the Malay Dain who are dramatized as cultural opposites. […] He [Dain] offers to Nina an alternative to her isolated existence and she gladly opts for it. (57)

Nina refers to the difference between Dain and Almayer and explains the rationale behind her preference as follows:

> "In time",[…] "both our voices, that man's and mine, spoke together in a sweetness that was intelligible to our ears only. You were speaking of gold then, but our ears were filled with the song of our love, and we did not hear you. Then I found that we could see through each other's eyes: that he saw things that nobody but myself and he could see. […]Then I began to live. (87)

For Nina, the reason behind her rejection of her father and his race is his lack of awareness. While Nina and Dain have a love affair which is full of the sweet song of love, Almayer talks about gold only and he is unaware of the fact that gold means nothing to Nina. Nina begins to live only after she sees Dain. Almayer "lacks awareness of the world of Others, a world in which Others have to be respected" (White 120). Therefore, she rejects Almayer and his race by choosing Dain as her life companion. Her love for Dain is so strong that she prefers to sacrifice herself when Dain attempts to kill Almayer: "'No!' she cried, […] 'No! Kill me! Then

perhaps he will let you go. You do not know the mind of a white man. He would rather see me dead than standing where I am. […] Kill me! Kill me!' "(88). Almayer prefers to see Nina dead than alive and marrying a Malay. Nina's remark that "you don't know the mind of a white man" is an epitome of racial discrimination while also positioning her between the two sides. In Tucker's words, "Nina's elopement with Maroola means, to the father, that she has rejected the values to which he has clung, values that are intimately connected with Almayer's version of European civilization" (85).

After Nina's elopement, Almayer feels disillusioned and starts to live in complete isolation because throughout his life he has clung to the dream of making a fortune and taking her with him to Europe. When they depart, he gets down on his hands and knees and, creeping along the sand, carefully erases all traces of his daughter's footsteps and expresses his sorrow:

> "I shall never forgive you, Nina," said Almayer, in a dispassionate voice. "You have torn my heart from me while I dreamt of your happiness. You have deceived me. […] When you were caressing my cheek, you were counting the minutes to the sunset that was the signal for your meeting with that man—there!" (93)

For Almayer, Nina betrays him by "discarding her white heritage and choosing her dark half" (Krajka 259). Almayer's ultimate aim in his life has been to realize his dreams of being rich through the existence of Nina. In Lacan's words, "the self [Almayer] aims to find the object [Nina]; that is, the other. Even if it is lost and can never be found again, he is in pursuit of reaching his ultimate goal, which is to find the other [the object] again" (qtd. in Miller 52). When Nina rejects him, he tries to exist by erasing every sign of Nina's existence. He burns his quarters and moves to the unfinished house, "Almayer's Folly". However, he can never forget Nina and erase her existence. Feeling totally estranged from reality, he becomes an opium-addict and finally dies. The concluding section of the novel highlights the bitter reality of a man who is perceived as the other by everybody around him. In Bala's words:

> The concluding section of the novel reveals the rapid deterioration of Almayer. Forsaken by all, he is destroyed by the weight of his failure and remorse. Somehow, he has become entangled in a web of

> circumstances from which he cannot free himself. Consumed by his own wishes and influenced by the bigotry of European society, he rejects the union of Nina and Dain by withdrawing to his deserted decaying house named "Almayer's Folly", which symbolizes the failure of his materialistic hopes. He falls further into personal and social isolation. His life becomes monotonous and sordid. Henceforth, it is a death-in-life existence for him. (58)

Nina's elopement has a profound effect on Almayer's sense of identity. When he carefully erases all trace of her from his material world by rubbing out her footprints in the sand, he completely erases his own individual selfhood. Nothing but disillusionment can be expected after this trauma. His loss of identity rapidly progresses with a lack of speech, lack of activity and lack of consciousness when he becomes an opium addict. He is physically and existentially disintegrated. He is existentially dead before his body dies.

Apart from his family, Almayer is also devalued by the non-European characters. He is humiliated by the Balinese prince Dain Maroola. While he does not trust the non-European to treat his daughter well, saying:

> "Do you know what you are doing? Do you know what is waiting for you if you follow that man? Have you no pity for yourself? Do you know that you shall be at first his plaything and then a scorned slave, a drudge, and a servant of some new fancy of that man?" (86). Dain answers him as follows: "By all the gods!" […] by heaven and earth, by my head and thine I swear: this is a white man's lie." (87)

He labels Almayer as a liar and racially discriminates against him by implying that white people are untrustworthy. He even attempts to kill Almayer: "Dain came into the circle of light, […] whispered in her ear—'I can kill him where he stands, before a sound can pass his lips. For you it is to say yes or no'" (88). Moreover, the narrator presents Dain as the dishonorable and dangerous native and the other.

Being devalued by everyone, Almayer lives in disillusionment and dies of despair. When he is found dead in his house, Abdulla enters his house and finds himself for the last time face to face with his old enemy:

> Whatever he might have been once, he was not dangerous now, lying stiff and lifeless in the tender light of the early day. The only white man on the east coast was dead, and his soul, delivered from the

> trammels of his earthly folly, stood now in the presence of Infinite Wisdom. (102)

The narrator's choice of words to depict his death is quite striking to show how Almayer is perceived as the other. By claiming that he was not dangerous now, the narrator implies that his existence as the only white in the Malay Islands was a threat for the non- Europeans. Even after his death, people feel no mercy for him. In contrast, a feeling of relief governs their soul, as in the narrator's words: "he is not dangerous now". The feeling of relief after Almayer's death indicates to what extent he is racially regarded as "the other" by the non-Europeans. Abdulla, for instance, does not feel regretful at all but glances "coldly once more at the serene face" and says "Let us go," addressing Reshid (103). They leave Almayer's dead body there, indifferently, and go away: "And as they passed through the crowd that fell back before them, the beads in Abdulla's hand clicked, while in a solemn whisper he breathed out piously the name of Allah! The Merciful! The Compassionate!" (103). Abdulla's remarks in Arabic indicate that he regards Almayer as the other and orientalizes through religious response.

In addition to Almayer, all the white people in Sambir are othered by the non-Europeans. The sense of difference with the white people being seen as stupid is evident in the scene when Dain, Lakamba and Babalatchi try to find a secure place to protect Dain from the Dutch officers. Babalatchi suggests Bulangi's house and explains the reason for it:

> Bulangi was a safe man. In the network of crooked channels no white man could find his way. White men were strong, but very foolish. It was undesirable to fight them, but deception was easy. They were like silly women—they did not know the use of reason, and he was a match for any of them—went on Babalatchi, with all the confidence of deficient experience. (40)

All these expressions indicate that Babalatchi is prejudiced against the white and believes that they are inferior to the Malay. In other words, by using "speech and language" in Lacan's words, he "returns to the objectified other whom he can make what he wants of" (qtd. in Miller 52). Hence, he stigmatizes the white men by using language and labeling them. Furthermore, the narrator presents free indirect reporting of thoughts and speech; and therefore, the speaker is also presented as "other" since

both the implied author and the reader know that Babalatchi is narrow-minded on his opinion of the whites.

Babalatchi maintains his prejudiced attitude towards the white people after Dain runs away from Lakamba's house. He dreams of the years he spent serving his master, Lakamba: "In those long years how many dangers escaped, how many enemies bravely faced, how many white men successfully circumvented!" (42). The words he uses to describe how Lakamba ruled Sambir, like "dangers", "enemies" and "circumvented", postulate that the white were dangerous enemies to the Malay and therefore need to be "successfully circumvented". Although circumventing people has nothing to do with success, for Babalatchi it is an act to be proud of, which is an indication that these people are full of hatred towards the white and regard them as inferior beings. Under the circumstances where the Dutch are colonial masters and the Arabs are trading masters, this reporting of Babalatchi's and Lakamba's adventures in the past is used by the narrator to show his opinion of Babalatchi as a childlike person.

Abdulla is another non-European who despises white people. Because he informs the Dutch officers about the gunpowder trade in Sambir, he wants to be rewarded by the white:

> 'The Orang Blanda are come,' said Reshid, 'and now we shall have our reward.' Abdulla shook his head doubtfully. 'The white men's rewards are long in coming,' he said. 'White men are quick in anger and slow in gratitude. We shall see' (53).

Abdulla devalues the Dutch officers by stereotyping them as quick-tempered people who lack gratitude. However, he himself lacks respect for the others no matter what their race is. As well as betraying Dain and Almayer, he belittles the white people.

Mrs Almayer despises white people, thinking that they are liars and therefore should be avoided. After Nina leaves her house and is on the way to the forest where Dain waits for her, Nina expresses her desire to see Almayer's face. Nevertheless, Mrs. Almayer tries to dissuade Nina by giving her a piece of advice:

> "Give up your old life! Forget!" she said in entreating tones. "Forget that you ever looked at a white face; forget their words; forget their thoughts. They speak lies. And they think lies because they despise

> us that are better than they are, but not so strong. Forget their friendship and their contempt; forget their many gods." (74)

Mrs. Almayer turns her last meeting with her daughter into a lesson in which Nina is advised to forget white people and reject her white heritage. Mrs. Almayer openly expresses her view of the whites as "other". She even points out that white people deserve to be murdered: "Let [Dain] slay the white men that come to us to trade, with prayers on their lips and loaded guns in their hands. […] they are on every sea, and on every shore; and they are very many!" (74,75) In Khushu-Lahiri's words, "It is Mrs. Almayer who most coherently and cogently expresses the strongest denunciation of the white and of the colonizing mission." (103).

Similar to her mother, Nina regards the white people as enemies. When the Dutch officers visit Almayer's house to investigate Dain's involvement in gunpowder trade, she implies that white people should be killed:

> "Of course you have heard of Dain Maroola. Your father secured him, I understand. We know he escaped up this river. Perhaps you—"
>
> "And he killed white men!" interrupted Nina.
>
> "I regret to say they were white. Yes, two white men lost their lives through that scoundrel's freak."
>
> "Two only!" exclaimed Nina. (67,68)

Nina shows the full extent of her hatred for the whites. For Nina, the existence of the white poses a threat. Therefore, she claims that they deserve to die having the tendency to erase their existence. Nevertheless, she is unaware of the fact that both parties need each other in order to exist.

Moreover, she expresses her hatred towards the whites while addressing the Dutch lieutenant:

> I hate the sight of your white faces. I hate the sound of your gentle voices. That is the way you speak to women, dropping sweet words before any pretty face. I have heard your voices before. I hoped to live here without seeing any other white face but this," she added in a gentler tone, touching lightly her father's cheek. (68)

She refers to her childhood spent in Singapore, where she drew unwanted attention from men as Captain Ford explained to Almayer on her return. She has been

unimpressed by the European civilization because she has been insulted by whites and treated as "the other" by them to the extent that she has grown to hate them and learnt to mistrust their treatment of women. She contrasts "the virtuous pretences "of the white people with the "sincerity" of her Malay kinsmen and she rejects the white community (Hampson 18). As Khushu-Lahiri argues, "Rather than the native's reputed moral inferiority, it is European civilization that Nina condemns for its narrowness, moral emptiness and lack of vigour" (104).

Although it is Conrad's first novel, *A.F* is unique in that not only the non-European but also European characters are depicted with all their weaknesses and follies. Contrary to the generally accepted notion that it is the Europeans who regard the non-Europeans as weak, backward and in need of enlightenment, Conrad's attitude towards humanity is quite objective and ambivalent. In Kurushi-Lahiri's words, "Conrad's treatment of the issues of colonialism and imperialism is informed by an ambiguity and ambivalence which alerts a discerning reader to an underlying subtext, at variance with the dominant text" (96). He shows the other side of the coin by employing non-European characters who label the Europeans as inferior, violent and untrustworthy.

2.3 THE FEMALE CHARACTERS ARE OTHERED

The three female characters in the novel, Mrs. Almayer, Nina and Taminah are of great importance to highlight the detrimental effects of patriarchal power on women. In Nadelhaft's words:

> Conrad's early novels and tales examine the practice of colonialism, the tensions and subterfuges which preoccupy both the white colonizers and the native populations. As readers, we may be so drawn to the analysis of colonialism that we ignore the deeper investigation which Conrad makes into the system of which colonialism is only one manifestation: patriarchy, especially patriarchal religion. […] In this analysis of patriarchy, the attentive reader understands the significance of women characters in a new light. (14)

All the men and women in *A.F* "see each other as the other. Nevertheless, they differ in the value they attach to each other. While women regard the male other as essential, men think that the female other is inessential" (De Beauvoir 69). Both Mrs.

Almayer and Nina are victims struggling to overcome the difficulties of the patriarchal society. Mrs. Almayer has been taken from her natural environment and adopted by Lingard to be accultured as European. For this reason, she is made to marry Almayer whose only aim is to make a fortune through this marriage:

> When, in compliance with Lingard's abrupt demand, Almayer consented to wed the Malay girl, no one knew that on the day when the interesting young convert had lost all her natural relations and found a white father, she had been fighting desperately like the rest of them on board the prau, and was only prevented from leaping overboard, like the few other survivors, by a severe wound in the leg. (11)

Mrs. Almayer is regarded as the other by both Lingard and Almayer. They have a pragmatic attitude towards her and both use her for their own benefits. Lingard encourages Almayer to marry his orphaned daughter:

> Nobody will see the colour of your wife's skin. The dollars are too thick for that, I tell you! And mind you, they will be thicker yet before I die. There will be millions, Kaspar! Millions I say! And all for her—and for you, if you do what you are told. (5)

Mrs. Almayer's opinion, feelings and wishes are ignored. Moreover, she is made to abandon her natural ties her religion, and converts to Christianity replacing her God with Lingard. In Lingard's words, he "make[s] her an orphan" (12), which has "the distinct implication of 'making' as a form of creation since Lingard perceives himself as a creator, a giver and taker away of life" (Nadelhaft, 19). Lingard perceives himself as the patriarch for the so-called inferior Mrs. Almayer since he claims to be her new father. Lingard is the symbol of the colonial power which is a "destructive project [and] eventually leans towards the 'marginalized others'such as women, victims of capitalism, non-westerners and the like" (Spivak qtd. in Engler 560)

Similarly, Almayer regards himself as superior to Mrs. Almayer and she becomes a submissiveness sharply contrasts with Almayer's selfishness and dominance as a white, male and European figure. She "delivers herself up, passive and docile, into the hands of a new master" (De Beauvoir 69), which results in her inferiority and "which gives rise to all her insufficiencies; that resignation which has its source in the adolescent girl's past, in the society around her, and particularly in

the future assigned to her" (ibid 69). Almayer feels ashamed to be married to a Malay woman and plans to get rid of her:

> he would pass the evening of his days in inexpressible splendour. As to the other side of the picture—the companionship for life of a Malay girl, […] there was only within him a confused consciousness of shame that he a white man—Still, a convent education of four years!—and then she may mercifully die. He was always lucky, and money is powerful! Go through it. Why not? He had a vague idea of shutting her up somewhere, anywhere, out of his gorgeous future. Easy enough to dispose of a Malay woman, a slave, after all, to his Eastern mind, convent or no convent, ceremony or no ceremony. (5)

Almayer considers Mrs. Almayer as disposable material, which can be used for his own benefit and thrown away. Under the influence of his "Eastern mind" in the narrator's words, he even thinks the she is a slave and deserves to be treated inhumanely. That is, he reduces her to an object which has no value at all. The narrator's description of Almayer's mind as 'Eastern' shows the implied author's critical attitude towards the Eastern people. Through this description, the narrator implies that he has been partially influenced by the non-Western people and have similar perceptions to the non-western people as regards women.

Hoping that one day he would be rich, Almayer begins building a house for the use of the future engineers, agents, or settlers of the new Company he plans to establish. Even though he feels optimistic about the future, Mrs. Almayer's defiant behavior makes him unhappy:

> He spent every available guilder on it with a confiding heart. One thing only disturbed his happiness: his wife came out of her seclusion, importing her green jacket, scant sarongs, shrill voice, and witch-like appearance, into his quiet life in the small bungalow. (16)

Even worse, his daughter accepts Mrs. Almayer as she is: "And his daughter seemed to accept that savage intrusion into their daily existence with wonderful equanimity. He did not like it, but dared say nothing" (16). Mrs. Almayer is devalued because she rejects the European culture and rebels against it by returning to her origins. Thinking that Nina is a European and should be loyal to her European side, he expects her to despise her mother because of her race. As Hampson claims, Almayer

denies both Nina's and Mrs. Almayer's real identity because he both refuses to give value to Nina's mixed blood and discriminates against Mrs. Almayer (17).

Mrs. Almayer is also regarded as inferior by the narrator because he uses expressions like "shrill voice", "witch-like appearance" (16) and "savage tigress" (13) to describe her. Through these descriptions, it is implied that the shrill voice and witch-like appearance are qualities peculiar to womankind. In Oliveira's words, "In *A.F*, the implied narrator's prejudice […] appears in his countless, comically contemptuous references to […] Nina's Malay mother as a witch, both in the narrator and in the other characters' voices" (Krajka 265). She is not even given a name by the narrator and is called "Mrs. Almayer" throughout the novel, which indicates that she exists only when she has her husband's surname. Moreover, she is described as if she were a wild animal reacting with violence to what the narrator calls "civilization": "While she was burning the furniture, and tearing down the pretty curtains in her unreasoning hate of those signs of civilisation, Almayer, […] meditated in silence on the best way of getting rid of her." (13). All in all, she is perceived as the other. In Sen's words,

> The discourse of colonialism with its construction of the Other, in particular the feminine Other, emphasizes not merely the difference between the colonized individual an the colonizer, but between the colonized female and the woman in the metropolis as well. With this alternative form of savagery and barbarism held out to her, the latter is compelled to conform to the archetypal role of the woman as passive, resigned, demure and restrained. (169)

As she herself points out: "What have I been? A slave all my life, and I have cooked rice for a man who had no courage and no wisdom" (72), she is regarded as inferior to him. In Hegel's words, although she wishes freedom and life, she cannot be away from "a being to which he [Almayer] will be attached. She acts like a Slave who serves the existence of his Master. There appears the "Master-Slave" relationship between the Self and the Other" (qtd. in Sartre, 237).

Nina is another female character who is belittled by all the male characters such as Dain, Abdulla, Lingard and Almayer and the narrator. Like her mother, she is uprooted from her native surroundings by Lingard who takes her to Mrs. Vinck in Singapore so that she can receive education. However, she is devalued due to her

Malay blood. Her European style of upbringing in Singapore ends in "a scene of humiliation, in an outburst of contempt from white people for her mixed blood" (20). Because she is humiliated by the white society, she later remembers her years in Singapore as "her days of restraint, of sorrow, and of anger" (34). Nina is othered by both Lingard and the other European men who regard themselves as superior due to her mixed blood because

> the men, who represent Western patriarchal culture, associate themselves with what they perceive to be civilization. The women, half-castes or natives, are taken to be the representatives of the world of nature, with all its associations of unpredictable and the [therefore] uncontrollable. (Nadelhaft 15)

Almayer thinks that he has the power to have a control over Nina. He considers Nina as a means to achieve his dream of a splendid future as prompted initially by Lingard:

> He absorbed himself in his dream of wealth and power away from this coast where he had dwelt for so many years, […]They would live in Europe, he and his daughter. They would be rich and respected. Nobody would think of her mixed blood in the presence of her great beauty and of his immense wealth. (3)

Almayer feels ashamed of his daughter's mixed blood thinking that his wealth can cover her defect as a half-caste. He bases his dreams on Nina who, in spite of his love for her, he evidently regards as somebody to control. As Hampson points out, "he includes others in his dreams without allowing for their otherness. However, he feels his own dreams collapse because of his daughter, Nina, whose character is the unknown factor he egoistically takes for granted." (12). In Nina's words, Almayer "want[s] her to dream [his] dreams, to see [his] own visions—the visions of life amongst the white faces of those who cast [her] out from their midst in angry contempt" (87).

Nina is perceived as an inferior being by the Dutch lieutenants. When Almayer introduces Nina to the Dutch officers, the lieutenant reflects as follows: "She was very beautiful and imposing,[…] but after all a half-caste girl" (60). Although Nina is half-Dutch, she is considered to have a defect, which is her mixed

blood. Her beauty and attractive appearance are ignored and devalued by the lieutenant and is devalued due to her mixed race.

Similar to her mother, Nina is presented as the other by the narrator. The wild forest where the lovers [Nina and Dain] meet is associated with Nina's animalistic side. As Hampson argues, the narrator's critical attitude against her emerges in the following description of the love scene between Nina and Dain:

> the intense work of tropical nature went on: plants shooting upward, entwined, interlaced in inextricable confusion, climbing madly and brutally over each other in the terrible silence of a desperate struggle towards the life-giving sunshine above—as if struck with sudden horror at the seething mass of corruption below, at the death and decay from which they sprang. (34)

The description of the plants which "shoot upward in extricable confusion, climbing madly and brutally over each other" would be inappropriate for a European and conventional late 19th century courtship and emphasizes the organic and animal side of their match. As Watt suggests, the representation of nature in this passage "violently subverts the conventional assumptions of popular romance" (qtd. in Hampson 25). Instead of "a static landscape", there is "nature in motion"; instead of "exotic travelogue", the Darwinian "struggle for survival" (ibid 25).

Nina is not only marginalized by the European male-dominated society; she is regarded as the other by the Arabs as well. Abdulla's request for Nina to marry Reshid shows how the Arab society humiliates her. As a powerful man arranging a marriage for his nephew, Abdulla does not care about Nina's feelings at all and offers money in return for this "alliance" (22):

> Abdulla spoke in a more confidential tone, waving his attendants away, and finished his speech by pointing out the material advantages of such an alliance, and offering to settle upon Almayer three thousand dollars as a sign of his sincere friendship and the price of the girl. (ibid 22)

Nina is regarded as a commodity which can be sold in return for money. The male-dominated patriarchal society labels her as "the other".

The narrator's attitude towards Nina is similar to Babalatchi's account of the two lovers' union in the forest. When Lakamba asks where Dain is hiding, he answers as follows:

> In Bulangi's clearing—the furthest one, away from the house. They went there that very night. The white man's daughter took him there. She told me so herself, speaking to me openly, for she is half white and has no decency. She said she was waiting for him while he was here; then, after a long time, he came out of the darkness and fell at her feet exhausted. He lay like one dead, but she brought him back to life in her arms, and made him breathe again with her own breath. That is what she said, speaking to my face, as I am speaking now to you, Rajah. She is like a white woman and knows no shame. (61)

Nina is reduced to a lesser being by Babalatchi. In addition, she is isolated from her surrounding, "the vast jungle drives home the isolation of Nina" and therefore, "she seldom speaks to the natives of Sambir" (Bala 54) and moves among them "calm and white-robed, a being from another world and incomprehensible to them" (18). She, on the one hand, feels helpless , on the other hand, tries to overcome this feeling of inferiority by using her power of sexuality to assert her existence in the male-dominated society which reduces her to a lesser being.

Taminah is another female figure who is belittled by all the male characters in the novel. Babalatchi is one of the dominating male characters who other her. During Dain's and Nina's escape, he uses depreciatory expressions against her: " 'That woman has told them all!' […] 'The she-dog with white teeth; the seven times accursed slave of Bulangi. She yelled at Abdulla's gate till she woke up all Sambir.' " (89). She is labeled as "the she-dog"and "the seven-times accursed slave" by Babalatchi and therefore is regarded as an inferior being in the supposedly superior male-dominated world. Moreover, she is regarded as an object and is sold to Babalatchi when she grows thin and cannot work anymore:

> Then Bulangi, who is a thief and a pig-eater, gave her to me for fifty dollars. I sent her amongst my women to grow fat. I wanted to hear the sound of her laughter, but she must have been bewitched, and . . . she died two days ago. (102)

Babalatchi perceives her as a play-thing whose laughter will entertain him and condemns her.

All the female characters in the novel are despised by the male-dominated society. However, these women lack the power to defend their own rights as individuals. They even betray each other rather than collaborate. They are all isolated beings and try to find meaning in life. As Maissonnat claims, like all the characters in the novel,

> they give themselves up to that never ending quest […] as they try to find the truth contained in the messages they receive from others. However, all the characters are involved in a constant tampering with meaning and truth that they alternately find themselves in the position of encoding or decoding trumped-up messages that hinder the construction of meaning. (qtd. in Krajka 6,7)

Being unable to find meaning in life, these characters prefer to betray each other by using language as a medium and distorting the facts. They live in a world in which everybody is regarded as "the other".

2.4 THE FLAWS OF THE OTHERED CHARACTERS

2.4.1 THE NON-EUROPEANS

In *A.F*, the narrator not only presents the weaknesses of European people but also the non-Europeans such as the Balinese, the Arabs and the Malays. The novel presents the flaws of individuals who can easily betray each other due to their materialistic greed. Although betrayal and materialistic greed cannot be generalized as forms of "othering", they are worth mentioning since Conrad has a rationale behind criticizing all the human beings no matter where they are from and which race they belong to. Contrary to his contemporaries in the 19th century, in which movements such as imperialism and colonialism were favored, he aimed to show the vices of the Europeans, as well as his skeptical views about the non-Europeans. Abdulla is one of those materialistic people whose only aim is to earn money out of trade. In chapter two, Abdulla is introduced as follows:

> Now the up-country canoes glided past the little rotten wharf of Lingard and Co., to paddle up the Pantai branch, and cluster round the new jetty belonging to Abdulla. Not that they loved Abdulla, but they dared not trade with the man whose star had set. Had they done so they knew there was no mercy to be expected from Arab or Rajah; no rice to be got on credit in the times of scarcity from either. (30)

Apart from having a greedy nature, Abdulla has a tendency to betray people. He betrays Dain by informing the Dutch authorities about his gunpowder trade in Batavia. His betrayal can be inferred when the Dutch lieutenants go to Almayer's house in pursuit of Dain. When Almayer asks: "How did you hear about the brig?" (59), the Dutch officer answers as follows: "

> An Arab trader of this place has sent me information about your goings on here in Batavia, a couple of months ago, [. . .] We were waiting for the brig outside, but he slipped past us at the mouth of the river, and we had to chase the fellow to the southward. (59)

This statement shows that "Abdulla and Reshid have turned the tables on Dain. Presumably Abdulla, the senior and wilier of the two Arabs, sent via Reshid the message to the authorities, which resulted in the ambush, the deaths, the pursuit and the denouement" (Watts qtd. in Billy 74).

Apart from Abdulla, Lakamba has a tendency to betray people for his materialistic gains. He protects Dain from the Dutch lieutenants only because he knows where the treasure is. Dain tries to escape from the Dutch lieutenants. Lakamba wants to help Dain escape just for his material gains. Babalatchi is also after money and agrees with what Lakamba suggests to protect Dain:

> And, this being accomplished by me who am your slave, you shall reward with a generous hand. That I know! The white man is grieving for the lost treasure, in the manner of white men who thirst after dollars. Now, when all other things are in order, we shall perhaps obtain the treasure from the white man. Dain must escape, and Almayer must live. (62)

He also misuses the river Pantai for gunpowder trade. Similar to the Europeans and Malays, he is involved in the gunpowder trade to the extent that he feels disappointed after the total stoppage of gunpowder trading in the Malay region:

> Even the loyal soul of Lakamba was stirred into a state of inward discontent by the withdrawal of his license for powder and by the abrupt confiscation of one hundred and fifty barrels of that commodity by the gunboat Princess Amelia, when, after a hazardous voyage, it had almost reached the mouth of the river. (23)

Although Lakamba is the ruler of the Malay region and protecting his territory should be one of his most important duties, he is the one who exploits the Pantai River by carrying fifty barrels of gunpowder and making profit out of it.

In addition to the river, the animals such as birds and trepangs [sea cucumbers] are used for material gains. Dain exploits the animals in the territory by collecting "the trepangs and birds' nests" and making money out of them (27). Even worse, he employs outsiders to collect these natural sources. As the narrator claims: "He did not want to buy gutta-percha or beeswax, because he intended to employ his numerous crew in collecting trepang on the coral reefs outside the river, and also in seeking for bird's nests on the mainland." (27) Dain exploits nature and its resources.

Lakamba and Dain also exploit the Malay Islands because they want to find gold in the territory. Their materialistic greed is evident when Lakamba wants to protect Dain from the Dutch officers' ambush, as we have seen: "He ought to live," said Lakamba; "he knows where the treasure is" (41). Lakamba claims that Dain knows where the treasure is probably because he is involved in treasure hunting and promises Almayer to help him go into the interiors of the land. In addition, we have seen that Lakamba is also in search of gold, as he wants to protect Dain just because he knows where the treasure is.

The Chinaman and Taminah are other minor characters who have weaknesses. Jim-Eng uses Almayer for his own benefits. When Almayer is abandoned by everyone around him, the only person who stands near him is the Chinaman. However, the Chinaman lives in Almayer's house not because of friendship but because of opium and money. His pragmatic attitude towards Almayer is reflected in the dialogue between Ali and Captain Ford:

> "Next time the steamer called in Sambir Ali came on board early with a grievance. He complained to Ford that Jim-Eng the Chinaman had invaded Almayer's house, and actually had lived there for the last month.
> "And they both smoke," added Ali.
> "Phew! Opium, you mean?"
>
> Ali nodded, and Ford remained thoughtful; then he muttered to himself, "Poor devil! The sooner the better now." In the afternoon he walked up to the house.

> "What are you doing here?" he asked of Jim-Eng […]
>
> Jim-Eng explained in bad Malay, […] that his house was old, the roof leaked, and the floor was rotten. So, being an old friend for many, many years, he took his money, his opium, and two pipes, and came to live in this big house. (101)

Although Jim-Eng exploits Almayer by using his house, money and opium, Almayer still continues to live with him. The reason for this is Almayer's last attempt to exist in a world in which everybody others each other. He clings to opium addiction as he wants to erase his identity and forget his life wasted in isolation. As Kirschner suggests, "Almayer's story is […] the account of what becomes of a man gifted with a strong and active imagination who dreams of triumphs which reality deprives him of all rational hope of fulfilling. It records the annihilation of the unshared ideal of self" (qtd. in Hampson 28).

Taminah falls in love with Dain and is jealous of Nina:

> Her jealousy and rage culminated into a paroxysm of physical pain that left her lying panting on the river bank, in the dumb agony of a wounded animal. But she went on moving patiently in the enchanted circle of slavery, going through her task day after day with all the pathos of the grief she could not express, even to herself, locked within her breast. (55)

Due to her jealousy, she informs Almayer about Nina's elopement and Mrs. Almayer's: "There are no women in your house any more, Tuan. I saw the old Mem go away before I tried to wake you" (79). Besides being jealous of Nina, she labels Mrs. Almayer as "the witchwoman" who helps Nina and Dain elope:

> Did I not tell you that I saw the witchwoman push the canoe? I lay hidden in the grass and heard all the words. She that we used to call the white Mem wanted to return to look at your face, but the witchwoman forbade her. (80)

Almost all the characters in the novel have flaws. What makes this novel impressive is the fact that the Malay people and the Arabs are presented with their weaknesses to show that all the people may have a tendency to betray each other and exploit the nature. The novel is based on a universal view of the humanity and its conflicts. For this reason, not only the Europeans are attacked for their perception of the non-Europeans as "the other", but also the non-Europeans are criticized due to

their vices such as betrayal, selfishness and materialistic greed. As Watts claims: "It is part of the originality of this novel of 1895 that it so thoroughly develops this pattern of scheming by nations, races or individuals against each other; the law of jungle prevails among men" (qtd. in Billy 73).

2.4.2. THE EUROPEANS

Conrad's tendency to depict all characters, including the Europeans unheroically is evident when the European characters such as Almayer, Lingard and the Dutch officers are considered. Similar to their non-European counterparts, the European characters have flaws which make them unheroic. In White's words, "he [Conrad] unconventially stresses the similarities between 'us' and 'them' rather than those differences that privilege 'us'" (119). Conrad's "Author's Note" to *A.F* provides an insight into his attitude towards the characters he depicts:

> I am informed that in criticizing that literature which preys on strange people and prowls in far-off countries, […] a lady […] summed up her disapproval of it by saying that the tales it produced were "decivilized". And in that sentence, not only the tales but, I apprehend, the strange people and the far-off countries also are finally condemned in a verdict of contemptuous dislike. […] A judgement that has nothing to do with justice. (qtd. in Khushu-Lahiri 100)

Conrad does not agree with the idea that the non-European lands and the people living there are uncivilized. On the contrary, he believes that the condemnation of them is unjust. For this reason, he presents the weaknesses of the European characters, who are perceived to be the other by both the non-European and the other European characters.

The Malay Archipelago and its sources are exploited by the European people who are involved in trade. In the first chapter of the novel, a very detailed description of the setting is given:

> At that time Macassar was teeming with life and commerce. It was the point in the islands where tended all those bold spirits who, fitting out schooners on the Australian coast, invaded the Malay Archipelago in search of money and adventure. Bold, reckless, keen in business, not disinclined for a brush with the pirates that were to be found on many a coast as yet, making money fast, they used to have a general "rendezvous" in the bay for purposes of trade and dissipation. The Dutch

> merchants called those men English pedlars; some of them were undoubtedly gentlemen for whom that kind of life had a charm; most were seamen; the acknowledged king of them all was Tom Lingard, he whom the Malays, honest or dishonest, quiet fishermen or desperate cut-throats, recognised as "the Rajah-Laut"—the King of the Sea. (3)

The detailed description of the Malay region is quite important to understand the underlying message of the text, which is the exploitation of the island for trade and money. As Bross claims,

> Setting is significant in *A.F,* not as the Pantai River sparkling in the evening sun, bordered by silent jungles, but as the dominant social and economic movement […] – the great trading enterprise of Europeans in non-European lands. (qtd. in Davis 33)

The narrator not only presents nature and its beauties but also introduces the social and economic movement of colonization, which the non-European lands suffer from. As Watt argues:

> in *Almayer's Folly* the genre at least afforded Conrad an opportunity of developing one of its characteristic strengths as a writer, his power to describe the outside world. The power is of a special kind: Conrad is not in the ordinary sense a nature writer; his memory and imagination distill and recreate the characteristic Malayan landscapes with vividness and truth, but his primary interest is both wider and more subjective. Conrad looks at the visible universe with the eye of one who believes that only by deciphering its features can the individual hope to find clues to its meaning or lack of it. (*Conrad in the Nineteenth Century* 44)

The minute description of the natural landscape enables the reader to visualize the Malay region in its realistic vividness as well as understanding Conrad's subjective attitude which questions the meaning or meaninglessness of life. Through the detailed portrayal of the natural landscape, the narrator presents one of the problems of his age, the colonization of the non-European lands.

Similar to the non-Europeans, none of the white characters in *A.F* are depicted heroically. All of them have weaknesses which are presented through their materialistic greed, selfishness and narrow-mindedness. As Khushu-Lahiri points out, *A.F* "questions the imperial subject as constructed by the dominant discourse of the day. As it refuses to depict the Europeans in Sambir heroically, the novel reflects Conrad's skepticism about the imperial venture generally" (99).

As well as the other white characters in the novel, Conrad presents Lingard as an unheroic character since in *A.F* "it is difficult to point to any of the European characters and feel they are held up as superior to the non-Europeans" (Billy 41). He captures a native girl, the future Mrs. Almayer, from Sulu pirates and adopts her. He first offers Almayer a job as supercargo and then proposes that the young man marry his adopted daughter with the promise to make a fortune in Sambir; as discussed earlier. The dreams through which Lingard lures Almayer never come true. Even worse, he disappears. A letter from Singapore announces his departure for Europe in pursuit of money:

> "There would be no difficulties," he wrote; "people would rush in with their money." Evidently they did not, for there was only one letter more from him saying he was ill, had found no relation living, but little else besides. Then came a complete silence. Europe had swallowed up the Rajah Laut. (14)

Although Almayer calls Lingard his father, Lingard lures him. In Rising's words, "whatever Almayer's errors, […] the environment that has enabled him to assist materially in his own downfall has been imposed on him by Lingard" (16). Nevertheless, Almayer also uses Lingard for his own ends and marries his adopted daughter only to be rich. While Lingard wants to secure his daughter's life through their marriage, Almayer views her as a discardable material.

Lingard also uses the Pantai river in Sambir as a means to carry out the gunpowder trade. At the very beginning of the novel, he is introduced as gaining his power for that very reason:

> That was it! He had discovered a river! That was the fact placing old Lingard so much above the common crowd of sea-going adventurers. […] Into that river, whose entrances himself only knew, Lingard used to take his assorted cargo of Manchester goods, brass gongs, rifles and gunpowder. (4)

Among all the sea adventurers in the Malay region, Lingard is the leading figure because of the fact that he has discovered an entrance to the Pantai river which he uses to carry goods, rifles and gunpowder. What makes Lingard so powerful in the region is that he makes money though trade in the river Pantai and exploits it for his own benefits.

Moreover, he exploits the Malay Islands to find gold. When Almayer questions his marriage with Mrs. Almayer, the narrator states that Lingard wished to use the territory to find gold:

> The house for the young couple; the godowns for the big trade Almayer was going to develop while he [Lingard] would be able to give himself up to some mysterious work which was only spoken of in hints, but was understood to relate to gold and diamonds in the interior of the island. (12)

Almayer hopes to be rich while Lingard is dealing with his "mysterious work", which is to find gold in the region.

Almayer, as a partner of Lingard, is another treasure hunter and hopes to find gold by using the journals of the lost Lingard. At the very beginning of the novel, Almayer looks at the river and waits for Dain's return. He expects to make a journey into the interior, and find gold with the help of Dain; he dreams of being rich:

> He liked to look at it about the time of sunset; perhaps because at that time the sinking sun would spread a glowing gold tinge on the waters of the Pantai, and Almayer's thoughts were often busy with gold; gold he had failed to secure; gold the others had secured—dishonestly, of course—or gold he meant to secure yet, through his own honest exertions, for himself and Nina. He absorbed himself in his dream of wealth and power away from this coast where he had dwelt for so many years, forgetting the bitterness of toil and strife in the vision of a great and splendid reward. (2)

Almayer is obsessed with finding gold and being rich. His obsession is emphasized through the repetition of the word "gold". It is repeated again and again to show Almayer's strong desire for material wealth and power. The narrator also likens the waters of the river to gold to indicate how Almayer is absorbed in his dreams of finding gold, being rich and living in Europe with his daughter Nina. As Watt argues, "That we look for general implications in the passage is largely because it is so full of verbal emphasis. The most obvious manifestation of this emphasis is repetition-for instance, in the three uses of the word 'gold' in the first paragraph" (*Essays on Conrad* 46).

Almayer has a tendency to exploit the Malay region for his own benefits. In the second chapter, the narrator argues that Almayer feels disillusioned because the Arabs have a controlling influence on trade in the locality:

> he felt a sudden elation in the thought that the world was his. He was very soon made to understand that he was not wanted in that corner of it where old Lingard and his own weak will placed him, in the midst of unscrupulous intrigues and of a fierce trade competition. The Arabs had found out the river, had established a trading post in Sambir, and where they traded they would be masters and suffer no rival. (12)

Although Almayer has a tendency to exploit the river, he suddenly realizes that the land is owned, "conquered" in the narrator's words, by the Arabs who are involved in a trade competition as they have discovered Lingard's secret entrance to the Pantai river.

The Dutch officers are among the European characters whose so-called aim is to bring civilization and light to the Malay islands. However, they are involved in the gunpowder trade in Sambir and are in pursuit of money and power just like Almayer, who is also Dutch. When Almayer invites the Dutch officers to his house, it is evident that they have a greedy nature:

> but when Almayer, stepping cautiously on the rotten boards of the Lingard jetty, tried to approach the chief of the Commission with some timid hints anent the protection required by the Dutch subject against the wily Arabs, that salt water diplomat told him significantly that the Arabs were better subjects than Hollanders who dealt illegally in gunpowder with the Malays. (17,18)

CHAPTER III

HYBRIDITY IN *ALMAYER'S FOLLY*

Almayer's Folly presents characters whose identities are shaped by colonialism. It reflects the conflicts of these characters who struggle to deal with the difficulties resulting from "a search for an essential identity" during the colonization process. The main reason for this conflict is that leads to colonization has its own propaganda; a so-called modernization on the Malay Islands", which results in the "fragmentation of national identities" (qtd. in Engler, 547). As Louis Althusser puts it, "ideology represents the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence" (ibid 547). Thus,

> it must be acknowledged that the colonized cannot find out their own identity, unless they recognize their search for origin as a myth or ideology constructed under colonial rule. For this reason, the issue of origin and how it is shaped under the influence of colonialism plays a central role in analyzing the term hybridity and its effects on the individuals. (ibid 547)

"Hybridity" came to prominence primarily in post-colonial theory, where, by a decade ago, it was "one of the most widely employed and disputed terms" (Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin 118). As mentioned in the introduction part of this thesis, it has been defined by many scholars. However, this chapter will focus specifically on Bhabha's theory of hybridity not because other theorists are not worth analyzing but because Bhabha's analysis of the term gives more insight into the process of hybridization in *A.F.* For Bhabha, "hybridity is a form of resistance to and engagement with dominating power" (qtd. in Jackson 112). "By highlighting the relations between cultural borrowing and resistance to colonial power" Bhabha argues that "hybridity provides a discursive politics to negotiate the persistent traces of imperialist power on the thought of the formerly colonized" (ibid 112). For Bhabha, hybridity is a process resulting from the conflict between the colonial powers and the colonized individuals and it has three significant points: ambivalence, mimicry and hybridity.

3.1 AMBIVALANCE

In *The Location of Culture*, Bhabha states that "colonial identity is ambivalent, as the colonizer's presence is in ambivalent interaction with the colonized, in that it seems original and authoritative but is represented as repetitive and different" (38). According to Bhabha, one of the main reasons leading to ambivalence is difference which he defines as "the interrogatory, interstitial space between the act of representation – who?, what?, where? – and the presence of community itself" (ibid 3). Struggling to find answers to the questions "Who am I?, Where do I belong to?", the Self questions his "own creative intervention within this in-between movement" (ibid 3). Unable to find definite answers to these questions, the Self creates an in-between space through which it can undermine the originality of the other and add its own creativity.

Kaspar Almayer is one of the characters who endeavors to find answers to the questions above. Nevertheless, he cannot deal with the in-betweenness resulting from the difference between himself and the people of different cultures and origins. Being of Dutch origin, but not having been to Europe before, he is one of the most alienated figures in the Malay region. He feels isolated due to the fact that he is different not only from the Malays, but also the Europeans living in Sambir. In Pettersson's words, "He is long since estranged from his Malayan wife, and as the only white man in the settlement, he is racially isolated from the villagers as well as cut off from other Europeans" (57).

Almayer's ambivalence can be based on "the struggle of power [among] various groups [in Sambir] about what is being said and who is saying what, who is representing who? What is a community anyway?" (Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* 3). Unable to answer these questions thoroughly, he becomes an in-between identity. Similar to Almayer, the reader cannot give definite answers to these questions due the ambivalence of the text. His ambivalence is presented through the description of his house:

> On the narrow strip of trodden grass, […] the morning fires smoldered untended, sending thin fluted columns of smoke into the cool air, and spreading the thinnest veil of mysterious blue haze over the sunlit

> solitude of the settlement. […] His own house was very quiet; he could not hear his wife's voice, nor the sound of Nina's footsteps in the big room, opening on the verandah, which he called his sitting-room, whenever, in the company of white men, he wished to assert his claims to the commonplace decencies of civilization. (94)

The ambivalence he experiences is echoed in the words such as "smoke", "mysterious", "vaguely" and "gazed sleepily at the unwonted appearance of Sambir", all of which have connotations of uncertainty, ambiguity and vagueness. Almayer does not communicate with his daughter and his wife. He uses the term "sitting room" only when other white men are in his house. That is, he cannot identify himself with his wife and daughter and depends on the white community to which thinks he belongs to as a remedy to his alienation.

Nevertheless, he is totally ambivalent, especially among the Dutch community to which he thinks he should "belong" for three main reasons. First and foremost, he has never lived in Europe:

> but his memory lagging behind some twenty years or more in point of time saw a young and slim Almayer, clad all in white and modest-looking, landing from the Dutch mail-boat on the dusty jetty of Macassar, coming to woo fortune in the godowns of old Hudig. (3)

He is in between the memories of the past in Java, his present situation in Sambir and his future wishes for a home in Holland. Thus, he "remain[s] ambivalent, pushed and pulled as he is towards both poles, 'in-between the claims of the past and the needs of the present' and future" (Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* 219).

Secondly, in the Malay Islands, he mostly tends to speak English: "Almayer had left his home with a light heart and a lighter pocket, speaking English well, and strong in arithmetic; ready to conquer the world, never doubting that he would" (3). The reason why he mostly speaks English rather than Malay is either because "he does not understand the language in which he is addressed" (Sönmez 288) or he consciously rejects speaking Malay. The fact that he mostly uses English instead of Malay while addressing to the Malay people indicate that "Orientals are twice as often silent as the Europeans" (ibid 288)

Thirdly, there is no cooperation between his so-called Dutch companions and himself. Although he warmly welcomes the Dutch lieutenants as "it is a great

pleasure to see white faces here [in Sambir]" (58), the Dutch officers are suspicious of him and accuse him of selling gunpowder to Dain and protecting him in his house: "A man with whom you had some dealings […] He passed here under the name of Dain Maroola. You sold him the gunpowder he had in that brig we captured" (59). When the Dutch lieutenant blames Almayer for breaking the law, he defends himself as follows:

> disloyalty and unscrupulousness! What have you ever done to make me loyal? You have no grip on this country. I had to take care of myself, and when I asked for protection I was met with threats and contempt, and had Arab slander thrown in my face. I! a white man! (66)

Although both the officers and Almayer are of the same origin, they are isolated in the foreign lands where they go for colonial purposes. Both parties betray each other for the sake of money. Almayer betrays his countrymen by helping Dain with gunpowder smuggling and the Dutch officers isolate him. As many post-colonial theorists state, "the process that transforms the immigrant from Europe into a colonialist, also alienates him from his country" (Krajka 102). Almayer's ambivalence results from his "unhomeliness" as Bhabha claims in *The Location of Culture* (9). He feels totally alienated in Sambir and suffers from "unhomeliness" because "the borders between home and world become confused; and uncannily, the private and the public become part of each other, forcing upon us a vision that is divided as it is disorienting" (ibid). As Preziuso points out, what he suffers from is "the ambiguous idea *of home* in a cross-cultural society." (85). As pointed out by the narrator: "Almayer, […] gazed sleepily at the unwonted appearance of Sambir, wondering vaguely at the absence of life" (94), what Sambir means to him is "absence of life" (ibid 94).

Almayer's ambivalence as to his future is also evident in his relationship with Lingard. Though he calls Lingard his father and feels closer to him than the others as he is a white European, Lingard shatters all his dreams of being rich:

> Lingard returned unsuccessful from his first expedition, and departed again spending all the profits of the legitimate trade on his mysterious journeys. Almayer struggled with the difficulties of his position, friendless and unaided. (12)

After Lingard leaves him, he feels totally disoriented and alienated. In fact, it is the ambiguity of Lingard's fate that results in ambiguity as regards his future dreams.

Nina, similar to her father, experiences ambivalence in Singapore, also due to "unhomeliness". She has been taken from her home, Sambir, to Singapore to be acculturated as a European. There she "encounters "newness" that is not part of the continuum of past and present" (Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* 7). The new European culture she encounters, however, is a "contingent 'in-between' space, that innovates and interrupts the performance of the present" (ibid 7). She does not imitate the new European culture, which would enable her to create an in-between space and undermine the authority of the Europeans. Nina has no particular familiarity either with the European culture or the Eastern culture. She is neither a Dutch nor a Malay. For this reason, she is miserable in Singapore and cannot adapt to the society she is forced to live in. As Captain Ford asserts addressing Almayer: "She was never happy over there. Those two Vinck girls are no better than dressed-up monkeys. They slighted her. You can't make her white" (15). Nina cannot feel a sense of belonging to the European society in Singapore since she has been derided by the members of the white European community. Her past is ambivalent because she has been uprooted from her Malay culture. Her present is also ambiguous due to her unfamiliarity with the new culture in Singapore.She becomes an in-between girl whose past is ambivalent and present is innovated by a new culture. In parallel to Bhabha who claims that ambivalence is a kind of undecidability, Said "uses the term of vacciliation" to expound his views on ambivalence:

> What gives the immense number of encounters [between East and West]; some unity however is the vacillation. […] Something patently foreign and distant acquires for one reason or another, a status more rather than less familiar. […] A category emerges that allows one to see new things, things seen for the first time as versions of a previously known thing, the orient at large therefore vacciliates between the West contempt for what is familiar and its shivers of delight in or fear of novelty. (qtd. in Byrne 79)

The other reason why Nina suffers from in-betweenness is the racial difference between her mother and father: "For years she had stood between her mother and her father, the one so strong in her weakness, the other so weak where he could have been strong" (74). She implies that while her mother is weak because she

is regarded as inferior due to her skin color and sex, her father is weak despite his strength as a so-called superior white man. That is, she expresses the ambiguity resulting from being in between two beings which are "so dissimilar, [and] so antagonistic" (74). She articulates the suffering of being a half-cast, which means "halfway between… being not defined- and it is this lack of definition in itself that has never been questioned, but observed like a taboo" (Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* 13). She cannot understand the rationale behind her own existence due to the ambivalence she experiences: "she stood with mute heart wondering and angry at the fact of her own existence." (*A.F*, 74).

Having interacted with various people from different places, Nina maintains her position as an "in-between" person after returning from Singapore to Sambir. In Bhabha's words, she experiences "assignations of social differences –where difference is neither One nor the Other but something else besides, in-between" (*The Location of Culture* 219). The narrator's remarks about how she feels in Sambir give an insight into her 'in-betweenness': "Nina, brought up under the Protestant wing of the proper Mrs. Vinck, had not even a little piece of brass to remind her of past teaching" (20). Having no souvenirs of her past Europeanized way of teaching, Nina shapes "a form of the future where the past is not originary, where the present is not simply transitory. It is, […] an interstitial future that emerges in-between the claims of the past and the needs of the present" (Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* 219). She rejects her past way of teaching, as stated by Nina: "I remember it well. I remember how it ended also. Scorn for scorn, contempt for contempt, hate for hate. I am not of your race." (*A.F* 87). She clings to her present life in Malay by choosing her dark side and eloping with Dain. However, she is still in an in-between space because she is a half-cast.

Because her past is vague in her mind, she tries to find something which she can cling to, resists the European way of teaching under the influence of her mother's stories: "And listening to the recital of those savage glories, those barbarous fights and savage feasting, […] where men of her mother's race shone far above the Orang Blanda, she felt herself irresistibly fascinated" (20). She resists the European culture

under the influence of the ambivalence resulting from her difference. As Bhabha puts it,

> resistance is not necessarily an oppositional act of political intention, nor is it the simple negation or exclusion of the 'content' of another culture, as a difference once perceived. It is the effect of an ambivalence produced within the rules of recognition of dominating discourses as they articulate the signs of cultural difference and reimplicate them within the deferential relations of colonial power-hierarchy, normalization, marginalization and so forth. (*The Location of Culture* 110)

Her ambivalence does not lead to confusion as she is able to avoid the difficulties stemming from the cultural differences between her father's and mother's origin by normalizing her mother's lifestyle and rejecting the European way of teaching. As implied by the narrator:

> the strangest of all, this abyss did not frighten her when she was under the influence of the witch-like being she called her mother. She seemed to have forgotten in civilised surroundings her life before the time when Lingard had, so to speak, kidnapped her from Brow. (*A.F*, 20)

Mrs. Almayer has also been uprooted from her own culture. Similar to Nina and Almayer, she experiences ambivalence although she has something to cling to; that is, her childhood reminiscences:

> Mrs. Almayer's thoughts, after these scenes, were usually turned into a channel of childhood reminiscences, and she gave them utterance in a kind of monotonous recitative—slightly disconnected, but generally describing the glories of the Sultan of Sulu, his great splendour, his power, his great prowess; the fear which benumbed the hearts of white men at the sight of his swift piratical praus. And these muttered statements of her grandfather's might were mixed up with bits of later recollections, where the great fight with the "White Devil's" brig and the convent life in Samarang occupied the principal place. (42)

Her past is not ambiguous, thus she is able to recite the glories of the Sultan of Sulu. Nevertheless, she experiences ambivalence because her past memories are mixed up with her later recollections of her contact with the European culture. Similar to Nina, she deals with the conflicts by rejecting the in-betweenness resulting from the vagueness of past, present and future.

She also experiences ambivalence after converting to Christianity. As she claims addressing Almayer: “You know, Kaspar, I am your wife! Your own Christian wife after your own Blanda law!” (19). Nevertheless, she rejects the Christian way of living. There is no evidence in the novel to indicate that she practices Christianity or believes in it. Despite her youthful experiences under Lingard's protection, which make her unhappy just like her daughter, she consciously rejects European culture. That she tears down European style curtains and burns European style furniture, wears 'native' type clothes and cooks local food over a fire indicate to what extent she is estranged from the European culture in which she has grown up. She even plans to wed her own daughter to a Balinese trader despite the fact that she is likely to be unhappy there, which is another example to her resistance to the European world.

Mrs. Almayer’s in-betweenness also results from the fact that she is both aware of her cultural heritage as a Sulu girl and has a sense of belonging to Lingard:

> Being fourteen years old, she realised her position and came to that conclusion, the only one possible to a Malay girl, soon ripened under a tropical sun, and not unaware of her personal charms, of which she heard many a young brave warrior of her father’s crew express an appreciative admiration. […] for was she not a daughter of warriors, conquered in battle, and did she not belong rightfully to the victorious Rajah? (11)

She is aware of the fact that she, as a Sulu girl, belongs to that culture. Although she admires the Sulu warriors, she feels proud of belonging to the Victorious Rajah [Lingard], which results in ambiguity as regards her identity.

Mrs. Almayer’s ambivalence can be analyzed from two perspectives. From the psychological point of view, she shows “reaction to the loss of some abstraction which has taken the place of one, such as fatherland, liberty, an ideal, and so on” (Freud, 164). That is, she reacts to the loss of her fatherland, and therefore, is in a state of continuous rejection, which results in her attempt to use the past remembrances as a refuge and to escape the burdens of the present. From the post-colonial point of view, “in the doubly inscribed space of colonial representation where the presence of authority is also a question of its repetition and displacement, the immediate visibility of such a regime is resisted” (Bhabha, *The Location of*

Culture 110). Mrs. Almayer resists the authority of the European society because she is unpleasantly surprised at being treated like a daughter, not a mistress or slave in that society and suffers from a gap between her own origin and the new European culture.

In *A.F,* three characters, Almayer and Nina and Mrs. Almayer suffer from ambivalence, which stems from difference, newness and unhomeliness. All of them turn into ambivalent and in-between identities. However, the way they deal with ambivalence is different. Almayer experiences conflicts as his identity, especially among the Dutch community, is ambivalent, but he cannot overcome the difficulties resulting from his ambivalence. Mrs. Almayer also experiences ambivalence due to her encounter with a different culture and unhomeliness in Europe. Nevertheless, she is fully aware of her identity as a Sulu girl and deals with the problems she has thanks to her regression into past remembrances and rejection of European culture. Similarly, Nina, though suffering from ambivalence, recognizes her origin through the stories of Sulu pirates recited by her mother.

3.2 MIMICRY

According to Bhabha's theory of hybridity, colonial ambivalence results in mimicry

> which is the desire for a reformed, recognizable Other, as a subject of 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. (ibid 86)

Because "colonial strategy is to compel the colonized to partly mimic the image of the colonizer in an incomplete form: 'almost the same, but not quite.'"(ibid), the colonized becomes neither the same as nor different from the colonizer. This means that "the colonized is partially identical with, and at once, partially different from the colonizer" (ibid). Accordingly, "mimicry is a double rupture between origin and copy" (Engler 565).

Almayer mimics the ideal image of a successful trader. Nevertheless, he is not a self-conscious imitator as he is not aware of the fact that he can never realize his dreams of being a rich tradesman. Nina and Mrs. Almayer's mimicry is totally different from Almayer's as they consciously reject the European way of life.

Almayer's mimicry is not parallel to Bhabha's theory on mimicry for two main reasons. First of all, if Almayer's position in the novel is taken as "the colonizer", he is aware of his superiority over the colonized and does not have the tendency to mimic any of the non-Europeans although the narrator's comments about his "Eastern mind" (5) indicate some degree of mimicry. Secondly, Almayer mimics his idea of a successful colonial trader, rather than straightforwardly imitating any particular individual. That is, he idealizes the splendid past of a successful trader, Lingard and tries to have a lifestyle similar to his:

> Almayer had heard of him before he had been three days in Macassar, had heard the stories of his smart business transactions, his loves, and also of his desperate fights with the Sulu pirates, […] That was it! He had discovered a river! That was the fact placing old Lingard so much above the common crowd of sea-going adventurers. (3,4)

What makes Lingard so impressive is not his personality as an individual but his fame as a successful trader and his superiority over other "pedlars" (3). To realize his dream of having a wealthy life, he [Almayer] mimics an image of an identity rather than simply imitating Lingard. As Bhabha argues, "identification is never the affirmation of a pre-given identity, […] - it is always the production of an image of identity and the transformation of the subject in assuming that image" (*The Location of Culture* 45). Almayer is not content with the identity given to him previously. Although he is of Dutch origin, he does not support the Dutch officers and collaborate with them. Instead, he creates an image for himself; that is, the image of a successful European trader, and tries to achieve his aims in this way.

Almayer's mimicry of the idea of a successful trader results from the fact that he idealizes the lifestyle and prestige of Lingard as a previously respected and wealthy man. Hence, he sets him on a pedestal presuming that he is a hero; as he first encountered him many years ago in Macassar:

> And so Lingard came and went on his secret or open expeditions, becoming a hero in Almayer's eyes by the boldness and enormous profits of his ventures, seeming to Almayer a very great man indeed […] Almayer […] would pause listening to the noise of a hot discussion in the private office, would hear the deep and monotonous growl of the Master (Hudig), and the roared-out interruptions of Lingard—two mastiffs fighting over a marrowy bone. But to

> Almayer's ears it sounded like a quarrel of Titans—a battle of the gods. (4)

The reason why Almayer perceived Lingard as a flawless hero is that Lingard was the epitome of his ideal image. Although Lingard's discussions with Hudig were similar to the fight of "two mastiffs" in the narrator's words, which implies animalistic and materialistic sides of Lingard's character, Almayer is unable to recognize his weaknesses. Furthermore, Almayer is under the influence of the Western philosophy;

> the dominant myth of origin stemming from the binarism of the Western philosophical tradition, which is grounded on the binary system such as male/female, presence/absence, and origin/copy, which heavily relies on the belief that there is a fixed, essential identity. (Lim 117)

Thinking that Lingard is totally different from the non-Europeans, Almayer regards him as an ideal image whose identity is fixed as the male, present, original and essential. Similar to Lingard, he tries to make money out of trade and even allies with the so-called racially inferior people, Dain and Lakamba:

> To obtain the necessary help he had shared his knowledge with Dain Maroola, he had consented to be reconciled with Lakamba, who gave his support to the enterprise on condition of sharing the profits; he had sacrificed his pride, his honour, and his loyalty in the face of the enormous risk of his undertaking, dazzled by the greatness of the results to be achieved by this alliance so distasteful yet so necessary. (*A.F* 30)

Nina's mimicry results from her ambivalence due to her encounter with two different cultures. Being an in-between girl, she partially mimics the European culture. However, her mimicry is self-conscious and "an exaggerated copying of language, culture, manners and ideas" (Huddart 57). Because she is fully aware of the European colonial idea and rejects it, her mimicry is "a form of mockery because it mocks and undermines the ongoing pretentions of colonialism." (ibid 57). That she rarely speaks in English is an indication of her awareness: "She turned her head slightly towards her father, and, speaking, to his great surprise, in English, asked—'Was that Abdulla here?' " (22). On the one hand, she seems to copy the language of the colonizer speaking in English, which is surprising to Almayer; on the other hand,

she undermines the colonial culture by rarely speaking in English. As Bhabha asserts:

> mimicry is not the familiar exercise of dependent colonial relations through narcissistic identification so that the black man stops being an actional person for only the white man can represent his self-esteem. 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. (*The Location of Culture* 88)

Nina never identifies herself with her father and the European society. She does not believe in the colonial idea that only the white man can represent her. Instead, she undermines the authority of the colonial power by rejecting its authority, but still cannot totally avoid her white side. As Mrs Almayer states during Nina's elopement, she is unaware of the fact that Dain may have a relationship with more than one woman: "There will be other women," she repeated firmly; "I tell you that, because you are half white, and may forget that he is a great chief, and that such things must be." (75). Nina's unawareness of the Eastern culture implies that she is neither totally a Malay nor a Dutch. Although she rejects her white side by eloping with Dain, she unconsciously acts like a white woman.

To deal with her in-betweennes, she imitates the Malay culture. That she speaks Malay while addressing to her father indicates that she resists the European culture and prefers her dark side. "There was a slight rustle behind the curtained doorway, and a soft voice asked in Malay, "Is it you, father?"(8). However, Almayer responds to her in English: "Yes, Nina. I am hungry. Is everybody asleep in this house?" (ibid 8), which shows that he also rejects the Malayan culture and is not content with his daughter's Malayan behavior.

Nina's affair with Dain can be given as another example to her mimicry. By falling in love with Dain and eloping with him, she imitates the Eastern culture in order to avoid ambivalence. The narrator describes her feelings as follows:

> She recognized with a thrill of delicious fear the mysterious consciousness of her identity with that being. Listening to his words, it seemed to her she was born only then to a knowledge of a new existence, that her life was complete only when near him, and she abandoned herself to a feeling of dreamy happiness, while with half-

> veiled face and in silence—as became a Malay girl—she listened to Dain's words. (30)

The words such as "recognized", "the consciousness of her identity", "a new existence" and "became a Malay girl" indicate that Nina consciously chooses her dark side by falling in love with Dain and imitating the Eastern culture. Her life is complete only when she is near Dain, which means that she fills in the gap stemming from her ambivalence by imitating the Eastern culture.

Similar to Nina, Mrs Almayer interacts with the European culture. She maintains her identity as a Malay and consciously rejects the European way of living. Nevertheless, she seems to obey the authority of the colonial power and conceals her hatred towards the Europeans:

> She bore it all—the restraint and the teaching and the new faith—with calm submission, concealing her hate and contempt for all that new life. She learned the language very easily, yet understood but little of the new faith the good sisters taught her. (11)

Mrs. Almayer's mimicry can be explained through Lacan's analysis:

> Mimicry reveals something in so far as it is distinct from what might be called and itself that is behind. The effect of mimicry is camouflage… It is not a question of harmonizing with the background but against a mottled background, of becoming mottled- exactly like the technique of the camouflage practiced in warfare. (*The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis* 99)

While she appears to submit to the authority, she hides her real feelings. Thus, she does not "harmonize" with the cultural values imposed on her, but partially mimics them to hide her feelings.

Her feelings before marrying Almayer can be given as another example to her mimicry. As pointed out by the narrator:

> She, however, had retained enough of conventual teaching to understand well that according to white men's laws she was going to be Almayer's companion and not his slave, and promised to herself to act accordingly. (12)

Having enough information about the European culture, she imitates the colonial culture by marrying Almayer to be a companion to him rather than a slave and therefore acts like a white woman. However, she rejects the European culture.

Although she seems to imitate that culture, she imagines a future life of a Malayan girl: "But in imagination she pictured to herself the usual life of a Malay girl—the usual succession of heavy work and fierce love, of intrigues, gold ornaments, of domestic drudgery" (11).

3.3 HYBRIDITY

Colonial ambivalence, which stems from mimicry, culminates in hybridity. According to Bhabha, hybridity is a kind of in-betweennness, "a Third Space of enunciation which makes the structure of meaning and reference an ambivalent process" (*The Location of Culture* 37) and forces the colonial identity to imitate the colonizer and makes him a partial replica of the colonizer, neither totally similar to nor completely different from him and vice versa. Because neither the colonial subject nor the colonizer or colonized other can completely imitate the colonizer, he suffers from ambivalence and produces an in-between space; that is, he becomes a hybrid. As Brah and Coombes put it,

> Bhabha's argument turns on the idea that because colonial culture can never faithfully reproduce itself in its own image, each replication (act of mimesis) necessarily involves a slippage or gap wherein the colonial subject inevitably produces a hybridised version of the 'original'. In other words, hybridity is intrinsic to colonial discourse itself, and consequently colonial discourse potentially undoes itself (qtd. in Jackson P 152).

Bhabha argues that "all cultural statements and systems are constructed in this contradictory and ambivalent space of enunciation, […] that we begin to understand why hierarchical claims to the inherent originality or 'purity' of cultures are untenable." (37). In the light of Bhabha's claim that there is no purity as regards cultures, it can be argued that Nina is one of the characters in *A.F,* who is in an ambivalent space of enunciation due to her mixed blood. As indicated by the narrator at the beginning of the novel, she is a biological hybrid:

> During those ten years the child had changed into a woman, black-haired, olive-skinned, tall, and beautiful, with great sad eyes, where the startled expression common to Malay womankind was modified by a thoughtful tinge inherited from her European ancestry. Almayer thought with dismay of the meeting of his wife and daughter, of what this grave girl in European clothes would think of her betel-nut

> chewing mother, squatting in a dark hut, disorderly, half naked, and sulky. (14)

Nina is neither totally Malay nor totally Dutch, but an in-between girl. While her black hair, great sad eyes and startled expression are peculiar to Malay womankind, her thoughtful nature is common to the Europeans. Moreover, her European way of look is juxtaposed to her mother's "disorderly, half naked and sulky appearance" (14).

Apart from being a biological hybrid, Nina is a cultural hybrid, which Bhabha defines as the "interstitial space in-between the designations of identity that opens up the possibility of a cultural hybridity that entertains difference without an assumed or imposed identity" (*The Location of Culture* 4). In parallel to Bhabha's definition, she easily adapts to her life in Sambir although she has been educated as a Christian among the white people. As stated before, Nina deals with her in-betweennes by entertaining the existence of the Malay culture. She does not accept the identity imposed on her in Singapore, erases her past remembrances of the "civilized" European culture.

Peter Wade's categorization of hybridity is similar to Bhabha's:

> hybridity of origin and hybridity of encounter […] the former concept highlights characteristics of hybrid forms as permutations and combinations of other forms, and the second underlines the social context of the mixing process. (qtd. in Engler 545)

Nina experiences both types of hybridity. She is described as a combination of a Malaysian mother and a Dutch father: "She was tall for a half-caste, with the correct profile of the father, modified and strengthened by the squareness of the lower part of the face inherited from her maternal ancestors—the Sulu pirates." (8). In addition, she is in a mixing process of two different cultures, one of which she celebrates "with wonderful equanimity" (16). Contrary to the expectations of Almayer: "She (does) not die from despair and disgust the first month, […] seem(s) to accept that savage intrusion into their daily existence" (17).

Nina's process of hybridization is two-fold. On the one hand, she "produces the discriminatory identities that secure the "pure" and original identity of authority" (112). Although she does not mimic the colonial power consciously, she vacillates

between her white and dark side as a hybrid. The dialogue between Dain and Almayer during his elopement with Nina indicates Nina's in-betweenness: "She is crying! Why?" asked Almayer, indifferently. "I came to ask you. My Ranee smiles when looking at the man she loves. It is the white woman that is crying now" (93). Similarly, the dialogue between Mrs. Almayer and Nina show that she cannot completely erase her identity as a white:

> I was a slave, and you shall be a queen," went on Mrs. Almayer, […] Tremble before his anger, so that he may see your fear in the light of day; but in your heart you may laugh, for after sunset he is your slave."
>
> "A slave! He! The master of life! You do not know him, mother."
>
> "You speak like a fool of a white woman," she exclaimed. "What do you know of men's anger and of men's love? (73)

Though unconsciously, she secures the position of the colonizer and "stabilizes colonial authority in that the colonized is altered from the intractable, inestimable other into the compliant, measurable other" (Lim 122). Nina's vacillation between her white and dark side is also evident in the narrator's description of her during the elopement: "The woman's back turned to him with the long black hair streaming down over the white dress" (90). While the white dress Nina wears symbolizes her white side, the long black hair stands for her dark side, that is, "the end of life" in Almayer's words (81).

On the other hand, she undermines the authority of the colonizer. In Lim's words, she "destabilizes colonial authority, thus decentering its centrality" (122). She prefers her dark side by eloping with Dain:

> With the coming of Dain she found the road to freedom by obeying the voice of the new-born impulses, […] She understood now the reason and the aim of life; […] she threw away disdainfully her past with its sad thoughts, its bitter feelings, and its faint affections, now withered and dead in contact with her fierce passion (74).

The process of hybridization for Nina is "such a partial and double force that disturbs the visibility of the colonial presence and makes the recognition of its authority problematic" (Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* 111)

Unlike Nina, Almayer is not a biological hybrid. Although he seems to be a cultural hybrid due to his interaction with different cultures, he is not a cultural hybrid if Bhabha's definition of hybridity is taken as a basis:

> Produced through the strategy of disavowal, […] it is a 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. (ibid 111)

Almayer's hybridiy is not the same as imitation or partial replication of one specific culture or person, but mimicking the idea of a rich tradesman. Nevertheless, he cannot truly produce the image in his ideal world because he cannot realize his dreams of having a wealthy life. To be a rich European man, he depends on Lingard, but he disappears leaving him alone. Then, he relies on Dain to find gold in the territory and befriends him, but Dain lures him and elopes with his daughter. Unlike Nina who prefers one culture to deal with the ambivalence due to her mixed blood, he collaborates with almost everybody in Malay no matter which race they belong to.

Similarly, Mrs. Almayer cannot be taken as a hybrid. Although she experiences ambivalence due to newness, difference and unhomeliness, she does not really mimic the European colonial culture, but seems to imitate it. In contrast, she disavows all the cultural elements belonging to Europe. Despite receiving conventional teaching and marrying a white man, she consciously rejects the colonial power and undermines its authority through this rejection not by "display[ing] hybridity- its peculiar 'replication'- and terrorizing authority with the ruse of recognition, mimicry and mockery" (ibid 115).

A.F presents characters that are dislocated from their cultures. Almayer, Nina and Mrs. Almayer all interact with new cultures different from their own. Nonetheless, dislocation and newness do not always lead to hybridity. What produces hybridity is ambivalence as a result of miscegenation and mimicry, which strengthens or decenters the authority of the colonial power. Nina is a hybrid due to her mixed origin, partial imitation and rejection of the colonial power. Mrs Almayer is not a hybrid. Though she seems to imitate the colonial culture by converting to Christianity, she rejects all the cultural elements belonging to Europe. Similarly, Almayer is not a hybrid, for he does not imitate a particular person or a culture.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

The concepts of othering and hybridity have been defined in many ways and been the central themes employed by many novelists whose fiction is based on the effects of colonialism on the individuals. Joseph Conrad has been a prominent figure among these literary men and a pioneering figure for the theorists and philosophers like Said, Bhabha and Sartre. His fiction enabled these theorists and philosophers to theorize these concepts. Bhabha, for example, in *The Location of Culture* claims that

> there is a conspiracy of silence around the colonial truth. […] It is a silence that turns imperial triumphalism into the testimony of colonial confusion and those who hear its echo lose their historic memories. This is the voice of early modernist colonial literature. (123)

Bhabha theorizes on the confusion that the results from colonialism and refers to Conrad to show to what extent the colonial mind suffers from that confusion: "In Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*, Marlow seeks Kurtz's voice, his words, "a stream of light or the deceitful flow from the heart of an impenetrable darkness" and in that search he loses 'what is in the work'-'the chance to find [himself]'" (ibid). Conrad's worldview and the way he reflects it in his works highlight the significance of these concepts. As well as *Heart of Darkness*, *A.F* is one of his novels in which he employs these concepts. On the one hand, the themes of othering and hybridity dominate the novel; on the other hand, they merely contribute to the novel having some weaknesses in terms of plot and characterization.

Othering is a dominant theme in *A.F* because almost each and every character in the novel is labeled as the other to the extent that both the Europeans and the non-Europeans are othered. Almayer, for instance, regards the Malays, the Arabs and the Balinese as inferior beings and uses derogatory remarks such as "savage" (86) to devalue the Balinese ruler Dain, "great rascals" (58) while depicting the Malays. Similarly, Dain states that what Almayer says to dissuade Nina from eloping with Dain is "a white man's lie" (87), and thus, racially discriminates against him.

When *A.F* is analyzed from psychological point of view, othering can also be considered as a dominant theme. Lacanian analysis of the concept gives insight into

the process of othering: "The Other-with the capital 'O' [is] the great Other, in whose gaze the subject gains identity" (Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin 166). Nina, for example, gains identity by choosing her dark side. While Almayer thinks that her mixed blood is something to be ashamed of, Nina is proud of her mother's Malay culture. Almayer produces her as "the Other" in Lacan's words; nonetheless, she gains identity by choosing her dark side.

Moreover, othering can be taken as a dominant theme from philosophical point of view. Sartre, for example, defines the Other as "not only the one whom I see but the one who *sees* me. I aim at the Other in so far as he is a connected system of experiences out of reach in which I figure as one object among others" (228). All the characters who belittle each other in *A.F,* are aware of the existence of each other and reduce the value of each other to that of an object. The non-Europeans, for example, are perceived as objects by Almayer because they are "out of reach", that is, the part of another system [culture].

Nevertheless, it can be stated that the concept of othering is not dominant in *A.F*, but merely contributes to the novel's meaning if it is analyzed in the light of the theorists who have defined what othering is from post-colonial point of view. For instance, Bhabha claims that "the colonial discourse enables the colonizer to argue that he is culturally, sexually or racially different from the colonized, which results in categorization of people and hierarchy" (*The Location of Culture* 96). Nevertheless, in *A.F*, the categorization of people is not one-sided since it is not only the colonizer who categorizes people but also the colonized who counterattacks the colonizer in various ways such as stereotyping the white people as the ones who "speak lies" (74), "quick in anger and slow in gratitude" (53), and "foolish" (40) among people. To give another example, Said argues that "culture is an indistinguishable part of identity and all the problems between the 'Other' and the 'Self' are posed by culture (xiii). If the characters in *A.F* are analyzed in detail, it is evident that not all the problems between the self [the colonizer] and the other [the colonized] occur due the fact that their identity is an inseparable part of their culture. Though most of the problems such as racial discrimination, stereotyping and othering occur as the characters think that the culture they belong to is superior to the other, there is inter-European strife as well as the conflict among the non-Europeans. These conflicts

mostly stem from the flaws of the characters such as materialistic greed and betrayal. Since all the characters have flaws, the novel shows a weakness in theories which need to consider othering as a human condition of which the colonizing experience is merely a part.

Similar to othering, hybridity is a dominant theme in *A.F.* if Nina, Almayer and Mrs. Almayer are analyzed in the light of Bhabha's theory of hybridity because all of them suffer from ambivalence, which leads to hybridity in Bhabha's words, one of the main reasons leading to ambivalence is difference which he defines as "the interrogatory, interstitial space between the act of representation – who?, what?, where? – and the presence of community itself" (*The Location of Culture* 3). All of them suffer from difference as they are exposed to a different culture which they do not belong to. However, Bhabha's theory of hybridity has some weaknesses in terms of the characterization in the novel. Because Nina is both Malay and Dutch and vacillates between her dark and white side, she can be taken as a biological and a cultural hybrid. Almayer is not a hybrid because he does not imitate a particular person or a culture, but an idea of being a rich man. Although Mrs. Almayer encounters a new culture, suffers from ambivalence, and seemingly mimics the Europeans, she does not become a hybrid.

REFERENCES

I- Primary Sources

Conrad, Joseph. *Almayer's Folly*. London: T. Fisher Unwin.Ltd., 1915.

II- Secondary Sources

Acheraiou, Amar. "Joseph Conrad's Eastern Geopolitics". *Joseph Conrad and the Orient.* Ed. Amar Acheraiou & Nursel İçöz New York: Colombia UP, 2012.

Ashcroft, Bill. Gareth Griffins and Helen Tiffin eds. *Key Concepts in Postcolonial Studies*. London/New york: Routledge, 1998.

Baines, Locelyn. *Joseph Conrad: A Critical Biography.*Great Britain: Richard Clay and Company Ltd., 1960.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Problems of Dostoyevsky's Poetics.* Ed.&Trans. Carly Emerson. The USA: The University of Minnesota P, 2003.

Bala, Suman. *Joseph Conrad's Fiction.* New Delhi: Intellectual Publishing House, 1990.

Baldwin, Debra Romanick. "The Horror and the Human: The Politics of Dehumanization in *Heart of Darkness* and Primo Levi's *Se questo e un uomo"*. *Conradiana.* Vol. 37, no 3, 2005: 185-204.

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994.

_____. "Cultural Diversity and Cultural Differences," *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, Ed. B. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths, H. Tiffin, Routledge, New York 2006, p. 155–157.

Billy, Ted. *Critical Essays on Joseph Conrad.* Boston, Massachusets: G.K Hall & Co 1987.

_____. *A Joseph Conrad Companion.* The USA: Greenwood P, 1999.

Byrne, Eleanor. *Homi K. Bhabha*. England: Pelgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Conrad, Joseph. *Heart of Darkness.* The UK: penguin Books, 1994.

Conrad, Joseph. *The Mirror of the Sea and A Personal Record.* Ed. Zdzislaw Najder. Great Britain: Oxford UP, 1989.

Darwin, Charles. *The Origin of Species by Natural Selection; or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life.* Middlesex: The Echo Library, 2006.

Davis, Laura. Ed. *Conrad's Century: The Past and Future Splendour.* Lublin: Marie Curie-Sklodowska UP, 1998.

De Beauvoir, Simone. *The Second Sex.* England: Jonathan Cape Ltd., 1953.

Dryden, Linda. *Conrad's Century: The Past and Future Splendour.* Lublin: Maria Curie-Sklodowska UP, 1998.

Eddleman, F. E.& D.L Higdon Ed. *The Works of Joseph Conrad.* Great Britain: Cambridge UP, 1994.

Engler, Steven. "Umbanda and Hybridity" *Numen 56.* 2009: 545–577 .

Freud, Sigmund. *Introductory Notes on Psycho-Analysis*. Ed. & Trans. James Strachey. London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1966.

Hampson, Robert. *Joseph Conrad: Betrayal and Identity.* The USA: St. Martin's P, 1992.

Hannis, Alexia. "Orienting Desire in Joseph Conrad's *Almayer's Folly*". *Joseph Conrad and the Orient.* Ed. Amar Acheraiou & Nursel İçöz New York: Colombia UP, 2012.

Hawthorn, Jeremy: "Artful Dodges in Mental Territory: Self-Deception in Conrad's Fiction" *Conradiana.* Vol. 37, no 3, 2005: 205-231.

Huddart, David. *Homi K. Bhabha.* New York: Routledge, 2006.

İçöz, Nursel. "Conrad and Ambiguity: Social Commitment and ıdeology in *Heart of Darkness* and *Nostromo*" *Conradiana.* Vol. 37, no 3, 2005: 245-274.

Jackson, Peter A. "Thai Semicolonial Hybridities: Bhabha and Garcia Canclini in Dialogue in on Power and Cultural blending". *Asian Studies Review.* June 2008: Vol. 32, 147-170

Jackson, Ronald L. (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Identity.* California: Sage Publications, 2010.

Krajka, Wieslaw. *Joseph Conrad: East European, Polish and Worldwide.* New York: Colombia UP., 1999.

Khushu- Lahiri, Rajyashree. "Conrad's Vision: A Post-Colonial Reading". *Beyond the Roots: The Evolution of Conrad's Ideology and Art.* Ed. Wieslaw Krajka. New York: Colombia UP., 2005.

Lacan, Jacques. *Ecritis.* Bruce Fink trans. The USA: W. W. Norton&Company Inc., 2006.

_____. *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis.* Trans. Alan Sheridan. London: The Hogarth P and the Institute of Psychoanalysis, 1977.

Levinas, Emmanuel. *Existence and Existents.* Alphonso Lingis trans. The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1995.

Lim, Sung Uk. "The Myth of Origin in Dialogism and Hybridity." *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies*, vol. 10, no. 29 (Summer 2011): 112-131.

Meyers, Jeffrey. *Joseph Conrad: A Biography.* New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1991.

Miller, Jacques Alain. Ed. *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan.* Trans. Sylvana Tomaselli. New York: W.W. Norton&Company Inc., 1991.

Nadelhaft, Ruth L. *Joseph Conrad.* Great Britain: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991.

Nelson, Gary & Lawrence Grossberg Eds. *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture.*London: Macmillan, 1988.

Papastergiadis, Nikos. *The Turbulance of Migration: Globalization, Deterriorialization and Hybridity.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 2000.

Pettersson, Torston. *Consciousness and Time: A Study in the Philosophy and Narrative Technigue of Joseph Conrad.* New York: ABO, 1982.

Preziuso, Marika. "Do I belong here?: Images of -Female – Belonging and Cultural Hybridity in Erna Brodbell's *Myal*, Velma Pollard's *Homestretch* and Carol Phillips *Cambridge*" *Journal of Caribbean Literatures.* 2005: 85-91.

Rising, Catharine. *Darkness at Heart.* New York: Greenwood P, 1990.

Said, Edward W. *Culture and Imperialism.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf Inc., 1994.

Sartre, Jean Paul. *Being and Nothingness.* Abington: Routledge, 2000.

Sen, Nupur. "Conrad's Savage Woman: From Colonialism to Gender". *Beyond the Roots: The Evolution of Conrad's Ideology and Art.* Ed. Wieslaw Krajka. New York: Colombia UP., 2005.

Simmons, Allan H. *Critical Issues: Joseph Conrad.* England: Macmillan Ltd., 2006.

Sönmez, Margaret J-M. "The Speech and the Silences of Orientals in Joseph Conrad's Malay Novels". *Joseph Conrad and the Orient.* Ed. Amar Acheraiou & Nursel İçöz New York: Colombia UP, 2012.

Stape, J. H. Ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Joseph Conrad.* Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 1996.

Tizard, B and A. Phoenix. *Black, White or Mixed Race?.* London: Routledge, 1993.

Tucker, Martin. *Joseph Conrad.* New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing CO., 1976.

Watt, Ian. *Essays on Conrad.* The UK: Cambridge UP., 2000.

_____.*Conrad in the Nineteenth Century.* Los Angeles: University of California P., 1979.

Watts, Cedric. *A Preface to Conrad.* London: Longman, 1982.

White, Andrea. *Joseph Conrad and the Adventure Tradition.* Great Britain: Cambridge UP, 1993.

Young, Robert. *Colonial Desire.* New York: Routledge, 1995.

APPENDIX A

TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü ☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü ☐

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü ☐

Enformatik Enstitüsü ☐

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü ☐

YAZARIN

Soyadı :
Adı :
Bölümü :

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) :

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans ☐ Doktora ☐

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. ☐
2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. ☐
3. Tezimden bir bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz. ☐

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ: