8-17-2012

Ghosts, Madness, and Dementia: The Failure of the Global Capitalist Enterprise in Joseph Conrad's Geopolitical Peripheries

Haitham Mahmoud Abdullah Talafha
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

GHOSTS, MADNESS, AND DEMENTIA: THE FAILURE OF THE GLOBAL CAPITALIST ENTERPRISE IN JOSEPH CONRAD'S GEOPOLITICAL PERIPHERIES

A Dissertation

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies and Research

in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Haitham Mahmoud Abdullah Talafha

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

August 2011

Indiana University of Pennsylvania
The School of Graduate Studies and Research
Department of English

We hereby approve the dissertation of

Haitham Mahmoud Abdullah Talafha

Candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

June 21, 2011 — Signature on File
Christopher R. Orchard, D.Phil.
Professor of English, Advisor

June 21, 2011 — Signature on File
Karen A. Dandurand, Ph.D.
Professor of English

June 21, 2011 — Signature on File
Michael T. Williamson, Ph.D.
Professor of English

ACCEPTED

Signature on File
Timothy P. Mack, Ph.D.
Dean
The School of Graduate Studies and Research

Title: Ghosts, Madness, and Dementia: The Failure of the Global Capitalist Enterprise in Joseph Conrad's Geopolitical Peripheries

Author: Haitham Mahmoud Abdullah Talafha

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Christopher R. Orchard

Dissertation Committee Members: Dr. Karen A. Dandurand

Dr. Michael T. Williamson

Conrad's time was drastically imperiled by the capitalist/imperialist rivalry that eventuated a geopolitical partitioning of the whole world. Europe's 'peripheral' others, Southeast Asia, Africa, and Latin America, were thereby integrated into the evolving capitalist system and positioned in unbalanced relationships with the center. The centrifugality of capitalist ideology, the economic conditions within the ensuing global system, and the geopolitical peculiarities of the system's peripheries are all paralleled in Conrad's fiction. Thus, following the 'dependency theory' of core-periphery configuration, this dissertation aims at appraising the 'success' of capitalism in the peripheral settings of Conrad's works.

I examine the first setting in two Malayan novels, and I particularly focus on the role of ideology in deciding the outcome of the political and economic strife between the major ideological blocs. Eventually, capitalist practices in this periphery are de-ideologized and epistemologically annulled by an incorporeal, subaltern ideology. In Conrad's African periphery, I trace the tripodal, discursive structure of true/false, power/knowledge, and the carceral that guarantees the continuity of the European capitalist enterprise in Africa. Yet, I show how disruptive points of resistance find space in the cogito/madness experience, effecting physically and discursively an imported rupture in Europe's *mission civilisatrice*.

Last, I scrutinize the historical 'development' of a neoliberal, capitalist paradigm in Conrad's Latin America. Drawing upon the Hegelian triadic dialectics, I delineate the regressive 'dementia' that befalls capitalist history due to various, intrinsic contradictions. Consequently, nowhere in Conrad's peripheral settings does the capitalist system survive the multiple, lethal probabilities that Conrad outlines.

While my dissertation uses Marxist, as well as Postcolonial, theoretical methods in establishing this conclusion, I accentuate the fact that Conrad can hardly be categorized within his contemporaneous, Marxist tradition. The drama of failure in Conrad's fiction unfolds a number of deviations from the capitalist routes anticipated by the Marxists of his time. Externalizing the role of subalterns and foreseeing capitalist continuity beyond the imperialist boundaries indicate Conrad's singularity in comprehending the crises paralyzing the capitalist system.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

Conrad's works below will be abbreviated as follows when used within in-text citations:

Almayer's Folly	*AF*
The Collected Letters	*CL*
"Heart of Darkness"	"HD"
Lord Jim	*LJ*
Nostromo	*N*
Notes on Life and Letters	*NLL*
An Outcast of the Islands	*OI*
"An Outpost of Progress"	"OP"
A Personal Record	*PR*
The Secret Agent	*SA*

CHAPTER ONE

CONRAD'S PERIPHERIES: AN INTRODUCTION

The historical moment of Joseph Conrad's career was saliently marked by the weighty ubiquity of global capitalism, which, by Conrad's time, encompassed nearly every quarter in the whole globe. No 'dark' spot could escape the grip, or the 'light,' of this intruding enterprise whose concomitant ideology was inceptively exported by Europe. The long nineteenth century was the time when capitalism was being transformed from industrialism into a monopolistic phase whose emergence is ascribed by economists like Vladimir Lenin, Karl Kautsky, and Rosa Luxemburg to the rise of European imperial powers, which competed among themselves to control the largest areas possible in the world.[1] The dissemination of capitalist ideology and the rise of imperialist rivalry eventuated a global system of imperialist capitalism, whereby Europe's 'others' were positioned in unequal power relationships with those in the center of the system. These economic and political proceedings are rightly reflected in the writings of Joseph Conrad, whose representation of geopolitical expansion parallels the considerable scope of the capitalist system. Notably, most of Conrad's novels are swarming with Europeans leaving the center of the global system to reach far foreign lands like Southeast Asia, Africa, and South America, with aims and plans interlaced with the centrifugality of capitalist ideology. The vivid diversity of peoples and geographical loci, with whom and with which Conrad himself was well acquainted, makes it possible to trace the emerging global enterprise in his works. This is exactly the research problem that I will try to solve in my dissertation: how successful/unsuccessful is global capitalism in the eyes of Conrad?

The significance of this problem for the discipline of literature and criticism is highly rooted in two imperative actualities. First, it goes without saying that the dynamism of capitalism is still ongoing within the present world system in which no geopolitical zone could remain untarnished by it. While the political and economic paradigm of the present capitalist system (neoliberal in essence) is different from the monopolistic one witnessed by Conrad, it is still characterized by the same geographical comprehensiveness and power relationships that marked Conrad's (fictional) world. In fact, Conrad is not indeed disconnected from the flux of our contemporary political and economic experiences as he all but accurately envisions the present capitalist model in his *Nostromo* (discussed in chapter four). As one Conrad critic puts it, while discussing *Nostromo*, "one of the best ways to understand what is happening now in our time of globalization is to read this old novel by Conrad, written just a hundred years ago" (Miller 173). I am, thus, considering Conrad as "one of us," in the same way Marlow conceives of his bond toward Lord Jim. It is truly consequential to see how a canonical man of letters like Conrad might have viewed the multiple facets, conflicts, and possible outcomes of the political economic processes that have shaped, and are still molding, the world we live in. Second, Conrad's writings have received much criticism that renders him complicit with imperialism. Chinua Achebe, for example, accuses him of providing a (pre)text that justifies the colonization of Third World territories. This is because Conrad has been conceived as a writer who presented colonized peoples as existing outside history. Such criticism is mainly political in nature and does not take into consideration a holistic view of the determinants of imperialism. In other words, imperialism is not a purely political phenomenon; rather, it is highly the historical result of economic conditions that, as mentioned above, gave rise to the imperial competition among

the major European powers. It follows, then, that tracing Conrad's treatment of imperialism cannot be carried out without delving into the economic circumstances behind the global system. Studying global capitalism in the world of Conrad's fiction, therefore, can lead to re-evaluating his vision of imperialism by taking into consideration the economic element which has been largely ignored by Conrad critics.

One of the important questions that should be answered in the course of my dissertation is: why Conrad in particular? Indeed, capitalism is foregrounded in the writings of many Victorian writers like Charles Dickens, George Eliot, William Thackeray, Anthony Trollope, Elizabeth Gaskell, and Rudyard Kipling. My answer to this question lies in the very nature of Conrad's life and writing, rendering his perspective a unique one. In the first place, his experience enabled him to view capitalism with a higher level of objectivity. Conrad grew up as a Russian subject living in a colonized country, Poland. But he became a British subject who witnessed the imperialist practices abroad. In his authoritative book, *Joseph Conrad: A Life*, Zdzisław Najder delineates how "at the same time, he was a man of three cultures: Polish, French, and English" (ix). That is why Conrad, in effect, is equipped with the eyes of the colonizer and the colonized, the center and the periphery. His diverse cultural upbringing is an effective factor in augmenting the objectivity that is needed in approaching a hugely wide topic such as global capitalism. Moreover, in addition to a number of works set in Europe, most of Conrad's writings are set in the Third World, or the 'periphery zone,' ranging from Southeast Asia to South America. Therefore, his experience is more global than European or local, and definitely nowhere in the writings of his contemporaries can we find the same geographical variability (as we do in his novels) that best serves the ultimate aim of this dissertation.

Though the problem under study in my dissertation has been touched upon and, in some respects, debated from several critical outlooks, still many of its important elements, like ideology, discourse, and dialectics, have been unnoticed by Conrad critics. Moreover, an appropriate approach that takes into consideration the geopolitical factor is completely lacking in what has been suggested about the same topic. The present study is different from previous critical attempts in both methodology and argument. In order to precisely explain the novelty of my participation, it might be worth surveying briefly some studies that have attempted to evaluate Conrad's grappling with the world capitalist system or at least examine the European imperialist experience in Conrad's fiction. The critical works I intend to invoke are chosen for their representative value, not for exclusiveness, and some of them are concerned with Conrad's depiction of global capitalism only as part of an overall argument. To begin with, in 1994, Daniel Goodman conducted a doctoral dissertation (at Temple University) entitled "Conrad in the Crawl Space of Capitalist Colonialism," where he adopts a Marxist approach in his exploration of "capitalist colonialism" in three major works by Conrad: "Heart of Darkness," *Lord Jim*, and *Nostromo*. In the first two works, Goodman argues, Conrad's attitude towards capitalist colonialism is equivocal in the sense that while he attacks capitalism he evidently represents it as a powerful enterprise. However, according to Goodman, Conrad managed to make what Goodman calls a "quantum leap" in *Nostromo*, where "his standpoint . . . crystallizes into a canny demonstration of maximally efficient colonization" (iii). This is another way of saying that capitalism in *Nostromo* is depicted as an all-powerful drive that cannot be resisted. Goodman concludes with his claim that Conrad spent the rest of his life trying to modify this view, but he ultimately failed.

The next study, by Maureen Whitebrook, is limited only to the scope of *Nostromo*. Whitebrook attempts to examine the social effects that ensue from introducing a capitalist system into the society of Sulaco. By adopting a textual analysis, Whitebrook tries to show how Sulaco eventually achieves some degree of economic and political stability despite the fact that individuals are unable to adapt to the emergent conditions. Therefore, if there is any kind of order brought by capitalism, such order is "inadequate for the functions demanded of it" (Whitebrook 173). However defective this order is, according to Whitebrook, its existence cannot be denied. In addition, Paul Delany dedicates two chapters of his book, *Literature, Money and the Market*, to foreground the issue of capitalism and relevant concerns in Conrad's "Heart of Darkness" and *Nostromo*. One of the implications of the first chapter is that imperialism, especially in the context of "Heart of Darkness," is far from being *only* driven by capitalist ideology. To support his argument, Delany draws on evidence that testifies to his belief that "the British Empire . . . cannot have been profitable even when it was at its height" (67). However, Delany does not explore this lack of profitability in "Heart of Darkness"; rather, his ultimate aim is to show how Conrad exculpates imperial practices through the "redeeming idea" of 'civilizing' the natives. The next chapter, entitled "*Nostromo*: Economism and its Discontents," marks a shift of focus from imperialism to economism. After Conrad juxtaposes material greediness and the redeeming idea of 'civilization,' Delany argues, he is now concerned with Cobdenism as an ideology that is based on economic rationality and liberalism. (Cobdenism is an economic theory that gives primacy to free market and free trade). What is more striking in Delany's analysis is his claim that regardless of "Conrad's reservations about Cobdenisim, he does not oppose it in

the name of protecting any indigenous cultural identity for Sulaco. That country is modernized by metropolitan intervention" (86).

Again, these are not the only studies that have examined Conrad's handling of the capitalist system,[2] but I find these the most representative and relevant to the goal of this dissertation. The above studies definitely make up a useful body of research on the present topic, and I do agree with some of their partial findings, like the transition to a new global system and the idea of economism in *Nostromo*. Yet, what I cannot accept is their taken-for-granted view of the power and physical presence of capitalism on a global scale as conceived by Conrad. While each of the above studies tries to establish a distinct argument with regard to the Conradian treatment of capitalism, they all agree on a very evident thesis: global capitalism in Conrad's work is depicted as an all-powerful and all-encompassing drive that is governed by a hegemonic ideology infiltrating even everyday life. This is directly articulated by Goodman, who posits that the potent grip of capitalism is undeniable to the extent that Conrad himself could not escape it in his private life. In a quite contrary direction, what I am suggesting is that Conrad's work demythologizes and deconstructs this assumed power of global capitalism by depicting it as a deteriorating, contradictory, and dysfunctional enterprise that can be labeled as nothing but a big failure. The present dissertation aims not only at ascertaining the fact that Conrad is anticipating the demise of capitalism and its global system, but I will also outline the mechanisms by which such a system is 'doomed' to fail in Conrad's fictional reality.

I will establish this argument by drawing on Marxist and Postcolonial approaches that directly address the geopolitical effects of global capitalism on the relationship between Europe and its 'others.' In particular, my point of departure will be the 'dependency theory'

proposed by economists like Immanuel Wallerstein, whom I will invoke so as to contextualize Conrad's work within the framework of the core-periphery relationships of the emerging capitalist system. Wallerstein argues that the capitalist world system is divided into three different zones: the core, the semiperiphery, and the periphery. He elaborates that

> The three structural positions in a world-economy—core, periphery, and semiperiphery—had become stabilized by about 1640. . . . The key fact is that given slightly different starting points, the interests of various local groups converged in northwest Europe, leading to the development of strong state mechanisms, and diverged sharply in the peripheral areas, leading to very weak ones. Once we get a difference in the strength of the state machineries, we get the operation of 'unequal exchange' which is enforced by strong states on weak ones, by core states on peripheral areas. Thus capitalism involves not only appropriation of the surplus value by an owner from a laborer, but an appropriation of surplus of the whole world-economy by core areas. (*Capitalist* 18-19)

What characterizes the world system most evidently, thus, is the unequal power relationships between the strongest and the weakest structural parts of the system. The status quo of this imbalanced configuration, according to Wallerstein, is perpetuated by the ability of the core states to manipulate the whole system in a way that suits their interests and weakens the peripheral states by conquest and monopolistic restrictions, which protect the interests of the core but prevent such protection in the periphery. And any ensuing tension from this lack of balance is soothed by the semi-peripheral zone, whose role is to smooth the tension between the other constituents.[3] Moreover, once this structure was systematized, after the core of

northwestern Europe evolved, the system started to incorporate new geopolitical territories into its various peripheral zones. By the nineteenth century, Wallerstein asserts, most areas covering the continents of Asia, Africa, and Latin America were completely incorporated as peripheries into the capitalist system (*Capitalist* 27). It is within the distribution of these localities that Conrad sets the fictional works I intend to study in my dissertation.

Of course, Wallerstein's theory on world economy is also supported by other well-known economists, and it can be traced back in the writings of previous theorists,[4] but I find his theoretical premise applicably adequate for the purpose of this study. For it is my intention to follow precisely the structural framework of the economic system theorized by Wallerstein and examine thereby how global capitalism is treated in the correspondingly geopolitical settings of selected Conradian works. More specifically, the following three chapters will focus on works set in Southeast Asia, Africa, and Latin America, respectively. In the second chapter, I examine the feasibility of the capitalist enterprise in *Almayer's Folly* (1895) and *An Outcast of the Islands* (1896), whose events take place in the Malayan Archipelago. My point of entry for doing so is to scrutinize the role of ideology in the political and economic strife between the major ideological blocs of Sambir. In the first place, the ideological practices of European capitalists are traced in order to establish a 'superstructural,' ideological formula that best describes, and prescribes, what such Europeans do in the world of the two novels. It is this ideological scheme, I argue, which is being attacked by the other antagonistic group, referred to as subalterns. This attack takes place on three major levels: wars of 'maneuver,' wars of 'position,' and wars of circumvention. In expounding the first two forms of conflict, I draw upon the work of Antonio Gramsci in order to show how the subaltern faction cannot succeed in altering the

rules of political economy in Sambir. However, they ultimately manage to turn the relationships of power upside down through the third type of attack, by entering into the capitalist ideology of their enemies and 'corrupting' its elemental constituents. Thus, capitalist ideology is rendered merely a corporeal body without the superstructural 'soul' that keeps it alive. What makes this outcome possible is the nature of subaltern ideology, whose unintelligibility is ascribed to its incorporeal 'soul.'

The third chapter aims at appraising the failure of capitalism in the African periphery as depicted in "An Outpost of Progress" (1898) and "Heart of Darkness" (1902). Drawing upon the theories of Michel Foucault, I postulate that what keeps the capitalist mission in Africa intact and ongoing is the highly powerful discourse of the *mission civilisatrice* and its tripodal structure of true/false, power/knowledge, and the carceral. The mechanisms of discourse and surveillance work together harmoniously in a way that wards off any anti-discursive behavior imperiling the rapacious project in Africa. However, Marlow manages to find an exit from the discursive crucible of Europe and passes through the epiphanic experience of the cogito/madness, establishing himself thereby as a figure of resistance. Importantly, I construct a series of problematizations about the character of Kurtz, who is predominantly believed by Conrad critics to be a sickly decadent character. I show on the contrary how Kurtz is the other resistant figure, who passes through precisely the same cogito/madness experience of Marlow, but whose resistance takes the form of military activities. Ultimately, the world of Conrad's African fiction is reconstructed to clarify the damaging, counter-discursive effect that the retelling of such stories, and their survival thereof, can produce back in Europe.

The Latin American periphery is highlighted in the fourth chapter, in which I particularly stress the devastating dysfunctions of capitalism in *Nostromo* (1904). I posit that the capitalist history of Sulaco is divided into three major stages whose structural mechanisms conform to the dialectics of the Hegelian triad of thesis-antithesis-synthesis. In the thesis, which is the Ribierist stage, I externalize the dysfunctional facets of corruption, exploitation, commodification, and others. The second stage, initiated by the Monterist coup, is marked primarily by the 'non-agenda' of barbaric pillage and violence. I also read the last stage through the legendary tale, narrated at the beginning of *Nostromo*, so as to explain how the human soul is being wasted in the expenditure of capitalist processes. Lastly, I find the unique capitalist model that is foregrounded in the inaugural stage being eventually responsible for the anti-teleological drama of events by diverting the movement of Sulaco's capitalist history from Hegelian progression to a barely visible, regressive 'advancement,' which is the overarching aspect of failure in the world of Conrad's novel. In the final chapter, I conclude with general remarks about the various possibilities of failure that Conrad hypothesizes in his fiction, and I spell out the ways that make it difficult to align Conrad within the Marxist tradition. While this dissertation examines global capitalism in Conrad's peripheries, I make some suggestions on how another study can be conducted on Conrad's 'core' works, like *The Secret Agent* (1907).

NOTES

[1] It is one of Lenin's major arguments that the whole world economy was transformed at the hands of capitalist countries from free competition to great monopolies, resulting thereby in the "highest stage of capitalism," which is imperialism. In Lenin's view, because national markets and industries became divided up between various economic entities within the borders of the capitalist country, these monopolies will have to look for new markets, raw materials and investment outlets on an international level. This process will eventually lead to a complete division of the world: "the colonial policy of the capitalist countries has *completed* the seizure of the unoccupied territories on our planet. For the first time the world is completely divided up, so that in the future only redivision is possible" (Lenin, "Imperialism, the Highest Stage" 254). Likewise, Kautsky proposes a theory of what he calls "ultra-imperialism," which is the view that, as Anthony Brewer puts it, "the major powers would find it preferable to agree to exploit the world jointly, rather than fighting over the division of the world" (123). More specifically, to jointly exploit the world, Kautsky argues, is the only solution for temporarily avoiding the demise of capitalism, and this can be materialized through "the notion of the cartel" (46). Moreover, in her book, *The Accumulation of Capital*, Luxemburg develops an argument that aims at solving what she considers a problem in Marx's theory, which has to do with the realization of the surplus value inside the capitalist economy. Luxemburg believes that the realization of surplus value cannot be carried out in the capitalist economy in isolation, and therefore it requires a market in what she calls "natural" and "peasant" economies that exist outside. Imperialism, for Luxemburg, comes as a result of this condition: because capitalism needs non-capitalist soils,

capitalist powers competed among themselves in order to secure for themselves the largest possible areas untouched by capitalism.

[2] Still, for example, Stephen Ross touches upon the same concern in his book *Conrad and Empire*. While analyzing "Heart of Darkness," *Lord Jim*, *Nostromo*, and *The Secret Agent*, Ross's focus is centered on a number of concepts related to the Empire, like "the distinction between imperialism and Empire, the historical transition from regimes of discipline to regimes of control, and deterritorialization" (9). What is relevant to the topic under discussion is his argument that Conrad's novels mark a historical transition from the old nation-state order toward the new global order, which is capitalist in nature. Ross then examines the effects of the new order on the psychology of individual characters like Jim, Kurtz, Nostromo, Mrs. Verloc, and the Professor. Also, J. Hillis Miller, in an article entitled "'Material Interests': Conrad's *Nostromo* and the Critique of Global Capitalism," shows how *Nostromo* anticipates the contemporary economic and social conditions of the United States in the context of the global capitalist system. In doing so, Miller draws on a textual analysis of modernist narrative devices employed by Conrad in order to explain how, for example, Sulaco's social diversity and community is similar to that of the United States. Miller further delineates how the novel is an illustration of current material interests and capitalist concerns in the States. Basically, Miller's argument contextualizes *Nostromo* in our contemporary time rather than reading it in its historical context.

[3] Like the core, according to Wallerstein, the semiperiphery is another exploiter of the periphery. However, like the periphery, it is exploited by the core. Wallerstein ellaborates,

> This semiperiphery is then assigned as it were a specific economic role, but the reason is less economic than political. That is to say, one might make a

> good case that the world-economy as an economy would function every bit as well without a semiperiphery. But it would be far less *politically* stable, for it would mean a polarized world-system. The existence of the third category means precisely that the upper stratum is not faced with the *unified* opposition of all the others because the *middle* stratum is both exploited and exploiter. It follows that the specific economic role is not all that important, and has thus changed through the various historical stages of the modern world-system (*Capitalist* 23).

[4] The dependency theory actually has its roots in the writings of Nicolai Bukharin, who believes that the economic "cleavage" between "town and country" had been expanded on an international scale. "[E]ntire countries," he asserts, "appear to-day as 'towns,' namely, the industrial countries, whereas entire agrarian territories appear to be 'country'" (21). Moreover, the concept of the world capitalist system being divided into different zones forms the basis of Samir Amin's theory of "underdevelopment." In his book *Accumulation on a World Scale,* Amin contends that when peripheral areas become part of the world economic system, they enter into unequal relationships with capitalist powers in the center of the system. Thus, according to Amin, the integration of these peripheral areas within the system will result in certain economic configurations that prevent development in the periphery.

CHAPTER TWO

IN SOUTHEAST ASIA: ANULLED BY A GHOSTLY IDEOLOGY

Like most other peripheral loci in the modern world economic system, the geohistorical area that came to be called Southeast Asia witnessed a long history of European imperialism and intervention. This history dates back to the early sixteenth century after the two Iberian kingdoms (Portugal and Spain) started exploring the globe, westward and eastward, in search of 'new' geographical spaces and maritime routes. They were initially driven by a dedication to the common cause of spreading their Christian faith to the rest of the world, specifically given the rising Islamic power of the Ottomans (Borschberg 3). However, Portugal and Spain were also notably competing over economic profitability and trade routes, of which Southeast Asia was of special significance. The maritime 'discoveries' of the Portuguese explorer Vasco da Gama, who succeeded in sailing directly from Europe to India (followed by the famous journey of Ferdinand Magellan, who reached Southeast Asia through the Pacific), expedited an ardent rivalry between the two Iberian states. The Portuguese outstripped Spain in this competition over Southeast Asian territories with their capture of Malacca in 1511, and after the Treaty of Zaragoza was signed in 1529, most of the area, extending to the Spice Islands in eastern Indonesia (the Moluccas), came under the control of Portugal, leaving only the Philippines, named after Philip II of Spain, to the Spanish (Borschberg 3-4).

The Iberians, especially the Portuguese, could not maintain their ventures in the maritime region after the arrival of other European rivals by the end of the sixteenth century and the beginning of the seventeenth century. In particular, the Dutch joined this rivalry and unflinchingly superseded other powers, so that by 1641 they had succeeded in laying their

hands on the Straits of Malacca, previously within the Portuguese sphere of control. The Dutch East India Company (or the VOC), founded in 1602 in Batavia (now Jakarta, itself established by the Dutch), played an important role in changing the rules of the monopolistic game during the next two centuries, while expanding its control over adjacent territories. Historians aver that the VOC, rather than adopting a 'conquest' enterprise, was more interested in sheer commercialism, trying wholeheartedly to relegate, or completely alienate, other competitors. Anthony Reid, for example, details how by 1680 the VOC, with a huge army of workers and thousands of ships, became the sole monopolizing trade institution after ruining the other competitive players.[1] During the eighteenth century, however, the company suffered serious management inefficiency, corruption, and fierce competition with the British, and the firm eventually went bankrupt by 1800. The VOC's assets and liabilities were then handed over to the Dutch state, which expanded its territorial authority during the nineteenth century to include the whole Indonesian Archipelago. (This is exactly the time and place of the two novels under study in this chapter, as explained below).

While the VOC was extending its territorial monopoly, its British counterpart, the British East India Company, was very active in a vast area extending from the Cape of Good Hope to the eastern coast of the Indian subcontinent, benefitting mainly from the lucrative spice trade. The tense political situation in Europe and the effects of the Napoleonic Wars across the continent have largely influenced European power relationships on a global scale. Accordingly, the weighty imperialist enterprise of Great Britain rose drastically during the nineteenth century and, significantly, they crept from mainland Southeast Asia into the Archipelago, establishing in 1819 a base in the city of Singapore at the tip of the Malayan Peninsula. Meanwhile, although the Anglo-Dutch relationship underwent a vacillating

history of temporary peace and wars during the eighteenth century, in 1824 both rivals signed a treaty that helped define their interests in the Archipelago. The British territorial rule in the region, thereafter, incorporated Burma, Penang Island, the Malayan Peninsula, North Borneo, and Malacca,[2] while the Dutch maintained their control of the whole area that became modern Indonesia.

What is significant in this regard is the fact that throughout "the three or four decades after 1870 the Western powers rapidly completed their seizure of the area [of Southeast Asia]," and therefore, "It is not without reason that this three-quarters of a century is often called the high colonial age" (Chandler et al. 173). And since, in the present chapter, we are more interested in the historicity of the modern world system with regard to this area, it is necessary to be cognizant of the situation that during this time, as Robert Elson affirms, "Southeast Asia had been thoroughly transformed by its incorporation into the emerging global system of commerce" (193). This historical observation is paralleled in Wallerstein's theoretical framework, discussed in the previous chapter, within which this study is implemented. And this is exactly what I am trying to outline here.

Of course, the present chapter is not a historical study of the modern global system's 'triumphancy' in this geo-historical area, and the above historical outline is by no means a concise delineation of the imperial background of the region at that time. There are still roles for the French in Indochina and the Portuguese in East Timor. But I wanted to emphasize, first, the historical span extending up to the nineteenth century and, second, the agency of the Netherlands and Great Britain, the two core countries that initiated this peripheral territory, the Indonesian Archipelago, into the modern world system.[3] This is because the two novels under study in this chapter, *An Outcast of the Islands* and *Almayer's Folly*, are precisely

situated in this place—the Indonesian Archipelago, where the fictional town of Sambir is located—and in the context of the intervention of the these two imperial powers, especially the former. Besides, the two novels under discussion are temporalized exactly within the "high colonial age" designated above, as there is a direct reference in the fourth chapter of *Almayer's Folly* to the Aceh War, which took place in 1873.[4]

Yet, if geo-historical 'facts' are, on many occasions, uncompromisingly indisputable in the academic discourse of historians, still it is very possible that such 'facts' can be aberrantly fallacious within the mimetic sphere created by Conrad, whose vision reflects deeply the experience of a European sailor/writer who has been fully immersed in the political and economic ongoings of Southeast Asia at that time. My supposition is that, in his dazzling understanding of the world he lived in, Conrad steps aside from the historical outlines theorized by historians and economists and, in *An Outcast of the Islands* and *Almayer's Folly*, goes off course as far as to assume that the world economic system in Southeast Asia has been fatally weakened. In order to disclose the Conradian detour, I intend first to particularize a number of critical features in this chapter. First, this chapter has no intention of showing how *certain* 'world-empires' or 'empire-systems' (i.e., British, Dutch, French, etc) are rendered inefficient in Conrad's fiction; my primary aim is rather focused on how Conrad's fiction externalizes the way in which it is the peripheral setting itself that makes the macro world-system fail. This will be carried out by carefully scrutinizing the behavior of *individual* Europeans given prominence by Conrad (other larger European entities being studied in consequent chapters). In particular, three axial characters will be highlighted in their interaction with the 'pre-capitalist' people of the land: Tom Lingard, Peter Willems, and Kaspar Almayer. These characters will be analyzed from the perspective

of a capitalist *ideology* by which they are thoroughly interpellated (in an Althusserian sense) and by which they are maximally used up. The discussion of this chapter is not meant to further substantiate previous criticism on Conrad's counteractive deviation from nineteenth-century imperial romance;[5] rather, Conrad's philosophical stance is reconstructed here against the actual historical moment of his fiction. That is, the way he treats capitalism in his work is examined here in the context of the global system in order to show how this system is going to collapse according to Conrad's vision. In short, my intention is to explain Conrad's characterization of the *future* of historical capitalism in that area.

Conrad's writings show an interesting degree of interconnectedness with a history that in a way makes his time (and probably ours) more fathomable. Indeed, it is not implausibly justifiable to say that Conrad was trying to better understand historical linearity, believing that the coming of the nineteenth century was a 'terrible' turning point in the history of the whole globe, wherein the very human nature of those who brought the 'terribleness' started to show a form of monstrosity. While using a maritime language, with the 'sea' standing for the whole world, Conrad identifies older times as relatively better. "That was the sea," the narrator philosophizes, "before the time when the French mind set the Egyptian muscle in motion and produced a dismal but profitable ditch" (*OI* 12). The French invasion of Egypt in 1798 marks a time when core states began looking not only for new markets but also for raw materials in order to maintain and speed up the internal economic processes of the emerging global system. This world-scale basis of the new world system can be established through Conrad's usage of the 'sea,' and therefore he does not limit his observation to the boundaries of Europe where industrialism started. The narrator then comments:

> The hand of the engineer tore down the veil of the terrible beauty in order that greedy and faithless landlubbers might pocket dividends. . . . The hearts changed; the men changed. The once loving and devoted servants went out armed with fire and iron, and conquering the fear of their own hearts became a calculating crowd of cold and exacting masters. . . . The sea of to-day is a used-up drudge, wrinkled and defaced by the churned-up wakes of brutal propellers, robbed of the enslaving charm of its vastness, stripped of its beauty, of its mystery and of its promise. (*OI* 12-13)

Having established what he believes a doleful situation, Conrad then takes us into painstakingly minute details throughout the two novels to forecast what will contribute to the ultimate downfall of the global system under study.

For Conrad, failure is not a matter of chance or determinism; it is rather based on a mechanism in which there lies a chain of dynamic processes connected by the logic of causality. If we are able to penetrate and decode the data of this mechanism, we can then grasp what Conrad believes will bring about this collapse within the peripheral zone. As a starting point, I will pause on the narrator's use of the clause "the French mind set the Egyptian muscle in motion." The narrator associates the French with the "mind" and ascribes the "muscle" to Egypt, making a clear dichotomy between the mental/spiritual and the bodily/sensible. While the implication of the whole formula will be revisited toward the end of this chapter, my primary interest here is only in Conrad's choice of "mind." Why doesn't Conrad simply put it as 'France' or 'Napoleon's' or the 'French'? The significance decidedly lies in the word "mind," not in its modifier, which does not alone make Conrad's declaration here something new (we all know that the *French* colonized Egypt). Moreover, the "mind" is

not only that of the French "engineer" or the scientist who invented the war machine, but it can be understood also to denote the consciousness and thinking that set that invasion in motion. The quintessence of that consciousness exists also in other core countries of the system (it is not only France that embarked on global expansion). In other words, it is not a scientific mentality but a common, overarching, capitalist *ideology* that made these people do what they did.

The next step would be then a qualification of this ideology in the two novels. It is my argument that the three characters of Lingard, Almayer and Willems are completely handcuffed within the hegemonic boundaries of that ideology exported from the core of the system, and I hope my discussion will underpin the undeniable nature of this fact. (Three Europeans from core countries are, in the "high colonial age," on a peripheral territory incorporated completely within the global system). For this reason, it is unavoidable to answer the question: *what is ideology*? If we can particularize what a *capitalist* ideology is, we can very likely evaluate the 'success' or the efficiency of this ideology in that specific area based on the two novels, which would, in turn, help us visualize more accurately the overarching formula of that ideology on a global scale. Rather than resorting to how traditional sociologists, historians, or Marxist economists define capitalist ideology, I will invoke the Slovenian critical theorist Slavoj Žižek, whose work on ideology has largely contributed to re-evaluating our understanding of many orthodox concepts in Marxism.

In order to arrive at an essential discernment of the notion of ideology and clarify any relevant misconceptions of it, Žižek takes us through a chain of constructive reasoning, drawing on Marx's original definition of the term as a point of departure. Thus, Žižek's initial argument runs as follows:

> The most elementary definition of ideology is probably the well-known phrase from Marx's *Capital*: '*Sie wissen das nicht, aber sie tun es*' —'*they do not know it, but they are doing it*.' The very concept of ideology implies a kind of basic, constitutive *naïveté*: the misrecognition of its own presuppositions, of its own effective conditions, a distance, a divergence between so-called social reality and our distorted representation, our false consciousness of it. (*Sublime Object* 28)

Žižek's grappling with the discrepancy between "social reality" and "false consciousness" constitutes (in a primary understanding of the notion) a problem of cognitive distortion of the "mind" (in the sense used by Conrad in the "French mind" quoted above). The way Žižek observes this problem, based on Marx's definition, echoes Plato's philosophical diagnosis of our existence in his famous metaphor of the cave. The way we see reality is essentially flawed, for the "reality" we conceive is not the reality of our social existence. Accordingly, the task of ideological critique is to make this flawed or "naïve" consciousness "recognize its own effective conditions, the social reality that it is distorting, and through this very act dissolve itself" (Žižek, *Sublime Object* 28). At this level of understanding of the notion, and based on the characters of Lingard, Almayer and Willems, one might well argue that capitalist ideology is the reason why their agenda is traumatically frustrated. For in the course of events their fate (Lingard disappears, Willems is killed, and Almayer goes mad and dies) is the result of this discrepancy between the way their consciousness is imbued with some haunting goals and the social reality in which their consciousness has become a mere illusion.

However, the situation is far more complicated than this simple characterization of their dilemma, for a cautious and critical dissection of the relationship between what they know and what they do can quite surely defy this critical standpoint. I am here drawing again on Žižek, whose argument, having established the aforementioned dichotomy, proceeds to contend that this descriptive analysis of the problem is not effective any more in our use of "ideology" since we are already aware of it. He relies on the German theorist Peter Sloterdijk's notion of *cynicism* to sustain that the "cynical subject" knows very well that his understanding of reality, his act of "knowing," is quite distorted because of the ideological mediation between his knowing and the real surrounding world. So, Marx's previous formula of ideology can be modified accordingly: "they know very well what they are doing, but still, they are doing it" (Žižek, *Sublime Object* 29). Although the cynical subject knows that reality is distorted, he insists on being involved in it without ever worrying about the epistemological deception masking it, as though reality is what "reality" is. Žižek's new deductive statement here can be exemplified in terms of Conrad's European characters. The plot of the Willems story, for instance, unfolds a procession of events with which Willems cannot be but fully aware of the absurd "doing" he is carrying out, but still he insists on following up his skewed agenda until he is killed. His successive betrayals of Hudig, Lingard, and Aïssa transfer him to a very suffocating stage in the narrative where there is certainly no exit. Nevertheless, he asks Lingard for an extra chance, and Lingard not only has to tell him that this is impossible but also to awake him to the fact that "You are not fit to go amongst people" (*OI* 275). Willems' predicament with regard to the ideology that led him hence is powerfully conveyed by the narrator:

> The discouragement, the conviction of the futility of his hopes would return in an acute sensation of pain in his heart. He would begin again his aimless wanderings. He tramped till he was ready to drop, without being able to calm by bodily fatigue the trouble of his soul. There was no rest, no peace within the cleared grounds of his prison. There was no relief but in the black release of sleep, of sleep without memory and without dreams. (*OI* 332)

Despite all this, and specifically despite his "conviction of the futility of his hopes" and heedfulness of the "aimless wanderings," his "doing" is consistently maintained with his persistent forward movements, even during the moment just before he dies.

But if Willems and his Conradian peers already know what they are doing, then what is the problem with their situation? In other words, if their project becomes an illusion at the end, where does that illusion exist? The answer to this question can be found, once again, in Žižek's conclusive remarks about this particular characterization of ideology, which he calls "ideological fantasy." Žižek uses the example of commodity fetishism in order to pinpoint exactly the positioning of the illusive functioning in the dialectic of "knowing"/"doing." When people use money, he argues, they know that its value does not exist in its material manifestation because that manifestation stands for hidden social relations, but notwithstanding their knowledge of this association they still continue using money the same way. In this case, illusion does not exist in the side of "knowing"; it is already in the side of "doing" itself, and as such what is unknown to them, or "what they misrecognize, is the fact that in their social reality itself, in their social activity—in the act of commodity exchange—they are guided by the fetishistic illusion" (*Sublime Object* 31). The trick here is that what people miss, what they are unable to grasp, is the illusion that lurks behind reality and not

reality itself. This reality is well known to them, but they still insist on acting in it as though the situation is not so. On that account, Žižek is finally able to decisively rewrite Marx's definition: "they know that, in their activity, they are following an illusion, but still, they are doing it" (*Sublime Object* 33).

What I have been trying to establish here is a twofold aim: first, my approach to ideology in the two novels is based on the act of "doing" itself, not the act of "knowing." The latter is a more commonplace interpretation of ideology because it is assumed that it should be studied within the epistemological sphere of investigation. This philosophical point is endorsed by Louis Althusser, who believes that ideology is essentially manifested in a material existence. This is because, he explains, "an ideology always exists in an apparatus, and its practice, or practices. This existence is material" (*Lenin* 166). Somewhere else, Althusser defines it as "the 'lived' relation between men and the world" (*For Marx* 233). For Althusser, what the individual practices is necessarily a materialization of the ideas and beliefs that drive him/her to do so. Therefore, my aim in this context has to do with questions addressing primarily the physical presence of the three characters coming from the core to Southeast Asia. Why should they leave their homeland unless they are prompted to do so by the centrifugality of the ideology that comes from the core? This question can be stated more simply: what are they doing in the Malay Archipelago? (This is why I have so far postponed a detailed analysis of the ideological trap in which the three Conradian characters are caught). Second, if we are able to undertake a diagnosis of the main features of capitalist ideology based on this "doing," then our next target would be searching for the illusion that exists beneath such doing. This illusion should necessarily explain the ultimate failure of their doing, or venture, which is structured out of their ideological drive. Having said so, I

will try to establish henceforth a formula, or a social rule, of what Lingard, Willems and Almayer are doing based on the same way that Žižek was able to arrive at a sound enunciation of ideology after Marx's definition of the concept. This ideological formula should give a précis of all the features of what these characters are doing in the macro world of Conrad's fiction, especially their movement within the core-periphery space.

So, what do they do? I will start from the basic data that constitutes the backbone of Conrad's narrative: 'Lingard, Willems and Almayer leave Europe, heading to Southeast Asia.' Though we don't see their act of 'leaving Europe' among the events of the two works, whether chronologically or structurally, this simple fact does not arguably necessitate any further validation, except with the case of Almayer, who is born to a Dutch family already in Southeast Asia. It has been rightly suggested that Almayer's dreams of being prosperous in Europe, especially Amsterdam, are transmitted to him from his mother, who is the daughter of a businessman (Dryden 52; Hampson, *Cross-Cultural* 105). As such, Almayer represents a continuation of the same ideology that brought the previous generation from Europe and which still prompts Almayer to follow in the same direction as his family and the other two characters already there by the time of the narrative. And because the current analysis is conducted in the holistic context of a world-system theory, I will use the 'core' instead of 'Europe' (the core is more geographically relevant) and a 'peripheral zone' to stand for 'Southeast Asia' to account for this: 'they leave the core, heading to a peripheral zone.'

In addition, in order for our formula to be more informative, we should answer a seminal question in the context of the previous 'what.' This question is: why? That is, why should they leave Europe at all and head southeastward to that very far and peripheral territory? There must be, by deduction, a very remuneratory output for the pricey

expenditure required for the input of the 'what,' and that output cannot be attained in Europe, otherwise the 'what' is redundant and meaningless. A handy explanation of the 'why' would be wealth, for it does indeed make the formula plausible: we see them all toiling very diligently to become rich, and this is well established, for example, in the case of the seventeen-year-old Willems when he is first met by Lingard after the former runs away from the Dutch Kosmopoliet IV:

> "I see," he exclaimed, "you ran away from the big ship that sailed this morning. Well, why don't you go to your countrymen here?"
>
> "Ship gone only a little way—to Sourabaya. Make me go back to the ship," explained the boy.
>
> "Best thing for you," affirmed Lingard with conviction.
>
> "No," retorted the boy; "me want stop here; not want go home. Get money here; home no good." (*OI* 15)

"Money" here is not simply money as the whole context of the narrative shows. It's all about a race toward riches. Lingard, Willems and Almayer spend their whole lives to do so, or at least in the case of Almayer more than twenty years, as the narrator comments in the opening of *Almayer's Folly*. That being so, the formula then becomes: 'they leave the core, heading to a peripheral zone with the aim of becoming rich.'

But still, this formula needs further modification on the basis of the 'how': by what means can they achieve their aim? Is it trade? This is largely conceivable not only because it is meant to be effectuated in the two novels but also under the larger umbrella of global capitalism. Lingard, for example, is essentially a trader, the narrator affirms, who comes to the islands with his ship, the "Flash," in order to trade among the islands. After developing

his trading post in Sambir "Lingard used to take his assorted cargo of Manchester goods, brass gongs, rifles and gunpowder," and in Sambir he can have access to "gutta percha and rattans, pearl shells and birds-nests, wax and gum-dammar" (*AF* 8). In this regard, he is deemed a very successful trader in the eyes of non-European traders like Abdulla and Europeans like Hudig to the extent that he is dubbed the "Rajah-Laut," or the King of the Sea. Almayer, also, comes from a family that is well established in business. His father works in the "Botanical Gardens of Buitenzorg," or what is now called the Bogor Botanic Garden (located south of Jakarta), and his mother is the daughter of a cigar dealer in Amsterdam. Twenty years before the time of *Almayer's Folly*, when he first comes to Macassar (Conrad's spelling for Makasar), he has plans to "woo fortune in the godowns of old Hudig" (*AF* 6). He later quits working at Hudig & Co. to become Lingard's partner, charged with running their own Lingard & Co. in Sambir. Much the same as Almayer, Willems was apprenticed in trade by Lingard and soon "his trading instincts developed themselves astonishingly, and Lingard left him often to trade in one island or another" (*OI* 17). Willems then prefers to enter the service of the Hudig & Co. and turns to be Hudig's confidential agent. He is once again aided by Lingard after his financial scandal that damages dearly his reputation and is taken to Sambir where he tells Almayer, "I want to become a trader in this place" and explains further that "I want a house and trade goods—perhaps a little money" (*OI* 92). The world of the two novels is indeed swarming with trade and traders, and based on these facts our formula can be advanced another step forward: 'they leave the core, heading to a peripheral zone with the aim of becoming rich by means of trade.'

While it is true that trade is most conspicuously the means that will satisfy the 'success' of this ideological statement, still there are other means that need to be accounted for. Piracy, for example, cannot by any means be called trade, though this distinction is not acknowledged in the two novels. In the first chapter of *Almayer's Folly*, Conrad draws a panoramic view of the capitalist scene in Macassar, the place that attracts traders and pirates alike to search for wealth. Those pirates/traders, among whom Tom Lingard is considered the most distinguished, are "not disinclined for a brush with the pirates that were to be found on many a coast," and they further "used to have a general 'rendez-vous' in the bay for purposes of trade and dissipation" (*AF* 7). The narrative gets the scene mixed up so that we don't know who is purely a trader and who is a pirate. This trade-piracy homogenization continues throughout the two novels, especially with regard to Lingard's enigmatic dealings. The story of Lingard's adopted daughter, who becomes Almayer's wife, unfolds a mysterious fight with the natives during which she was taken by Lingard. In *Outcast*, it is explicitly made known that Lingard's intimidating position is largely the result of "his successful recklessness in several encounters with pirates" (14). When Lingard encounters Babalatchi, right before his final meeting with Willems, Babalatchi reminds him of their past maritime fighting in which Omar el Badavi, Babalatchi's leader, becomes blind. Lingard's involvement in piracy is further discussed by Heliéna Krenn, who argues that "honest fishermen as well as desperate pirates acknowledge him as 'King of the Sea,' and this suggests an affinity with both" (13). This view is shared also by Hampson who affirms that the text unfolds an "unsettling of the opposition of adventurers and pirates" (*Cross-Cultural* 100). In addition to bringing evidence from *Outcast*, Hampson invokes *The Rescue* (the third of the Malay trilogy), where Lingard is referred to as "a fellow deep in with pirates" (160),

and as a man "Stopping boats, kidnapping gentlemen" (183). Indeed, Lingard's career and business in this novel, which chronologically precedes the first two, is highly relevant in depicting the erosion of the demarcation line between piratical activities and legal trade.

In fact, trade and piracy mix-up is not only characteristic of Europeans but also of natives as well as other 'traders' like Omar and Babalatchi. These social and economic instabilities reflect truly the real historical context of Conrad's Malay fiction. Agnes Yeow, to elaborate further, argues that "[a]s far as revenue was concerned, Malay rajahs did not distinguish between commerce and piracy" (60). Yeow arrives at this conclusion by drawing on the historical findings of Anthony Milner, who avers that "The concern of Malay rulers, as reflected in Malay writings, was not with commerce but with wealth. The way in which wealth was obtained, be it by force, 'legitimate trade,' monopoly, or even gambling or magic, was a relatively unimportant matter" (qtd. in Yeow 60). Whatever history has to unveil, though, the consequential relevance of this is that piracy goes hand in hand with trade as a medium of actualizing the 'why' of the present ideological formula. This is true, especially when in Sambir, which is the locus that "encourages lawlessness" (Krenn 27). Embezzlement, along the lines of piracy and legal trade, is another means. When Willems steals Hudig's money he does not at all consider himself guilty of doing so; this act, as he deems it, belongs only to the smart, the ambitious and the brave. Later on, Almayer is irritated by "the picture of Willems ranging over the islands and disturbing the harmony of the universe by robbery, treachery, and violence" (*OI* 209).

A world that is invaded by trade, piracy, robbery, and treachery is a place where illegal transactions cannot be differentiated from what is economically and socially legal (though legality is sometimes a debatable issue that is characterized by relativity: what is

legal for the colonizer, for instance, might not be so for the colonized, and vice versa). Of these illegal dealings is the gunpowder smuggling which is prohibited. Almayer, for example, agrees to secure the gunpowder shipment for Dain with the aid of Captain Ford in return for Dain's help in the gold expedition. Moreover, Hudig's secret business, which used to be carried on by Willems, encompasses "the quiet deal in opium; the illegal traffic in gunpowder; the great affair of smuggled firearms, the difficult business of the Rajah of Goak" (*OI* 8). This is indeed a chaotic world where everybody has his own sense of what is right and what is wrong, what is legal and what is not, in accordance with everybody's materialist interests. Conrad makes it clear when he says that "everything is relative" and that "this world [is] of relative values" (*NLL* 13). Conrad's Europeans have no referentiality that can regulate their "doing" since such referentiality is replaced by an ideology that has no difficulties in drawing on some form of barbarism. "[A] man," the narrator comments while describing Lingard's system of justice, "does not live for years beyond the pale of civilized laws without evolving for himself some queer notions of justice" (*OI* 235). Truly, it has been argued that the world of Lingard is the realm of "seeking happiness through material wealth or through adherence to the non-values of supposed 'civilization,' moral isolation and corruption" (McLauchlan 79). As such, capitalist ideology in Conrad's fiction transfers people to a peculiar temporal and geographical setting where there is no common sense of justice; instead there is a multiplicity of different constructs of equity. This is utterly applicable to Lingard, whom nobody had ever bothered to tell "the errors of his conceptions. It was not worth anybody's while to run counter to Lingard's ideas of the fitness of things" (*OI* 235). In short, as Marialuisa Bignami puts it, Lingard is one of those characters who are "downright legal offenders" (201). As a consequence, when trade becomes indistinguishably

conjuncted with piracy, robbery, and other illegal transactions, and when everybody has his own system of identifying what is right and what is wrong, then this is a world where all options become open. And being so, it is possible to materialize the 'why' of the ideological formula, which at this stage should be mutated into 'they leave the core, heading to a peripheral zone with the aim of becoming rich *by all means, with an adherence to a system of amorality*.' This formula is somehow similar to Harry Sewlall's argument that *Almayer's Folly* revolves around "the pursuit of money and power regardless of the means to attain them" (41).

But I still need to qualify more narrowly the 'how' in the above 'updated' formula and specifically single out two economic ways among the 'all means' for their special singularity and significance, which will be highlighted again in consequent discussions. The first of these is itself a qualifier of the type of 'trade' that is peculiarly run by Lingard. "A good many years ago," affirms the narrator, Lingard "had found out and surveyed—for his own benefit only—the entrances to that river, where, he had heard through native report, a new settlement of Malays was forming" (*OI* 200). It is this perplexing river that makes Lingard so distinguishable among other traders of the islands. We are reminded again in the other novel of this fact: "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" (*AF* 8). And while the river is the reason of Lingard's peculiarity it is also the medium through which his downfall is worked out. This is because the river is monopolized "for his own profit only," and once this monopolistic method is conceded to other traders Lingard's whole business is ruined. The momentousness of the river's monopoly is recurrently highlighted in both novels, especially in the way Lingard boasts of his 'ownership' of it: "His river! The

whispers of curious men, the mystery of the thing, were to Lingard a source of never-ending delight" (*OI* 202). Monopoly here is a source of power as it allows Lingard to occupy a position whereby people become subordinate to him. Such subordination can be gleaned in Almayer's words: "There isn't a man in Sambir, big or little, who is not in debt to Lingard & Co. Not one" (*OI* 171). In addition, monopoly is not restricted to Lingard's business; it is rather the practice that most traders are trying to secure for themselves. Willems, by way of illustration, asks Almayer for money so that he can run a small business in Sambir, and to guarantee his earnestness he declares his plan that "I shall cut out the small native traders" (*OI* 92).

The second medium is the vast commodification process of everything in which all entities, concepts, and social relationships are objectified in terms of lucrativeness. If the river, for instance, is monopolized in some sense, it is commodified in another. Its usefulness and importance is evaluated by Lingard only through his capitalist economism. The settlement of Sambir itself, with its entire people, is evaluated on this basis. More evidently, Almayer is a striking example of the person who unimpededly considers everything around him as mere commodities. For him, Lingard is not a friend or the man who sponsors their joint business; he is rather a commodified human through whom Almayer intends to be wealthy. Lingard is made so the moment Almayer agrees to marry his adopted daughter so that Almayer thereby can be "made king amongst men by old Lingard's money" (*AF* 10), for Almayer believes that after he marries Lingard's adopted daughter old Lingard would soon die. Almayer's marriage here does not entail commodifying Lingard in the same degree as commodifying his adopted daughter in the first place. Though this marriage is considered shameful by Almayer (for he, a white man, is married to a native woman), she is the bridge

to Lingard's wealth and to a high social position. In a word, she is a commodity, or rather "a low-priced commodity" (Sewlall 41), that can meet the requirements of the 'why' in his ideological agenda. And while legality is excluded from any ideological calculation, morality here is equally dismissed. It has been contended that Almayer is even ready to commodify his racial 'qualification,' for he "seems to regard his whiteness as his greatest asset" (Henthorne 35). This is because Lingard wants to marry his adopted daughter to a European and Almayer agrees to be that person. On that account, Almayer decides "to advance his material interests by exploiting his racial identity rather than his abilities" (Henthorne 36).

Besides, Almayer is not reluctant to incorporate in this chain of commodification his daughter, Nina, in whom the people of Sambir become interested after she arrives at her father's house. Pretending to come for business, Arabs and Malays would visit Almayer in order to catch a glimpse of her. "Under these improving circumstances," says the narrator, "Almayer brightened up a little. All was not lost perhaps. Those Arabs and Malays saw at last that he was a man of some ability, he thought" (*AF* 26). He is glad that his daughter attracts the attention of the settlement in a way that will reap money. This mentality that tends to commodify everything in order to materialize 'success' is compatible precisely with the historical capitalist ideology, according to which, in Wallerstein's words,

> capitalists have sought to commodify more and more of these social processes in all spheres of economic life. Since capitalism is a self-regarding process, it follows that no social transaction has been intrinsically exempt from possible inclusion. That is why we may say that the historical development of capitalism has involved the thrust towards the commodification of everything." (*Historical Capitalism* 15-16)

It is for this reason, the conclusiveness of the process, that I give here an out-of-the-ordinary positionality for commodification. And at this stage, the textual ideology under study can be once again developed a step further: 'they leave the core, heading to a peripheral zone with the aim of becoming rich by all means, *specially monopolies and the commodification of everything*, and by an adherence to a system of amorality.'

If the 'why' is supposed to be very rewarding so as to compensate for the expenditure of the 'what,' it follows that the 'why,' and the concomitant subordinate of the 'how,' must be characterized by firmness and straightforwardness in purpose because there is no way back as failure is not permissible. This is an important condition that is required to keep the enterprise activated, especially in the very harsh and difficult setting they choose for themselves. For once that condition is undermined, their failure, or at least a dysfunction in their "doing," becomes inescapable. This condition is highly stressed by the narrator: "Consciously or unconsciously, men are proud of their firmness, steadfastness of purpose, directness of aim. They go straight towards their desire" (*OI* 197). The narrator's generic philosophizing precedes his more focused remarks about Lingard, who "had never hesitated in his life. Why should he?" (*OI* 197). If he does, as a matter of fact, not only the enterprise but also his whole life becomes wasted for nothing. Willems and Almayer are also characterized by the same willingness. Willems' steadfastness even leads him to a damaging state of overconfidence; he always boasts to his relatives and friends of his "theory of success." He enjoys keeping his family awake into the late night hours so that he can expound that theory to them. For him, "[t]he wise, the strong, the respected, have no scruples. Where there are scruples there can be no power. . . . It was his doctrine, and he, himself, was a shining example of its truth" (*OI* 8). Almayer is not different in this regard.

Throughout the two novels, and despite his 'folly,' he keeps crawling through a volatile chain of means that are connected by the overarching 'how.' He first works at Hudig's company and then, as mentioned earlier, he becomes Lingard's partner. In the opening of *Almayer's Folly* we see him haunted by the occupation of gold hunting with the help of Dain Marolla, and he remains so until he loses his sanity and dies.

This steadfast goal of becoming wealthy occupies a very critical position in the above formula, for it harbors the key to the formula's dynamic achievement and eventual dissolution. If they become rich, there is no need for the formula to be kept effective. But this is not the case with Lingard, who has definitely achieved this criterion according to the testimonies of the narrator, other Europeans and the native Malays. Those who work at Hudig & Co., for example, know this fact very well: "'And Captain Lingard has lots of money'—would say Mr Vinck solemnly, with his head on one side—'lots of money; more than Hudig!'" (*AF* 8). Even Lingard himself fully admits to the "much capital" he already has: "When thinking of his rise in the world—commander of ships, then shipowner, then a man of *much capital*, respected wherever he went, Lingard in a word, the Rajah Laut—he was amazed and awed by his fate" (*OI* 198; emphasis added).

But how much capital should somebody have so that he can be considered wealthy? In fact, being rich is a matter of relativity. Lingard might be rich according to the social status and the geopolitical position of somebody but he might not be so according to another's. And this is effected for the most part by the injustices of the new global capitalist system. For this reason, and due to the fact that he is well off in the eyes of those inside Conrad's narrative, the 'why' must be re-modified in a way that makes the formula congruous with the economic actuality in the two novels. This requisite rectification can be

done by resorting to what Lingard himself comments about his own agenda. "He spoke of his past life," says the narrator, "of escaped dangers, of big profits in his trade, of new combinations that were in the future to bring profits bigger still" (*AF* 9). It is the accumulation of capital, thus, that can make the 'why' explain precisely the economics of capitalist ideology inside Conrad's fiction. With this amendment the ideological statement matures into 'they leave the core, heading to a peripheral zone with *the firm aim of accumulating capital* by all means, specifically by monopolies and the commodification of everything, and by an adherence to a system of amorality.' The 'why' here makes capitalist ideology within Conrad's narrative compatible with its counterpart without, for in the real world system capitalism is working according to the same impetus. Wallerstein decisively acknowledges this fact: "The economics of capitalism has thus been governed by the rational intent to maximize accumulation" (*Historical Capitalism* 17).

One last thing that should be attached to the formula concerns a final step in their plan. If they succeed in completing all the partial constituents in this ideological frame, they will simply return 'victorious' to Europe like mythological figures. Almayer is always preoccupied by the fairy palace he intends to build in Amsterdam. Willems and Lingard are no exception in this regard. The movement of wealth in the novel is exactly in the way described by Wallerstein in his discussion of commodity chains:

> Now commodity chains have not been random in their geographical directions. Were they all plotted on maps, we would notice that they have been centripetal in form. Their points of origin have been manifold, but their points of destination have tended to converge in a few areas. That is to say,

> they have tended to move from the peripheries of the capitalist world-economy to the centres or cores. (*Historical Capitalism* 30)

The centrifugality of capitalist ideology, then, is equally met by an opposite centripetality of wealth. Indeed, the geopolitical dissemination of capitalist ideology (to incorporate every possible peripheral area) is meant to yield a polarization of capital. I am emphasizing here this process of 'dissemination' because such ideology was moved intentionally by agents like Lingard. In this regard, I totally agree with John McClure who holds that "[i]n *Almayer's Folly* . . . the European colonists are not the modern knights of a new feudalism, but the wanton destroyers of living feudal communities. They are identified, and rightly, not with the forces opposed to commercialism and bourgeois values, but as forces spreading these values throughout the world" (107).

I have so far repeatedly quoted Wallerstein in order to substantiate the convergence between Conrad's narrative and its historical context. Both are governed in great measure by the same (con)textual ideological rationality which we can finally formulate as: 'they leave the core, heading to a peripheral zone with the firm aim of accumulating capital by all means, specifically by monopolies and the commodification of everything, and by an adherence to a system of amorality. Only then can they successfully come back to their point of origin.' What I have documented here is not at all a complete delineation of the ideology that drives people to do what they are doing in the novel. I have only emphasized the most prominent features of that ideology in accordance with the present discussion (still, one of the most important features of this ideology has to do with the *mission civilisatrice*, discussed in the next chapter). And while the above formula, in my belief, is structured out of the same historical capitalist circumstances that are mirrored here, others, like Andrea

White and Linda Dryden, might see European practices in these two novels as a reflection of the type of "doing" that is deeply inscribed within nineteenth-century romantic adventure writings, which render Lingard, Almayer, Willems and their peers anti-heroic.

The ideological formula, up to this point, represents only a vignette of the drama in the two novels: it stands for what they just start to practice, with the belief that such practice is efficient. However, I propose that once made effective their ideology has to be filtered through two major obstacles that govern the real proceedings in the geopolitical world of Sambir: the Subaltern obstructor and the Self obstructor. These are named in the light of the classical binary opposition used extensively in literary theory (especially Postcolonialism), which questions the position of considering what is Western as the Self and what is not as the Other. Instead of using the Other, but still preserving many of its essential connotations, I opt here for the 'Subaltern' in the sense it is used by Antonio Gramsci, who argues that subalterns are subordinate groups who are subjected to the ideology of the ruling class. Before analyzing how these two obstructors have a tremendous effect on capitalist ideology, it is very helpful to piece together the political, economic and social conditions in Sambir. And I will do so by drawing upon basic theoretical notions by Gramsci and Althusser on the function of ideology within the structure of society.

In trying to explain how the ruling class exerts and maintains power over "subalterns" in central and western European societies, Gramsci identifies "two major superstructural 'levels': the one that can be called 'civil society,' that is the ensemble of organisms commonly called 'private,' and that of 'political society' or 'the State'" (*Selections* 12). Civil society is the domain where can be found "trade-union bureaucracy and the social-democratic groups" (Gramsci, *Selections* lxvi), as well as various cultural

institutions including the media, the educational system, the church, the family and others. It is in this domain that the function of "hegemony" is most paramount in the sense that it ensures the "'spontaneous' consent given by the great masses of the population to the general direction imposed on social life by the dominant fundamental group" (Gramsci, *Selections* 12). Political society, on the other hand, is the "apparatus of state coercive power which 'legally' enforces discipline on those groups who do not 'consent' either actively or passively" (Gramsci, *Selections* 12). Later, this classification is further developed by Althusser, who posits that the ideological function of civil society is perpetuated through the "Ideological State Apparatuses" (ISAs) that encompass a web of systems: "religious," "educational," "legal," familial, "cultural" and other apparatuses (*Lenin* 143). These ideological institutions work by establishing subjects who are conditioned to accept willingly the political and economic status quo, i.e., the situation whereby it is deemed natural and every-day-common-sense to be exploited through the hegemonic ideology in which they are steeped. The "Repressive State Apparatus" (RSA), in contrast, is the system that functions primarily through violence in order to back up the efficiency of the ISAs. This type of apparatus comprises clearly visible institutions such as the "Government," the "Police," the "Army," the "Prisons," and so on (Althusser, *Lenin* 142-43). "What distinguishes the ISAs from the (Repressive) State Apparatus," Althusser argues, is that "the Repressive State Apparatus functions 'by violence,' whereas the Ideological State Apparatuses *function* '*by ideology*'" (*Lenin* 144-45).

This delineation of ideological functioning, set forth by Gramsci and Althusser, provides for us a key to understanding how the people of Sambir are subjected to a system in which relations of production/exploitation are meant to serve a small "hegemonic bloc." The

history of Sambir unfolds the way this system came to existence under the lead of Patalolo and Lingard. “In the early days of the settlement,” says the narrator, “before the ruler Patalolo had shaken off his allegiance to the Sultan of Koti, Lakamba appeared in the river with two small trading vessels. He was disappointed to find already some semblance of organization amongst the settlers of various races who recognized the unobtrusive sway of old Patalolo” (*OI* 50). This “semblance of organization” is kept intact by the ‘government’/RSA of Patalolo who, with the help of Lingard, would not hesitate to use violence in order to re-condition any subject who would not be ruled by consent. This fact is emphasized by the narrator who relates how Lakamba, who at first “would not recognize the constituted authorities” (*OI* 51), engineers the insurgency of the Bugis settlers. Nevertheless, Lingard appears with his armed vessel and together with Patalolo they quell the dissent. Babalatchi later reports to Abdulla how Lingard, during political troubles in Sambir, “took possession of Patalolo’s mind and made his heart hard; he put severe words into his mouth and caused his hand to strike right and left” (*OI* 115).

When the power of the hegemonic bloc becomes completely established in Sambir, relations of exploitation begin to take effect, and gradually it becomes ‘natural’ for those under the iron hand of Lingard and Patalolo to be economically manipulated. This naturality is expressed straightforwardly in the case of Mrs. Almayer who, after being taken to the “Samarang Convent,” behaves with the same acquiescence associated with other subalterns in Sambir. The narrator affirms that “she accepted her position calmly, after the manner of her people, and even considered it quite natural” (*AF* 18). Because trade is utterly monopolized by Lingard through his secret river, the people of Sambir have to accept whatever terms and conditions he outlines for his transactions with them. Babalatchi

complains to Abdulla saying, "That unbeliever [Lingard] kept the Faithful panting under the weight of his senseless oppression. They had to trade with him—accept such goods as he would give—such credit as he would accord. And he exacted payment every year" (*OI* 115-16). Sahamin further explains the suffering of Sambir: "We are weary of paying our debts to that white man [Almayer] here, who is the son of the Rajah Laut. That white man . . . is not content to hold us all in his hand with a cruel grasp. He seeks to cause our very death" (*OI* 116). All of this is done subtly and covertly by making the public believe that what Lingard is doing is for the well-being of Sambir. "Lingard's 'right policy,'" according to McClure, involves "threatened starvation, perpetual indebtedness, and the threat of force," and it aims at "the dual function of enslaving those at whom they are directed and deceiving any observers" (111). In addition to exclusive rights to trade, Lingard and Patalolo claim "tribute for the cultivated fields" (*OI* 51). They even do not hesitate to confiscate whatever goods they deem 'illegal' according to their system of 'justice.' This is clearly carried out, for example, upon Babalatchi's first arrival with Omar and Aïssa in a small vessel loaded with "cocoanuts." Suspecting the truth of Babalatchi's ownership of the goods, the Rajah later confiscates the cargo. Trade and taxes are interrelated here because the two processes are originated by the same hegemonic group and directed at the same target of exploitation. As Yeow concisely puts it, "The licence to trade and to monopolize trade in important commodities was basically the licence to collect state revenue" (113).

One of the most significant ISAs that contribute to the dissemination of the ideology that serves the interests of Lingard and the conditioning of 'good' subjects are religious and educational institutions. The Samarang Convent here exemplifies the role of such institutions in creating subjects ready to accept and internalize the ruling ideology. Mrs. Almayer, after

surviving the deadly defeat that befalls her people at the hands of Lingard, is moved to this institution where she finds "slavery in the far countries, amongst strangers; in unknown and perhaps terrible surroundings" (*AF* 18). Throughout her stay there, Mrs. Almayer is instructed in the new 'faith' in an attempt to transform her into a naturalized ideologue in the new system. The following passage shows how this ideological apparatus backs up and works concomitantly with the repressive policy of Lingard:

> 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, assimilating quickly only the superstitious elements of the religion. She called Lingard father, gently, and caressingly, at each of his short and noisy visits—under the clear impression that he was a great and dangerous power it was good to propitiate. Was he not now her master? And during those long four years she nourished a hope of finding favour in his eyes and ultimately becoming his wife, councillor and guide. (*AF* 19)

While being ideologized, Mrs. Almayer is *made quite aware* of Lingard's power that lurks behind the Convent. This process of generating awareness among people is meant, with the passage of time, to naturalize their position in the new relations that structure the world of Lingard and his allies. This naturalization is evident in the way Mrs. Almayer conceives of Lingard after these years. The same process will be experienced later by Mrs. Almayer's daughter, Nina, who at the age of ten was sent by Almayer to the Vincks with the help of Lingard. Once again, the narrator tells us, "Lingard had—so to speak—kidnapped her from

Sambir. Since then she had had Christian teaching, social education and a good glimpse of civilized life" (*AF* 33-34).

The position of religious education in the process of hegemonizing the public poses a special significance for Gramsci, who suggests that "[o]ne would not be able to explain the position the Church has maintained in modern society if one were not aware of its continuous patient and persistent efforts to develop its particular section of this material structure of ideology" (*Further Selections* 155-56). Like Gramsci, Althusser dedicates a considerable part of his discussion of the ISAs to the singular role of the religious and educational apparatuses, which are very deeply entangled with the family apparatus. The "School-Family" ideological apparatuses, for Althusser, have "replaced the Church-Family couple" as the leading and most effective ISAs (*Lenin* 154). The role of the family in spreading and maintaining the ruling ideology is actually detectable in the case of Nina. At a very early age when she is a child living under the teaching of her father, she addresses Lingard, saying, "You have been away fighting with many men. Ali says so. You are a mighty fighter. Ali says so. On the great sea far away, away, away" (*OI* 192). Ali, who is Almayer's servant, only "says so" under the supervision of her father. More significantly, the following dialogue between her and Lingard shows how indeed the family can be quite one of the leading ideological apparatuses:

> "What is it, little woman?"
>
> "I am not a little woman. I am a white child. Anak Putih. A white child; and the white men are my brothers. . . ."
>
> Almayer almost danced with paternal delight.

> "I taught her. I taught her," he repeated, laughing with tears in his eyes. "Isn't she sharp?"
>
> "I am the slave of the white child," said Lingard, with playful solemnity. "What is the order?"
>
> "I want a house," she warbled, with great eagerness. "I want a house, and another house on the roof, and another on the roof—high. High! Like the places where they dwell—my brothers—in the land where the sun sleeps." (*OI* 194)

And, undoubtedly, "the sun sleeps" in the West according to the perspective of Nina, who is being taught that she is "a white child." But later, when Nina is brought by Captain Ford to Sambir, Ford tells Almayer "You can't make her white" (*AF* 25), and it is this process of 'making' that marks the function of such institutions. In fact, Conrad does not provide more examples of the family's role in the two novels, but the case of Nina might be sufficient in allowing the reader to catch a glimpse of how children are brought up in communities run by capitalists like Lingard in Southeast Asia.

Having established the political and economic structure in the life of Sambir, I will henceforth highlight the way the ideological formula constructed above will be completely ruptured by the two obstructors I have suggested, starting with the first one. The Subaltern obstructor, which is more important, represents a perilous threat to capitalist ideology through the types of political conflict generated by Lakamba, Babalatchi, Abdulla and their followers. Because the dominance of the ruling group is based on repression and ideological hegemony, the subaltern group, in the first stage, shows resistance in both domains. To use the more nuanced terminology of Gramsci, the subalterns' clash with the dominant group

exists on two fronts: "maneuver" and "position." A war of maneuver is the type of conflict that exists on the military level as a "frontal attack," and it is equivalent to the kind of revolution anticipated by Marx to take place in the structural "base." A war of position, on the other hand, takes place within the confines of ideology (in the superstructure), where "an unprecedented concentration of hegemony is necessary" (Gramsci, *Selections* 238). For this reason, Gramsci argues, a war of position requires longer time and, "once won, is decisive definitively" (*Selections* 239). It is in this type of struggle that Gramsci makes a step further in comparison with Marx, because the latter believes that the ideological superstructure is conditioned and dependent upon the material 'base', and to change society resistance should start from below so that a new ideology is effected.[6] Like Gramsci, moreover, Althusser lays analogous emphasis on the second type of war: "the Ideological State Apparatuses," he says, "may be not only the *stake*, but also the *site* of class struggle, and often of bitter forms of class struggle" (*Lenin* 147). I am emphasizing this development of Marxist thought in order to establish in this context the first of Conrad's deviations from Marxist tradition in his treatment of Capitalism. This is because, as I intend to explain below, neither a war of maneuver nor a war of position is successful in creating the historical change aspired to by Marxists. This condition remains in place even though capitalism, in Conrad's vision, is rendered dysfunctional by the Subaltern in Southeast Asia.

The war of maneuver is the first type of conflict that unfolds in the two novels between subalterns and agents of capitalism. But this war, according to Conrad, can never be successful, and its failure is mainly exemplified through the characters of Lakamba, Babalatchi, Omar, Mrs. Almayer and Dain. When Lakamba first arrives in Sambir, as mentioned earlier, he expresses his disappointment at the political and economic control that

Patalolo and Lingard exert over the settlement. Believing that force would yield what he aspires to, Lakamba rebels against Patalolo by seeking the aid of the Sultan of Koti, but he fails because the latter's support is impossible due to the great distance between them. He later leads the Bugis insurgency and "besieged the old Rajah in his stockade with much noisy valour and a fair chance of success; but Lingard then appeared on the scene with the armed brig" (*OI* 51), and the result is failure again. Lakamba eventually becomes convinced that his 'maneuvering' attempt is useless, and thus he retires to his "campong," conceding even to pay the tribute.

It is in the case of Babalatchi and his leader, Omar, that this type of war is depicted not only as a failure but as an experience with damaging effects for subalterns. The history of both characters, prior to their arrival in Sambir, is deeply rooted in piracy and fighting. Babalatchi is described as "a vagabond of the seas, a true Orang-Laut, living by rapine and plunder of coasts and ships in his prosperous days" (*OI* 51-52). He always associates their past work (trading) with fighting. He narrates to Lakamba in detail how Omar used to be a "great" fighter as well as trader: "I knew him well when he had slaves, and many wives, and much merchandise, and trading praus, and praus for fighting" (*OI* 46). He explains further that Omar

> had many virtues: he was brave, his hand was open, and he was a great robber. For many years he led the men that drank blood on the sea: first in prayer and first in fight! Have I not stood behind him when his face was turned to the West? Have I not watched by his side ships with high masts burning in a straight flame on the calm water? Have I not followed him on

> dark nights amongst sleeping men that woke up only to die? His sword was swifter than the fire from Heaven, and struck before it flashed. (*OI* 46)

Here, and elsewhere, Babalatchi ascribes to Omar a number of antonymous epithets and combines them in a way that is only possible with synonyms. For him, Omar is "generous" and(/but) "a great robber," "brave" leader and(/but) reckless in driving himself and his men to perilous disasters, virtuous and(/but) a pirate, and so on. The narrator describes Babalatchi himself as "brave and bloodthirsty" (*OI* 52). But again, the world of Babalatchi is governed by the same rules of conduct that govern Lingard's, and this becomes clear when taking into consideration how within this chaos Omar's "face was turned to the West." Babalatchi and Lingard are linked only by violence and intimidation. Their relationship is clearly articulated in this regard: "[H]e [Babalatchi] hated the white men who interfered with the manly pursuits of throat-cutting, kidnapping, slave-dealing, and fire-raising, that were the only possible occupation for a true man of the sea" (*OI* 52). We should also never forget that Lingard is not only "a true man of the sea" but also the well-known "Rajah Laut" in the whole archipelago. Yeow argues in this regard, "Pirates or otherwise, as we have seen, Conrad never idealized or outrightly condemned any particular group in his fictional world" (130). The piratical clash between Babalatchi and Lingard can be further illuminated in the light of Christopher GoGwilt's discussion of piracy in Conrad's Malay fiction: "[T]he meaning of piracy itself cannot be disconnected from the struggle for hegemony over trading routes during the colonial period" (82). Piracy, therefore, is particularly affected by a clash with agents of capitalism like Lingard.

Indeed, despite their long history of piracy and violence, as Babalatchi affirms, the only known incident in this history is their devastating encounter with Lingard, when

"robbery and violence received its first serious check at the hands of white men" (*OI* 52). This is the attack in which Omar becomes blind, as Babalatchi reminds Lingard toward the end of novel. During the attack, the narrator relates, "The beaten ground between the houses was slippery with blood" (*OI* 52), and when Babalatchi manages to leave with Aïssa and Omar, Aïssa says, "They shall find only smoke, blood and dead men, and women mad with fear there, but nothing else living" *(OI* 53). Mrs. Almayer, similarly, still remembers how she survived the violent destruction that befalls her people with images of dying men and burning vessels. Thus, it is only after such incidents that Babalatchi admits to the futility of facing Lingard 'militarily': "They are very strong. When we fight with them we can only die" (*OI* 53). That is why, when he arrives in Sambir, he does not assent to Lakamba's hasty plans of using force again with Patalolo, Lingard, or Almayer:

> Babalatchi experienced great difficulty in restraining him from unconsidered violence. It would not do to let it be seen that they had any hand in introducing a new element into the social and political life of Sambir. There was always a possibility of failure, and in that case Lingard's vengeance would be swift and certain. No risk should be run. They must wait. (*OI* 58)

Upon Babalatchi's advice, Lakamba (as well as Abdulla) abstains from any 'maneuvering' act and follows Babalatchi's new schemes for the emergent political situation. As a result, the narrator makes it clear that "He [Babalatchi]—the man of violence—deprecated the use of force, for he had a clear comprehension of the difficult situation" (*OI* 56).

The failure of this type of war is exemplified not only through those attempted against Lingard and Patalolo but also against the Dutch authorities, as revealed in the case of Dain. This last example takes place, the narrator says, during a time "when the hostilities

between Dutch and Malays threatened to spread from Sumatra over the whole archipelago" (*AF* 62). No matter how enlarged the scale of this war is, the outcome is not different. Sent by his father the Rajah of Bali in order to smuggle gunpowder, which is prohibited by the Dutch authorities, Dain resorts to Sambir, where Almayer agrees to help him in return for Dain's support in the gold expedition (while Lakamba is involved in the smuggling but remains behind the scene). While implementing the plan, Dain's brig is blown up by the Dutch, and many of his men are killed, so he escapes to Sambir to seek refuge under Lakamba's protection. But Lakamba, now fully aware of the pointlessness of Dain's struggle, replies firmly, "When I was young I fought. Now I am old and want peace.—It is easier for me to have you killed than to fight the Dutch. It is better for me" (*AF* 62). Having no choice but to avoid any trouble with the Dutch, Lakamba and Babalatchi concoct a plan whereby the Dutch (as well as Almayer) are deceived into believing that Dain is dead, and consequently Almayer is the one who is to be investigated. It seems subsequently that Conrad insists on the abortiveness of violent insurrections aiming at any historical metamorphosis of capitalism (an attitude sustained in later novels such as *The Secret Agent* where he satirizes Anarchism).

While a war of maneuver comes to naught, a war of position is not only in vain but seems ludicrous and unimaginable from the start. This is because the 'game' of this war is mostly played and controlled by institutions within the boundaries of civil society, and the qualification to have such 'institutional' abilities is missing among subalterns of the two novels. Subalterns are either hegemonized by Capitalist ideology or, if not ideologized (like Babalatchi and Lakamba), cannot generate a counter-hegemonic movement that serves their interests. Conrad's view in this regard seems compatible with Gramsci's in his discussion of

the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia in 1917. Gramsci observes that "In the East the State was everything, civil society was primordial and gelatinous" (*Selections* 238), and this observation applies to both novels. A war of position involves essentially a formation of alliances among different social groups so as to construct a hegemonic bloc supported by the consent of people. In order to win this type of war, subalterns should seek and succeed in making such alliances with those who are either hegemonized by the ruling group or impervious to it. Gramsci's argument is very clear in this regard:

> For the proletariat to become the ruling, the dominant class, it must succeed in creating a system of class alliances which allow it to mobilize the majority of the working population against capitalism and the bourgeois State . . . this means succeeding in obtaining the consent of the broad peasant masses. (*Pre-Prison* 316)

Even within the same social group, Gramsci further explains, there exists a multiplicity of different interests and political trends, and hence the war becomes conditioned by the degree to which each group is successful in compromising and "balancing" these interests (*Selections* 148). Althusser postulates a similar view of this game, for he equally acknowledges "the existence of *different ideological tendencies* that express the 'representations' of the different social classes" (*Philosophy* 30). The ability for each group to recognize and deal with these ideological tendencies plays a decisive role in determining the outcome of the whole war.

Now the question is: does this 'game' exist in the political arena of Sambir? I believe it does, but not in the same degree of complexity described above. Subalterns, in the two novels, make a limited number of attempts to make alliances with parties (with limited

power), but these attempts either fail prematurely or are rendered ineffective by the essential weakness of the sought alliance, which alone cannot hold out against the power of the hegemonic ideology. Lakamba's alliance with the Sultan of Koti (though the narrator does not elaborate on this alliance) does not turn out well against Patalolo's sway due to its logistic dysfunction. In fact, Lakamba is totally unqualified to lead such an ideological war against Lingard or Patalolo because this war is necessarily fought over a long period of time, a characteristic that renders Lakamba the wrong person. The narrator portrays him as a man who is "made up of short impulses that never lasted long enough to carry him to the goal of his ambition" (*OI* 50). The man who is indeed fit for this war is Babalatchi, who undertakes to obtain the support of other groups at different stages, but none of his attempts is realizable. For instance, after the Lingard attack, when Babalatchi, Omar and Aïssa seek refuge under the protection of the Sultan of Sulu, Babalatchi tries to convince the Sultan of "certain proposals" in order to "sweep the islands from Ternate to Acheen" (*OI* 54). To Babalatchi's frustration, the Sultan dismisses angrily such proposals exclaiming that it is because of such proposals that "on our heads falls the vengeance" (*OI* 54). Not only is Babalatchi's attempt aborted, but also he and his companions are to "be made the victims of political expediency" between the Sultan and the Spanish, who demand their being handed over to them (*OI* 54). Moreover, Babalatchi dismisses the idea of beseeching the partnership of Patalolo as "there was no use in poisoning old Patalolo, he maintained. It could be done, of course; but what then?" (*OI* 56). Babalatchi's political abilities mature into understanding the distribution of power in Sambir, and he acts accordingly. He deems Patalolo's alliance useless because Patalolo's power is backed up by Lingard. Not only Patalolo, but also the whole population of Sambir would not help in this regard, as Babalatchi exerts himself to know their position

in the hierarchy of power: "[H]e pervaded the settlement, squatting in the course of each day by many household fires, testing the public temper and public opinion" (*OI* 58). Babalatchi is the type of man whose mind is always busy reflecting on the proceedings and prospects of Sambir politics in the future. Aïssa repeatedly sees him "sitting alone and thoughtful in the silent night by the dying fire, his body motionless and his mind wandering in the land of memories, or—who knows?—perhaps groping for a road in the waste spaces of the uncertain future" (*IO* 59).

It is through Babalatchi and his industrious thinking that Conrad introduces a third type of war: that of circumvention. A war of circumvention uses elements from the other types of war but is none of them. Instead of attacking the enemy on the material ground of society in order to change society's superstructure (as prescribed by Marx), and rather than arming oneself with a parallel ideology aiming to combat the antagonistic ideology (as suggested by Gramsci in his "war of position"), this war is launched from within the boundaries of the ruling class's ideology. It draws upon a Trojan-horse technique by entering imperceptibly into that ideology with the aim of adulterating its basic constituents. It is basically based on the effectuation of a dysfunction in the ideology of the ruling group in a way that would gradually cripple its holistic functioning, an act which can destroy the supremacy of the dominant group. In order to do so, a good knowledge of that ideology is a prerequisite for an 'entry' into it, and accordingly it becomes possible to effect the ideological erosion necessary for the destruction of that group. As such, this war is neither military nor ideological; it is rather epistemological in the first place. Once the epistemological ground for that group is shaken, it becomes easy to take over their political power and economic privileges.

By using the name 'circumvention,' I am borrowing from Conrad, whose narrator in *Almayer's Folly* uses this word in commenting upon Babalatchi's successive deeds: "In those long years how many dangers escaped; how many enemies bravely faced; how many white men successfully circumvented" (66). While this word is picked up by some critics (Krenn 11; Henthorne 47), I am using it here in a more technical sense in relation with the other types of war. In particular, I am ascribing to it the characteristic of epistemological engagement in accordance with the proceedings of the plans set forth and actualized by Babalatchi. Truly, Babalatchi is the type of person who is eligible to spark and conduct such a war on a high level of slyness and subtleness. He is importantly equipped with the ability to penetrate and grasp the basic components of the ruling ideology and the way these components function together in effecting the supremacy of the Lingard party. His claim, while speaking to Lakamba, that "I know the white men" is credible in this regard (*IO* 60).

If Babalatchi shows adeptness in the ideology of the ruling group, the question is how does he set about this war and handle it successfully? That is, in what ways is Babalatchi able to get epistemologically into his enemy and work out a strategy whereby the major ideological elements of his enemy collapse? In order to answer this question, I will go back to the ideological formula constructed above to explain how this process is implemented: 'they leave the core, heading to a peripheral zone with the firm aim of accumulating capital by all means, specifically by monopolies and the commodification of everything, and by an adherence to a system of amorality. Only then can they successfully come back to their point of origin.' This formula is essentially based upon three major integral parts that meet the requirements of the 'what,' 'why,' and 'how' explained earlier. A critical assessment of this tripartite construct would show the pivotal position of the 'how' among the other parts. It is

the nucleus of the whole matrix wherein the intactness of the totality is contingent upon the flawlessness of this particular element. Consequently, if the 'how' is corrupted or damaged the whole formula becomes inoperative. It is this mechanism that Babalatchi understands very well, and accordingly he focuses his deleterious scheme on the ideological nucleus that will rupture the whole chain. More specifically, Babalatchi's plan starts from the monopoly and commodification processes, as these are not only the backbone of capitalist ideology but also a source of power for the dominant group's material position (this is because Sambir and the Pantai river are commodified and monopolized at the same time). What Babalatchi will do is to play upon, and corrupt, the commodification element so as to destroy the monopoly process at the same time, so that all other contingent elements will be shattered thereafter. This is the master plan, which is implemented through a number of stages, or semi-plans.

While using one ideological element to destroy the other, Babalatchi will use one capitalist against the other, an act which fits rightly in the 'entry' scheme. In the same way Babalatchi finds the key to corrupting the ideological formula, he has also to find a suitable member from the ruling group through whom the manipulation of the ideological elements will be implemented. This is his first step, which is so important because Babalatchi's entry in the antagonistic ideology cannot be carried out in a vacuum; it needs an 'environment,' somebody who is part of that ideology. The best choice is Willems, as all conditions make him eligible to be the necessary host for the anti-ideological adulteration. Willems is brought by Lingard to Sambir and is left to the care of Almayer until Lingard's second return, but during Lingard's absence, Willems is made exactly this necessary 'somebody.' Irritated by the intolerant Almayer, Willems leaves Almayer's house heading to the 'care' of the forest,

and while being there he falls in love with Aïssa. Being penniless, tired, and without shelter, Willems now is in urgent need of money. He seeks Almayer's help informing him, "I want to become a trader in this place," and then he adds, "Yes. And you shall set me up. I want a house and trade goods—perhaps a little money. I ask you for it" (*OI* 92). At this moment, both Almayer and Willems will behave according to the ideological formula outlined above. Almayer is in that peripheral area not to give, but to take, and thus he declines Willems' request and dismisses him disgracefully, whereas Willems, on the other hand, is now willing to achieve his goal *by whatever means*. It is this condition, which belongs to the 'how' of the formula (and is the key to it), that Babalatchi will play upon. In particular, Babalatchi will plant an imperceptibly 'malignant' means in the 'how' of the formula in a way that will make it *look like* it is functioning 'healthily.' In order to do so, he offers Willems the means by which he can satisfy the 'why' (by giving him money so that Willems can start a business, become a trader, and so on). However, in order to realize the 'why,' Willems has to go rapidly through the 'whatever means' because it is his opportunity to have money. It is exactly during this hurried moment that Babalatchi 'infects' the formula. To speak in more concrete terms, Willems knows the secret of Lingard's monopoly; he knows how to get to Sambir through the river. Therefore, it is possible for Babalatchi to make Willems *commodify* this secret and sell it to him as a product since commodification is part of the formula. Nevertheless, this will destroy the other means of the 'how' by making the river unmonopolized. Subsequently, terminating the monopoly (which is one form of the 'how') will again extirpate the other form, the commodification process (which is one way the river is used by Lingard), and eventually the whole 'how,' the key to the whole formula, is

completely demolished. And once this key becomes dysfunctional, the formulaic elements will gradually be dismantled and transformed into nothing, a dead ideology.

This is the theoretical frame of Babalatchi's plan, which becomes clear to him only after the failure of his wars of maneuver and position. He informs his leader, Omar, that "I only saw a way for their destruction and our own greatness. And if I saw aright, then you shall never suffer from hunger any more. There shall be peace for us, and glory and riches" (*OI* 101). Babalatchi insinuates what he intends to do; he tells Lakamba, "Let one white man destroy another" (*OI* 60), and he further predicts, while speaking to Omar, that "[t]hey shall fight amongst themselves and perish both" (*OI* 102). Babalatchi's prediction is true, because the reciprocity of destruction among the ideological elements is paralleled among members of the dominant class.

Still, there remains one pre-condition for Babalatchi in order to start effecting his strategy: he has to find a partner, a co-executive whose interests accord completely with Babalatchi's:

> What was wanted was an alliance; somebody to set up against the white men's influence—and somebody who, while favourable to Lakamba, would at the same time be a person of a good standing with the Dutch authorities. A rich and considered trader was wanted. Such a person once firmly established in Sambir would help them to oust the old Rajah, to remove him from power or from life if there was no other way. Then it would be time to apply to the Orang Blanda for a flag; for a recognition of their meritorious services; for that protection which would make them safe for ever! The word of a rich and loyal trader would mean something with the Ruler down in Batavia. (*OI* 57)

We should not think this alliance makes Babalatchi's plan identical to a war of position, because it is not meant to empower an already existing ideology against the capitalist one. Rather, it is needed to facilitate an entry to the latter. This idea is further endorsed by the fact that Babalatchi's ally should be "in good standing with the Dutch authorities" and should not mind applying for a Dutch flag. Importantly, this condition is not temporary but rather applicable even after the success of the stratagem. The narrator describes Babalatchi as a man who "would to some extent admit the eventual expediency of Dutch protection" (*OI* 56). Neither Babalatchi nor his ally would do so if their war is either of the previous ones. Moreover, to have good terms with the Dutch and to work under their flag would meet the requirement of the Trojan-horse technique, which is what Babalatchi's design requires. That is why a war of circumvention in this regard uses elements of both wars (forming an alliance in this case), while being neither of them.

In addition, there are other conditions that should be complied with in the new alliance: "The man they wanted should be rich, unscrupulous, have many followers, and be a well-known personality in the islands. Such a man might be found amongst the Arab traders" (*OI* 57). Being an affluent trader is indispensable for paying whatever price Willems would demand for the product, which must be invaluable in this regard. Babalatchi eventually chooses Abdulla for this task. This character fits very congruously in Babalatchi's plan not only because he is a rich trader whose interests accord with Babalatchi's but also because he exhibits the same level of flexibility and adaptability shown by Babalatchi. Abdulla is the head of a big family that is well rooted in business over the whole Archipelago:

> [T]he great family lay like a network over the islands. They lent money to princes, influenced the council-rooms, faced—if need be—with peaceful

> intrepidity the white rulers who held the land and the sea under the edge of sharp swords; and they all paid great deference to Abdulla, listened to his advice, entered into his plans—because he was wise, pious, and fortunate. (*OI* 110)

Importantly, Abdulla maintains good relations with the white rulers of the area, but at the same time he has his own interests which go against theirs. His strong family has the power of lobbying so that the course of events would move in the direction that serves his wishes. The narrator also emphasizes the fact that Abdulla's network run "an immense correspondence, enclosed in silk envelopes—a correspondence which had nothing to do with the infidels of colonial post-offices, but came into his hands by devious, yet safe, ways" (*OI* 111). To have good relations with one's enemies but to simultaneously work against them is precisely the qualification that Babalatchi is looking for. Besides, Abdulla is essentially equipped with "a fluid performance of identity within the shifting pattern of political allegiances of the archipelago" (Hampson, *Cross-Cultural* 111). In fact, such fluidity is the kernel of the war of circumvention whose impact will usher the demise of the Lingard party forever. It has been rightly argued in this regard that "[t]hese Malays of Conrad's . . . attempted to get along amicably with the intruders through open friendship and secret deceit or by hiding their kingdoms in remote parts, or they had already lost control and were trying to regain it" (Clemens 341).

Accordingly, the deal between Babalatchi and Abdulla is struck, and both agree to make Willems sell out Lingard's secret route. When Willems meets Abdulla he says, "You will pay that money as soon as I come on board. That I must have" (*OI* 133), and accordingly Abdulla consents, provided that Willems himself will pilot Abdulla's ship up the river. In

addition, Babalatchi assures Willems, "This is my own house. I will let you have it without any recompense" (*OI* 124). And once again, while this war uses elements from wars of position, it also draws upon some tactics used in wars of maneuver since Babalatchi's plan does not exclude a minor use of force against any resistance shown by either Patalolo or Almayer. But Babalatchi is keen to make Willems himself do the job, as the whole scheme is based upon a self-erosion technique ("They shall fight amongst themselves"). Thus, he reminds Abdulla that "he shall guide your ship and lead in the fight—if fight there be . . . . If there is any killing—let him be the slayer. You should give him arms" (*OI* 119).

Eventually, the plan is accomplished meticulously in every respect, and the journey up the river is successful as expected. Lingard's monopoly is broken up, and Sambir's governance is surrendered to its subalterns. Because monopoly and commodification represent the means to the ruling group's goals, the key to the ideological formula, the ruling group immediately give up their position once those means are seized by subalterns. Almayer later reports to Lingard that Abdulla's ship, "Lord of the Isles," anchored for the first time in Sambir in a pompous way with a large gathering of people from all over Sambir: "Every dugout in Sambir was there" (*OI* 175). This scene reflects the observation that what Babalatchi has materialized represents an overarching tendency within the imagination of the public, the subaltern at large. Moreover, Almayer reports, "All of a sudden . . . bang! They fired a shot into Patalolo's gate, and before I had time to catch my breath . . . they sent another and burst the gate open" (*OI* 175). It is interesting that Patalolo does not show any form of resistance, and nobody is killed at all, as if to emphasize the peculiar nature of this type of war and differentiate it from the previous ones. More noticeably, Almayer describes how the Dutch flag is hoisted in Lakamba's new place and how "Lakamba advanced and

proclaimed in a loud voice that during all that day every one passing by the flagstaff must uncover his head and salaam before the emblem" (*OI* 179). Lakamba's authority is now backed up by the "Great White Ruler" in Batavia, whose protection is to be secured through Patalolo. It has been argued that "the Dutch flag is emblematic of Lakamba's ambiguous position—it signifies both his servitude and his authority" (Simmons 17). However, this ambiguity is the effect of an ideological manipulation from within the epistemological boundaries of the hegemonic bloc. Once this manipulation is grasped, the ambiguity is cleared up, for, I postulate, the subalterns' position is not ideologically ambiguous at all. It is rather *meant to be* so as the design of imperceptible entrance requires.

Once Lingard's monopoly is broken up at the hands of Willems, subalterns use the same self-erosion policy in order to get rid of Willems at the hands of Lingard. After Lingard returns to Sambir and is informed of Willems' betrayal, he receives from Abdulla a letter whose content is not disclosed. However, Almayer comments on the letter, explaining that "Abdulla's meaning—as I can make it out amongst all those compliments—is: 'Get rid for me of that white man—and we shall live in peace and share the trade'" (*OI* 204), but then he adds, "No doubt we will share the trade for a time—till he can grab the lot" (*OI* 205). The fact is that they will not even share the trade as Lingard's business is ruined forever. But the important issue is the way Abdulla overturns the enmity poles between members of the same group, an act whose aim eventually succeeds. Toward the end of the novel, Lingard meets Babalatchi while in search for Willems, upon whom Lingard avenges himself. In order to make sure that Lingard's revenge is certain, Babalatchi tries to directly condense Lingard's hate against Willems. After telling him how Willems "is full of great cunning, and speaks of you without any respect, after the manner of white men when they talk of one another" (*OI*

231), he shows him where Willems dwells and leaves him his gun so that Lingard will use it. Though Lingard does not kill him, Willems (according to Lingard's system of 'justice') is sentenced to remain a prisoner in that remote place for the rest of his life. Willems is ruined at the hands of the same person whom he was made to destroy. Conrad reiterates this reciprocal destruction (which is put into effect by the subaltern) in a number of minor cases. When Lingard and Willems come face to face at the end, Lingard says Aïssa "begged me for your life," to which Willems replies, "And for three days she begged me to take yours" (*OI* 268). Again, Aïssa's mediation operates along the lines of Babalatchi's interference.

The results of this war are disastrous for the Lingard party: Lingard disappears into Europe, Willems goes insane and is shot, and Almayer becomes a halluciné. Their star will never be allowed to rise again. This is because the Babalatchi party continues to keep them out of the political and economic game in Sambir by using the same circumvention shield. Subaltern political behavior in this regard conforms to Gramsci's prescription of what a certain group is expected to do after seizing power: "A social group can, and indeed must, already exercise 'leadership' before winning governmental power … but even if it holds it firmly in its grasp, it must continue to 'lead' as well" (*Selections* 57-58). While this argument is articulated in Gramsci's discussion of wars of position, it is completely applicable to wars of circumvention. In *Almayer's Folly*, subalterns keep capitalist ideology ineffective by resorting to the same contamination process of its fundamental elements. Again, they pervert the function of the 'how' and make it move in a destructive direction. With the emergence of Dain, Almayer is convinced to help out in the gunpowder business in return for Dain's help in finding the gold mine. The deal between Almayer and Dain is again engineered by Babalatchi and Lakamba, and the prospect of achieving the 'why' for Almayer

seems realizable. The narrator explains that Almayer becomes "dazzled by the greatness of the results to be achieved by this alliance so distasteful yet so necessary" (*AL* 48), and he adds, "his imagination soar[s] far above the tree-tops, into the great white clouds, away to the westward, where the paradise of Europe was awaiting the future eastern millionaire" (*AF* 49).

However, this prospect is far from being actualizable because even if Almayer succeeds in evading the Dutch authorities during the gunpowder smuggling and then succeeds in finding the gold location, it is very unlikely that he will benefit from this deal since Lakamba "had long ago been impressed with the notion that Dain possessed the secret of the white man's treasure" (*AF* 63). Not only is this the real situation but also during the process "[t]hose two infernal savages Lakamba and Dain had induced him with their promises of help to spend his last dollar in the fitting out of boats" (*AF* 56-57). If Almayer's power is terminated in *Outcast*, his prospect of restoring that power is completely destroyed in the other novel as he becomes a puppet in the hands of Malayans. Almayer loses the treasure, gets in trouble with the Dutch authorities who come to Sambir to investigate his role in powder business, and eventually loses his daughter who elopes with Dain. Meanwhile, Dain returns safely with Nina to his people, and Lakamba and Babalatchi have nothing to lose and might find the treasure on their own if there is any. The only loser is Almayer.

This is the Subaltern obstructor. It is depicted as a dynamic obstacle that is characterized by a high level of innovation, organization and coordination. Subalterns do not stop at any seemingly blocked space; they always keep moving and struggling hard in accordance with any emergent situation. If frontal attacks and ideological wars are not

successful, they keep thinking of other ways to outmaneuver and defeat their enemies. Moreover, Conrad accords them a singular way of networking and organization. Abdulla has cooperative relatives and good relations everywhere, and Babalatchi is always spying on Almayer and collaborating with Mrs. Almayer in order to be alerted of any unexpected danger on the horizon. Almayer only becomes aware of this fact very late: "Of course I know now the infernal nigger came to spy and to talk over some of my men" (*OI* 168). We also see how Babalatchi and Lakamba coordinate very 'professionally' with Dain and Mrs. Almayer in deceiving Almayer and the Dutch into believing the death of Dain. In fact there are many examples of how subalterns master this kind of well-planned organization, which is completely missing among members of the Lingard party. Lingard leaves Sambir for long periods of time without corresponding with any of his partners, leaving everybody to make their own decisions and estimations. Even if such correspondence exists it lacks the understanding and communication that we find among subalterns. Almayer tells Lingard that just prior to Abdulla's entry into the river he writes to Patalolo, warning him against "rumours and uneasiness in the settlement" (*OI* 168). Patalolo's reply is that "[t]he Rajah sends a friend's greeting, and does not understand the message" (*OI* 168). Worse still, the relationship between Willems and Almayer during Lingard's absence becomes antagonistic instead of collaborative. Contrary to this image, the social ties among subalterns are characterized by loyalty and mutual respect, clearly illustrated in Babalatchi's relationship with Omar, whom Babalatchi saves during their fight with Lingard. After Omar becomes blind and weak, Babalatchi keeps "regular attendance upon his chief and protector" (*OI* 98). This behavior is similarly exhibited within Lakamba's house, which is full of followers using the house as though it were their own. Significantly, communion and social solidarity

between subalterns are meant to highlight the harshness and fragility of the relationships between Lingard's followers and partners. In this regard, it has been pointed out that Babalatchi's "courage and fierce loyalty in the face of an oppressive enemy bespeak at least an idealism unknown to Willems" (White 147).

It fact, this lack of collaboration, respect, and understanding among Lingard's followers is part of the second obstructor which is partially effected by subalterns. I am dubbing this obstacle the 'Self' in order to denote three levels of impairment that can be classified under this category: destruction which comes from oneself, one's partners and followers, and finally from the state. Every capitalist entity on any of these levels behaves in a way that makes capitalism susceptible to ruin. This idea has been partially discussed above and I am rehearsing it here in order to pinpoint the decisive role of the subaltern and to place this second obstructor in its right position, which occupies in my view a subordinate one. Starting with the personal level, it has been extensively established by Conrad's critics that Europeans in the two novels, especially Lingard and Willems, are enemies in the first place to themselves, and their business is essentially suicidal. Krenn, for example, believes that "self-interest renders them suspect even in their most benevolent form and in the end they defeat themselves" (15). Dryden, moreover, argues, "In rescuing Willems from the quay in Samarang Lingard sowed the seeds of his own destruction" (87). And concerning the character of Willems, it has been asserted also that his "betrayal is essentially self-betrayal, and only secondarily the betrayal of other loyalties" (Hampson, *Joseph Conrad* 32). This view is shared by McLauchlan: "[T]he real enemy would seem to be the self in which Willems has lived imprisoned, the moral blindness which has led him to his death" (95). These are some examples of what has been said in this regard, and all in all, it is generally

believed that Europeans' delusions about their moral behavior is the reason why their project is a failure. As such, this failure is the result of their moral and psychological abnormalities, which are starkly visible in the case of Willems.

Second, failure comes also at the hands of those who are part of the same ideological bloc. In particular, selfishness is one of the major characteristics of those who operate within the capitalist sphere because 'all means' are open to them, even if those means pertain to the destruction of their partners. Willems' embezzlement from Hudig & Co., which is an act governed by the same law, is conveyed to Hudig by Vinck and Leonard not out of loyalty and honesty but by the same impetus: the destruction of one's 'friends.' Mr. Vinck explains his worries to Mrs. Vinck that "[h]e [Willems] is becoming dangerous; he knows too much. He will have to be got rid of" (*OI* 10). Vinck eventually succeeds in his intention. But why are Vinck and Leonard very antagonistic to him? Vick insinuates that Willems "knows too much," and that which Willems knows might be a reason why Vinck feels endangered and wants therefore to get rid of him. This issue has been raised by Krenn, who believes that Willems' embezzlement "provides his rival [Vinck] not only with the desired weapon, but also with a shield of self-righteousness behind which that man hides his own dishonesties" (59). It might be that Vinck's "dishonesties" towards Hudig, which might be known to Willems, make Vinck afraid of his rival. In this regard, I support Krenn's analysis of the later appearance of the Vicks in Singapore as a well-to-do family with their daughters being educated in Europe: this image "strongly suggest[s] that they have gained by Hudig's loss" (60). Besides, the same condition applies to Hudig, who has attempted to get the secret of Lingard's route to Sambir for many years, pressuring Willems to help him in this regard.

Had Hudig discovered the secret, Lingard's business would have been ruined many years earlier.

In addition, Willems' betrayal of Lingard in Sambir is not limited to disclosing Lingard's secret but also is expressed through his treatment of Almayer after Abdulla's ship is anchored in Sambir. Willems' behavior uncovers the hatred and envy that govern his relationship with Almayer, who reports to Lingard how "[b]y his orders they laid me out on the floor, wrapped me in my hammock, and he started to stitch me in, as if I had been a corpse. . . . He told them to put their dirty paws over my mouth and nose. I was nearly choked" (*OI* 183). This is part of a long scene where Willems does not save any means in humiliating Almayer physically and psychologically. Willems' hysteric reaction raises the question of whether his revenge is only the result of Almayer's unfriendly company in Sambir. The reader would probably doubt Willems' 'Europeanness' as his actions towards his fellow Europeans, as Dryden puts it, make him "more 'Malay' than 'white'" (104), and of course Willems is finally rejected by both. In fact, it is very difficult to conceive of Almayer as a victim of Willems' betrayal because he is not different and might be even worse in this respect. Toward the end of *Outcast,* Almayer's worries and wariness against Willems become more clearly articulated: he is mainly afraid that the presence of Willems might endanger the 'success' of his plans, which are based on being Lingard's protégé. He believes Willems might take his position, and therefore Willems should be eradicated. This stance is largely similar to that of Vinck in Macassar, but with the difference that Almayer's selfishness and cautiousness lead him to think of killing his enemy. However, Almayer finally decides to deceive Joanna, against Lingard's will, in order to make her remove him from the scene.

Finally, the third form of self-failure is that which exists on the level of the state, by which I mean not only Patalolo's rule in Sambir but also the Dutch colonial authorities. It is on the latter form that I would like to focus here because Patlolo's ineffective role has been discussed in Babalatchi's war of circumvention above. In particular, the state is not there to help Lingard, his protégés, and his allies because it is so weak to the extent that it cannot help itself. The events of the two novels are set against the backdrop of the Aceh War whose news is reported in the "Straits Times" brought to Almayer by Captain Ford. The defeat of the Dutch in this war discloses part of the political milieu over which the Dutch are losing their control. This fact is grasped by Henthorne, who argues that "[t]he inability of the Dutch to defeat the Aceh outright diminished their military reputation, which, in turn, made their control of the archipelago all the more tenuous" (48). The incapacity of the Dutch to control settlements like Sambir is most visible through their nearly complete absence, especially during periods of political trouble such as when subalterns attack Patalolo's campong and install their authority. Almayer reports to Lingard, "You must understand that on that night there was no government in Sambir" (*OI* 171). Indeed, Lingard's authority in Sambir fills in the gap left by the Dutch, and Lingard himself is aware of this condition: "I am more master there than his Dutch Excellency down in Batavia ever will be when some day a lazy man-of-war blunders at last against the river" (*OI* 45). But while Lingard is not hindered by the Dutch in assuming power, his fall is to some extent the result of the same political reality.

Almayer articulates very clearly to the Dutch (when they come in search of Dain) that they have no political control in this region: "You have no grip on this country" (*AF* 104). Consequently, Almayer was offered no protection by the state, which he regards as a satisfactory explanation for his lack of loyalty to the state. He is simply reciprocating the

same political attitude with those who come to accuse him of "disloyalty and unscrupulousness." In fact, the Dutch not only fail in offering protection for their subjects but also work against their interests. When Willems humiliates Almayer and throws his gunpowder into the river, he does so pretending to abide by the Dutch regulations: "This coast is under the protection of the Netherlands, and you have no right to have any powder" (*OI* 185). Almayer is even threatened with punishment for his disloyalty and is told that if he ever tries to resist the new power in Sambir he would be doing so against the authority that is represented by the Dutch flag. And again, the gunpowder that Willems spoils is a tool of protection that functions as a reminder of the gap caused by the Dutch absence.

These three levels of self-destruction surveyed briefly here further prove that, contrary to what might be thought, capitalism in this setting is destroyed only by the interference of subalterns. In a letter to his aunt Marguerite Poradowska in 1894, Conrad comments on the character of Willems:

> First, the theme is the unrestrained, fierce vanity of an ignorant man who has had some success but neither principles nor any other line of conduct than the satisfaction of his vanity. In addition, he is not even faithful to himself. Whence a fall, a sudden descent to physical enslavement by an absolutely untamed woman. I have seen that! The catastrophe will be brought about by the intrigues of a little Malay state where poisoning has the last word. The dénouement is: suicide, again because of vanity. (*CL* 185)

While the denouement is suicidal, the climactic conflict is effected by subaltern "poisoning," another naming for the war of circumvention. Prior to the emergence of subalterns' interference, the capitalist project survives all other obstacles, especially self-destructive

characteristics, and this temporary survival applies to all characters I have studied so far. Lingard's monopoly is challenged by those capitalists with whom he trades, but it remains safe. Willems still revels in his ambitious plans with the same spirit even though he is betrayed by Vinck and Leonard. And Almayer's business remains operative despite the threat that is posed, he believes, by Willems. But when subalterns show up in the scene, the whole drama then is turned upside down. It is not without reason that Willems should be killed at the hands of Aïssa (as a subaltern) instead of Lingard, who has a very good reason to do so. The scene of killing Willems, I believe, symbolizes Conrad's vision of the future of Capitalism in that geopolitical area and how its annihilation might only be worked out through subalternity.

With the interference of subalterns, and as a result of the new war they introduce in the politics of Sambir, the formula of capitalist ideology is wiped out; it is transformed into complete nothingness. The text provides many signs for the empty space left by the evaporation of that ideology. The most noticeable of these, in my view, is the motif of the Dutch flag, which exhibits two dimensions of existence: material and abstract. These correspond exactly to the realities of capitalism in the Archipelago: material ISAs and abstract ideology, or (to use Marx's terms) a material base and an ideal superstructure. The flag is material, but it also symbolizes a cognitive meaning, an ideology and power. My point is that it is only when the superstructure, the ideology and the soul of the capitalist body, is dead do subalterns hoist the flag in their town. The flag, in other words, becomes a body without a soul; it is now harmless, and therefore claiming one's allegiance to it is neither harmful nor even beneficial, but is a mere absurdity. The flag's physical description affirms this analysis: "It was made hurriedly, during the night, of cotton stuffs, and, being heavy,

hung down the mast, while the crowd stared" (*OI* 179). The flag is motionless, a reality that describes its political and ideological lifelessness. This is confirmed through Babalatchi's eyes in *Almayer's Folly*: "As Babalatchi looked up at the flagstaff overtopping a group of low trees in the middle of the courtyard, the tri-colour flag of the Netherlands stirred slightly for the first time since it had been hoisted that morning on the arrival of the man-of-war boats" (99). The lifeless body of the flag does indeed reflect the ideological and material reality of the Lingard party thereafter, because notwithstanding the ideological vicious circle within which they are trapped, their practices and the physicality of their business remain there. The Lingard & Co. office is turned into merely a physical reality, one that is decaying and closed. Lingard and Almayer want to divert their business to gold-hunting, which they are never successful in doing. Willems believes that he can be aided again by Lingard and embarks on a new beginning, but in vain. Thus, while the physical dimension of their ideology is tangible, the ideology itself is dead. Their reality becomes a new version of the modern Tithonus. This is exactly the trick, the illusion that Žižek describes in his analysis quoted above (that is, "they know that, in their activity, they are following an illusion, but still, they are doing it") and which Lingard and his protégés fail to understand.

Like the flag, nature is also seen through the eyes of Willems and Almayer as a place that can harbor only decay and death. Throughout the two novels, nature functions as an externalizing tool of the inner conflicts and uneasiness of these characters. When left in the jungle with Aïssa, Willems can only feel "the blossoming of the dead" and "the acrid smell of decaying life" (*OI* 70, 74), despite its colorful and vigorous life. The natural scene is depicted as a foreshadowing tool for the fate of the ideology that keeps these characters and their business alive. In fact, nature is always portrayed as a decaying and dying entity

whenever Willems is there. Notwithstanding the seemingly double suffocation that Willems suffers at the hands of the mysterious forest and the love of Aïssa, both types of misery are the same because Aïssa is associated with the spirit of the jungle. This fact is emphasized by Dryden, who argues that Aïssa represents that mysterious land, "manifesting its romance, its fecundity, and its threat to male self-control" (97). Dryden's contention is also shared by Peter O'Connor: "We can regard Mrs. Almayer, as well as the female generally, as a symbol of nature—physical, dark, uncontrollable, [and] fluid" (226).

Aïssa is indeed part of the natural scene as both Aïssa and nature effect the same torturing sensations within Willems. The narrator always describes his meeting with her as an event that has the power of emptying him of all thoughts, ambitions, and memories, leaving him thereby a body without a soul. Whenever he sees her he would perceive "Nothing in the past, nothing in the future; and in the present only the luminous fact of her existence" (*OI* 76-77). This is always the case, especially when he is under the effect of her gaze:

> With that look she drew the man's soul away from him through his immobile pupils, and from Willems' features the spark of reason vanished under her gaze and was replaced by an appearance of physical well-being, an ecstasy of the senses which had taken possession of his rigid body; an ecstasy that drove out regrets, hesitation and doubt, and proclaimed its terrible work by an appalling aspect of idiotic beatitude. (*OI* 140)

Aïssa is part of this war of circumvention as she plays a role in convincing Willems to betray his people. It is for this reason that, while on his way to do so, his "spark of reason vanished." The ideology in which he lives and through which he is trying to make his dream

come true is completely evaporated. After the flag scene, the text becomes more and more gloomy and ominous as "Willems's forseeing his own death increases in frequency toward the end of the book" (Orr 38). Indeed, Willems reaches a point before his death where he imagines himself a mere corpse rotten and eaten by insects. What is left behind is a purer ideology (a synthesis of nature and the subaltern represented by Aïssa) that makes the material body of Willems redundant. In fact, all that has been left behind is the corrupt capitalist husk.

Lingard, similarly, exhibits the same symptoms of a dead ideology. Instead of conducting tangible trade and monopolistic business, he hallucinates about gold mines and revenge upon Willems. While the narrator describes how the "spark of reason vanished" inside Willems, he later comments on "the spark of divine folly in his [Lingard's] breast, the spark that made him . . . stand out from the crowd" (*OI* 273). Lingard's spark is undoubtedly the same as that of Willems; it is associated with "folly," with an inability to understand the illusion, the mirage of an ideology that has the power of controlling their physical reality, but which is not real at the same time. This is made unambiguously obvious when Lingard meets Willems after the latter's betrayal: "He felt a great emptiness in his heart. It seemed to him that there was within his breast a great space without any light" (*OI* 272).

This diagnosis of Lingard's ideological crisis applies also to Almayer, who fails to survive the traumatic experience of losing the privileges he used to have in Sambir. Truly, Almayer's life becomes utterly haunted by hallucinations, which makes the whole text of *Almayer's Folly* a hallucinatory tale. During the last days of his life, markedly, Almayer's face "seemed to know nothing of what went on within" (*AF* 143), reflecting one of the various indicators for his ideological nothingness. Throughout *Almayer's Folly*, moreover,

Almayer is portrayed as if he were a lifeless body moved and prompted to act by unconscious impulses. This characterization is postulated by Leonard Orr who affirms, "He [Almayer] is described in ways that make him seem like a corpse long before he is actually dead" (32). If not dead, as a matter of fact, Almayer is at least diminished to a mere creature accompanied and taken care of by his pet monkey, especially when he retires to his house, which is dubbed "Almayer's Folly." After his death, Almayer's face unveils a "serene look" (*AF* 155), which might be interpreted as another sign of the ideological emptiness he suffers prior to his death. This is the fate of capitalist ideology in Southeast Asia; it reduces men to mere bodies operating without any 'software' to control such operations.

But why should subalterns do all of this to capitalist ideology? That the subalterns launch a war of circumvention against capitalist ideology is a given, but what is that which makes them so antagonistic to the Lingard party? In the same way capitalist ideology is constructed above according to the practices of Lingard and his protégés, subaltern's subversive 'doing' reflects necessarily their inherent ideology. Actually, subaltern ideology can be summed up very briefly: 'resist, by all means, all that is in capitalist ideology so as to completely destroy it.' Resistance here is fueled by a general enmity to the western presence and power in that area. This hostility amounts, in a certain degree, to an overarching discourse that can be traced and constructed by studying the behavior of certain subaltern characters. For example, despite long years of indoctrination in Western epistemology, and notwithstanding being married to a white man, Mrs. Almayer regains her Malay identity, and eventually her attitude is determined by "hate and contempt for all that new life" (*AF* 19). Mrs. Almayer never forgets that her people were exterminated by Lingard, and her consciousness is occupied by a number of questions: "was she not a daughter of warriors,

conquered in battle, and did she not belong rightfully to the victorious Rajah?" (*AF* 18). She also tries to nourish her daughter, Nina, with the same spirit of antipathy by asking her to erase from her memory everything associated with European capitalists. She tells Nina, "They speak lies. And they think lies because they despise us that are better than they are but not so strong" (*AF* 113).

On her part, Nina does not need such advice in order to comply with the same antagonistic ideology. Nina's experience, while being under the care of the Vincks, is not different from her mother's, and Nina's hate is similarly articulated. When she encounters the European men coming to her father's house, she addresses them with contempt: "I hate the sight of your white faces. I hate the sound of your gentle voices" (*AF* 106). Though subalterns are not culturally idealized (the text equally condemns many of their social illnesses), Nina finally expresses a decisive attitude toward her cultural identity. For her, "the savage and uncompromising sincerity of purpose shown by her Malay kinsmen seemed at last preferable to the sleek hypocrisy, to the polite disguises, to the virtuous pretences of such white people as she had had the misfortune to come in contact with" (*AF* 35). Nina's love relationship with Dain finds its power in the way she tries to restore the identity of her Sulu part, and that is why she agrees to leave with Dain against her father's wishes.

The same rhetoric of hatred is expressed with equal weight by other subaltern characters, the most prominent of whom is Babalatchi and his leader. They share a similar position toward "the power of men we always hated" (*OI* 101), as Babalatchi puts it. Babalatchi, the 'most' subaltern of all, sometimes expresses a more fundamentalist attitude. He tells Lingard, "a white man's eyes are not good to see when the devil that lives within is looking out through them" (*OI* 228). It is very clear that this becomes a regular discourse

among subalterns (like Omar, Aïssa, Abdulla, Sahamin, Lakamba, Dain, among others), and there can be a long list of examples taken from the fabric of subaltern speeches and mental thinking. What is significant in this regard is the fact that the practice of stereotyping is not limited only to Europeans (in their speech about the natives) but also is sensible in subalterns' discourse about Europeans.

But in addition there is another significant dimension in the ideology of subalterns, which explains the reason behind this vast discourse of antagonism. In particular, the text unveils subalterns' hatred toward white people not because they are white or strangers to the land, but because of the new system they bring with them. Capitalist ideology is resisted because of its intrusion into the ways, the customs, and the traditions of subalterns. More specifically, according to Conrad's fiction, capitalism cannot stand on solid ground in its peripheral regions without erasing the indigenous culture, appropriating their land, and replacing all this with a Western model which is capitalist in nature. The moral of this practice is totally rejected in Babalatchi's speech to Lingard: "Tell me, Tuan, do you think the big trees know the name of the ruler? No. They are born, they grow, they live and they die—yet know not, feel not. It is their land" (*OI* 225). Babalatchi's emphasis that "[i]t is their land" represents the foundation of his ideology, for the land harbors all that is deemed integral to subaltern life: the culture, political system, and economic structure. Babalatchi objects clearly to the capitalist conviction that "[i]t is written that the earth belongs to those who have fair skins and hard but foolish hearts" (*OI* 226). This prominent stress on the land is repeated again and again, especially by Babalatchi, who reminds Lingard that "you whites have taken all: the land, the sea, and the power to strike!" (*OI* 229). It is an issue that is accentuated not only in these two novels but also in other works to the extent that it becomes

a motif in Conrad's fiction. It is asserted, for example, "The land remains where God had put it; but white men … come to us and in a little while they go. . . . They go to their own land, to their people" (*LJ* 274).

The ideology that nourishes Babalatchi's attitude with regard to their land is given additional delineation in his speech to Lingard. Babalatchi reminds him that there are other systems of values that European capitalists should acknowledge: "You think it is only your wisdom and your virtue and your happiness that are true" (*OI* 226). The essential implication of Babalatchi's remarks about subaltern values and culture are not perceived at all by people like Lingard. Subalterns' land, in short, is seen by Lingard as 'unowned' and, thus, possessable. Yet, the land, which is the periphery, and its peripheral people are two correlative entities; they are inseparable from each other. Moreover, capitalist parameters of "wisdom," "virtue" and "happiness" are differentiated from those that belong to subalternity. I say 'capitalist' because these parameters are concomitant with the insatiability characteristic of the capitalist system, as Babalatchi juxtaposes Lingard and his companions with the "black tiger" who, unlike capitalists, "knows when he is not hungry" (*OI* 226). Capitalism, in Babalatchi's understanding, is evaluated according to this principle of contentedness.

Like Babalatchi, other subalterns give equal prominence to the land, stressing the threat that endangers their existence in it. This observation is foregrounded through the relationship between Willems and Aïssa, who recurrently reminds the reader of the same concern through the same choice of words. On more than one occasion, Aïssa ruminates about the "land of lies and of evil" (*OI* 144, 359), from which Willems comes and which is the source of the "misfortune" that befalls subalterns, or those "who are not white" (*OI* 144,

153, 359), as she puts it. In the eyes of Aïssa and "those who are not white," Willems is also associated with the "land of violence and evil" (*OI* 153). Thus, this tripartite structure of "lies," "evil," and "violence" is made equal to capitalist ideology as both are characterized by the same centrifugal movement. And to be more precise, capitalist ideology *is* the "misfortune" seen by subalterns as a threat to their land and existence. And, consequently, in order for subalterns to avoid the misfortune, their goal is to destroy the major pillars of this ideology, which they are successful in doing. This is the ideological mechanism behind the wars of Sambir, and whose outcome for the Lingard party is a body without a soul. Aïssa's relationship with Willems is not simply one of love; it is primarily one of strife and political struggle. Similarly, Nina's relationship with Dain is essentially political because it is deeply rooted in Nina's vision of what it is to be a subaltern, which she chooses as her identity. Upon 'wedding' her to Dain, Mrs. Almayer reminds her how a woman of her position should treat her husband: "Let him slay the white men that come to us to trade with prayers on their lips and loaded guns in their hands" (*AF* 115).

There is one last characteristic missing in the above descriptive diagnosis of the mechanism of this cultural clash. For if capitalism is evinced as a body without a soul, what is the case of subalterns and their ideology? Does the binary structure of a material body and immaterial soul apply to the condition of subalternity? My answer is not exactly so because of a very subtle peculiarity that seems to be the source of power for subaltern ideology. In fact, what differentiates this latter ideology from that of capitalism is the very quality of *tangibility* which appears to be missing in the case of subalterns. In short, I argue that subaltern ideology is featured as a ghost: it is impalpable, invisible, unknowable, uncontrollable and perilous, and these immaterial and ghostly attributes are underscored

through a number of direct and indirect facts. To begin with, the power and willingness of subalterns to resist European intrusion and appropriation of their land seems to be plainly galvanized and substantiated by an unseen but felt *spirit* of resistance hovering in the air and lurking in every corner of tropical life. Babalatchi, and those revolting subalterns, can supernaturally feel the souls and the ghosts of the men who fought and died in battle like "[t]he companions of that piratical and son-less Aeneas" (*OI* 54). "[T]heir ghosts," the narrator relates in a mythical way, "wander over the waters and the islands at night—after the manner of ghosts—and haunt the fires by which sit armed men, as is meet for the spirits of fearless warriors who died in battle" (*OI* 54). The text here is transferred to a mythological level as the spirits of deceased warriors can communicate with the living everywhere in order to take action against those who sabotaged them. Their fighting and 'heroism' become the topic of people's talk.

Furthermore, Babalatchi is the one who is most clearly able to communicate with these ghosts. As mentioned earlier, Babalatchi would frequently sit by himself letting his imagination wander and his mind meditate through the forest, through the dark and entangled world in which he struggles hard to see a beam in a possible path that would deliver him to his goal. While doing so, especially during the night, Babalatchi's senses transcend the material world into a supernatural one. Just before he is encountered by Lingard when the latter seeks a final meeting with Willems, Babalatchi is sitting alone by the river, startled by strange noises. While attempting to find out who is approaching, the narrator recounts, Babalatchi looks "as if he had expected to see the blind ghost of his departed leader [Omar]" (*OI* 215). Immediately prior to this description, the narrator reveals that Babalatchi "face(s) the gods in the sublime privilege of his revolt" (*OI* 215), and the place where he sits is very

close to the location where "the fierce spirit of the incomparably accomplished pirate [Omar] took its flight" (*OI* 214). It is through such meditations that Babalatchi engineers his war of circumvention, and it is in the same seclusions that he would 'convene' with the spirits. It has been even argued that Babalatchi himself is "a sort of genie-like unhuman character" (Orr 39). Undoubtedly, the supernatural element in the text is an elaboration on the source of the ideas and convictions that drive Babalatchi, and similar revolting subalterns, to act against capitalist intrusion.

Babalatchi is not the only subaltern who is referred to in ghostly terms. Abdulla, for example, is associated by the narrator with "the good genii, who ordered the stars at his birth" (*OI* 111). Actually, despite Abdulla's being the 'co-executive' of Babalatchi's war, he very seldom appears in the text. Rather, his personality and actions are reported either by the narrator or by other characters in the two novels. He is the man about whom we hear more than we see, and, as such, he can be considered one of the many apparitions that haunt the narrative. Indeed, his "personality evades clear recognition" (Krenn 70), and therefore he remains enigmatic and powerful, like the very ghostly ideology being discussed here. Moreover, Aïssa is another subaltern who is portrayed in many instances as a phantom, an unfathomable woman extremely associated with the forest. Her physical semblance sometimes makes Willems go mad as he is highly baffled by the mysterious and 'exotic' woman with whom he is in love and by whom he is completely consumed. The narrator says "she appeared to him with the impalpable distinctness of a dream . . . standing before him like an apparition behind a transparent veil" (*OI* 70). By the same token, Mrs. Almayer is another exponent of resistance through whom the existence of subaltern ideology is figured mostly in terms of "superstitions" and reminiscences of indigenous mythic stories. The gist

of these stories is about the "glories," the "great splendor" and the "prowess" of the Sultan of Sulu, and how these traits "benumbed the hearts of white men" (*AF* 33). The narrator asserts these stories are rehearsed in a "monotonous" and "disconnected" way, as though to connote the idea that they are told by a necromancer. This witch-like portrayal is further endorsed by the "little brass cross" which she holds whenever she recites these tales. Of this cross, the narrator comments that "she contemplated it with superstitious awe. That superstitious feeling connected with some vague talismanic properties of the little bit of metal, and the still more hazy but terrible notion of some bad Djinns and horrible torments invented" (*AF* 33). The stories of the Sultan's struggle against Europeans, the figure of the sorceress, the superstitious cross, and the Djinns are all amalgamated in a moment of invoking and 'procuring' a zealous and ghostly call for resistance. When Nina listens to these stories, she would be impressed by the way "her mother's race shone far above the Orang Blanda" (*AF* 33). This is how Nina becomes highly attracted to the Malayan side of her identity and turns out to be one of the counteractive figures in that culture. She does so because of her 'ghostly' initiation into the apparitional ideology of subalterns.

Subaltern ideology is enigmatic and unpredictable, for in addition to being expressed through people's actions and behavior it is the mysterious power that controls the 'reaction' of the 'indigenous' trees and animals toward European intruders. This is established while Willems wanders through the forest, where "the very buffaloes snorted with alarm at his sight . . . and stared wildly in a compact herd at him" (*OI* 66). Similarly, the trees "nodded their broad leaves over his head as if in contemptuous pity of the wandering outcast" (*OI* 67). In fact, Willems becomes eventually aware of his crisis, the dilemma of being trapped and intimidated by an invisible foe in the middle of a detrimental, incognito setting: "He had a

notion of being lost amongst shapeless things that were dangerous and ghastly" (*OI* 80). The most 'epiphanic' moment that unveils to him his catastrophe takes place promptly after Omar's unperceivable attempt to kill him. Willems becomes terror-stricken:

> It was the unreasoning fear of this glimpse into the unknown things, into those motives, impulses, desires he had ignored, but that had lived in the breasts of despised men, close by his side, and were revealed to him for a second, to be hidden again behind the black mists of doubt and deception. It was not death that frightened him: it was the horror of bewildered life where he could understand nothing and nobody round him; where he could guide, control, comprehend nothing and no one—not even himself. (*OI* 149)

Subaltern ideology is here referred to as the "motives, impulses, [and] desires" which go completely unnoticed except for a "second" after the manner of ghosts. This description amounts even to a gothic milieu where Willems is powerless, puzzled and horrified. It is not without purpose that the narrative so repeatedly conveys the fact that Willems "could understand nothing" and "comprehend nothing."

Later, he tries to amend the situation with Lingard by attempting to explain to him the inexplicable, to make him comprehend that he, much the same as Lingard, was defeated by an enemy who is not like any other enemy. He warns him, again, that he can never piece together what Malayans might be thinking about and that "[t]he only thing you can know is that it isn't anything like what comes through their lips" (*OI* 268). Lingard does not believe him, replying sarcastically, "You have been possessed of a devil" (*OI* 273). In fact, Willems seems to be the only European who comes close to the bewildering and weird nature of subaltern ideology, but he fails to understand and 'decode' it. The way he is killed bears

witness to the uncanny and shadowy 'substance' of subaltern ideology. During this moment, Aïssa loses control of herself and becomes rather controlled by a spectral entity whose "voice" dictates her to take action. The narrator says, "she heard a whisper near her, the whisper of the dead Omar's voice saying in her ear: 'Kill! Kill!'" (*OI* 359). The agency of killing is ascribed to the spirit rather than to her. This whisper looks very analogous to the voices that Almayer hears in *Almayer's Folly*, just when Taminah comes to inform him of his daughter's elopement. While being half-asleep and shrouded with darkness, Almayer hears eerie voices: "And what were the voices saying? Urging him to move! Why? Move to destruction!" (119). As a matter of fact, the way the text exposes the miserable entrapment of European figures establishes a dramatic irony, a situation that is only grasped by the reader.

This is the world of Conrad's Southeast Asia, and this is how the text is haunted by an 'inexorcizeable' ghost responsible for the destruction of capitalist existence in that area. It is no wonder that the Lingard party will meet such a fate in this setting, which is described by Conrad as a world of "hallucination" (*PR* 21), a realm typified by "a hallucinated vision of forests and rivers and seas" (*PR* 19). And it is no wonder that capitalism cannot survive the cataclysmic war launched by the "Pantai band," as Conrad tends to call them (*PR* 23). While it has been argued that the "hallucination" and the "Pantai band" are amalgamated in order to effect the idea "that no such cohesive band or solidarity actually existed" (Yeow 26), I argue that these are meant to signify quite the opposite. In the two novels, prior to the defeat of capitalism, there is supposed to be multiple, different others (subalterns) and one unified Self (the Lingard group). This binary structure is completely ruptured in Conrad's fiction. The Self is rifted into antagonistic, objectified selves and the multiple others act harmoniously toward the destruction of the Self, becoming thereby a powerful, singular

Other. It follows then that the multiplicity becomes a singularity and the singularity becomes a multiplicity; or rather, the other becomes the Self and the Self becomes the other. This is a complete shift of concepts, a complete decentricity of the capitalist epistemological sphere. This shift is the result of the weird nature of the conflict between capitalism and subalternity. While capitalism is diagnosed as a body without a soul, subaltern ideology is a soul without a body, or a ghost. It goes without saying that it is futile to fight a ghost as we have never heard of a defeated one. It is indeed absurd and aimless because this ghost, this ideology, is significantly 'undecodable' and unpredictable as it exists beyond the boundaries of capitalist knowability. What is actually being rejected in the work of Conrad is the Capitalist/Eurocentric way of foreseeing and theorizing geopolitical interaction between different geopolitical zones, and therefore Conrad makes a point here in calling attention to the existence of other geohistorical realities and ideologies that have independent subjectivities.

At the beginning of this chapter I have discussed the significance of the phrase "the French mind set the Egyptian muscle in motion" that the narrator uses in the context of alluding to the French invasion of Egypt. However, what we have at stake here is completely the opposite, for the "mind" turns to be associated with subalterns, who make capitalism only a body (which parallels the "muscle"). Truly, the text ends up with allowing only one ideology to be in control. While a number of Conrad's critics have argued that the text of these two novels is dialogic by allowing for various points of view (White 127; Henthorne 33; Yeow 27), I postulate that the narrative is by no means polyphonic per se; it does not allow for a simultaneous multiplicity of voices. If we count upon the concomitant relationship of space and time, the narrative then becomes dialogic only in space but not in

time. This is because temporal simultaneousness is impossible as the narrative moves from the worldview of capitalism to that of the peripheral subalterns. As such, the only way of seeing their co-existence is through the spatial perspective. Therefore, the narrative becomes (as I shall call it) *transmonologic* (or transideological), and this condition of *transmonologicality* describes exactly the teleological process of the narrative's movement from a dying ideology to the floating, incomprehensible ideology that is characteristic of peripherality.

NOTES

[1] For further information about the rising monopoly of the VOC, see chapter five in Anthony Reid, *Southeast Asia in the Age of Commerce*.

[2] In fact, some areas came directly under British authority, and some parts were indirectly controlled by the British. This is explained by Anthony Webster: "The second half of the nineteenth century saw a rapid expansion of the British empire in south east Asia. By 1900 the Malay peninsula, Burma and northern Borneo had all been subjected to direct rule, while Siam had been drawn into Britain's informal empire" (167).

[3] For a detailed and comprehensive consideration of the history of imperialism in Southeast Asia, see, in addition to the references cited so far, Anthony Reid, ed., *Southeast Asia in the Early Modern Era*; Victor Lieberman, *Strange Parallels*; and Nicholas Tarling, ed., *The Cambridge History of Southeast Asia*.

[4] The Aceh War, referred to as the "Acheen war" by Conrad (*AF* 38), took place when the Dutch colonial government invaded Aceh under the leadership of Major General Johan Harmen Rudolf Köhler. Like the experiences of most Dutch characters in Conrad's fiction, interestingly, Köhler's expedition failed, and he was killed in the course of the event.

[5] See, for example, Linda Dryden, *Joseph Conrad and the Imperial Romance*, and see also Andrea White, *Joseph Conrad and the Adventure Tradition*.

[6] In trying to understand the real reasons behind the failure of the socialist revolution in Italy, Gramsci reflected critically on previously established theories about possible ways of enacting the social transition from Capitalism to Socialism. In doing so, Gramsci revisited Karl Marx's views about the relationship between society's "base" and "superstructure" and posited a more sophisticated understanding of this relationship. More specifically, for Marx,

the entirety of the relations of production "constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness" ("Preface" 425). Thus, primacy here is given to the economic base because, according to Marx, it "conditions the social, political, and intellectual life process in general. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness" ("Preface" 425). Accordingly, any attempt that aims at effecting the social transition to a new mode of production should be worked out within the economic materiality of society.

CHAPTER THREE

IN AFRICA: HAMPERED BY THE COGITO/'MADNESS'

More than three decades ago, the African writer and critic, Chinua Achebe, presented a lecture at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, in which he blasted Conrad's "Heart of Darkness" with severe criticism.[1] Achebe's attack is grounded on his belief that Conrad's Africans are intentionally misrepresented and such misrepresentation conforms to a Western discriminatory propensity against Africa. "Heart of Darkness," Achebe avows, "projects the image of Africa as 'the other world,' the antithesis of Europe and therefore of civilization, a place where man's vaunted intelligence and refinement are finally mocked by triumphant bestiality" (1785). This treatment of Africa, Achebe insists, is a compelling reason for dubbing Conrad as a "thoroughgoing racist" (1789), the point that Achebe wants ultimately to bear out in his lecture. While my aim in this chapter is not, in any way, to take issue with Achebe's standpoint (although I believe such critical assessment needs modification), I intend here to use his comments so as to establish an entry into "Heart of Darkness" and "An Outpost of Progress," which are the focus of my analysis in exploring Conrad's treatment of capitalism in the peripheral zone of Africa.

Notably, Achebe's depreciation of Conrad's work induces us to reflect upon the position of Conrad's African subalterns within the geopolitical formula of the global system, as conceived by Conrad, and the role that Africa plays in bringing about the downfall of this system. What I want to accentuate tentatively is that Achebe's verdict is true, *in some measure*, with regard to the portrayal of Africans in "Heart of Darkness" (though not so with regard to Conrad's 'racism'). To be more accurate, I am here interested in the dynamic role of Africans in the *political economy* of the story more than in their static picture whose

stereotypical representation is thoroughly undeniable. This is because the latter, I believe, is largely dependent upon the powerful existence of the former, and this is a relation upon which I will elaborate shortly. What is unexpected and bewildering is the way the indigenous people are quarantined and banished on their own land, and I say 'unexpected' especially in the context of envisioning the vigorous agency of subalterns I have examined thus far. What I need mostly to spell out in this regard is recapitulated in Hunt Hawkins' words that "Conrad's story barely shows the Congolese. None of the African characters has a name. With the exception of Kurtz's mistress, no African appears for more than a full paragraph. We do not go into the minds of any of the Africans to see the situation from their point of view. In fact, they barely speak" (163). While the situation is true, our consideration of Conrad's 'version' of subalterns in the second chapter would indeed problematize this characterization and make it very arduous to accept this Conradian break apropos peripheral peoples. Conrad's Southeast Asian and African subalterns are paralleled on the level of their being stereotyped (that they are 'savage,' 'ugly,' etc.); however, the latter are not afforded the former's commanding subjectivity and political lead. That is, we would not simply expect such passivity/invisibility from African subalterns given what we have seen from their Malay counterparts. The vital agency of subalterns in the second chapter stands as a defiant guard and shattering power against any textual tendency toward stereotyping—or rather 'staticizing'—and a consequent expulsion out of history. That is why, as I have suggested, the passive essentialism of the natives is largely effected by the geopolitical space they occupy. But in "Heart of Darkness," and similarly in "Outpost of Progress," we do not see the Babalatchi, Lakamba, and Abdulla of the second chapter. We do not see in Africans the same dynamism of the Malayans that serves to protect their independent subjectivity.

The question is why? Before getting into solving this puzzling situation I should remark yet again that my aim here is not to examine this representation of Conrad's Africans but rather to establish it as a first step into appraising the geopolitical role of Africa and its people(s) in impacting the capitalist system (this role being decisively detrimental to this system in the two novels studies in the previous chapter). In fact, one of the possible solutions to this problem (of Africa's representation) is suggested in Achebe's polemical lecture itself: "Students of *Heart of Darkness* will often tell you that Conrad is concerned not so much with Africa as with the deterioration of one European mind caused by solitude and sickness" (1789). Of course, such apologetic argument is utterly rejected by Achebe as he finds it grounded upon "preposterous and perverse arrogance" (1790). Despite Achebe's dismissal of this explanation, however, I will pause here to see what further implications this argument might lead to. For if the African sphere *seems* empty, that would probably mean Conrad is directing our attention this time to the European one, to look for traces of meaning and key elements that characterize how Conrad diagnoses the capitalist presence in Africa. For now, I will accept this premise in order to postulate that this is effected by a narrative and significational strategy whose rules and web of construction are different from what is posited in the second chapter. That is, if Conrad's *Almayer's Folly* and *An Outcast of the Islands* are inherently structured out of a transmonolical formula that exists between Europe and Africa (i.e., a formula whereby the conflict in Southeast Asia results in a ghostly Malay ideology destroying and succeeding a capitalist one), the narrative strategy in "Heart of Darkness" is developed out of another geopolitical scheme whose foregrounded players are Europe and Europe, or rather 'two Europes.'

However, an important caveat should be added here: when I say "Heart of Darkness" has two Europes, that is not to say Africa is situated only as a backdrop or a 'decoration' of the geopolitical scene. On the contrary; I shall argue that it is standing *actively* if indirectly between the two poles of the formula. This active position of Africa constitutes, in my view, the supreme rationale behind the failure of capitalism with regard to the African periphery, which is the hypothesis that this chapter ultimately intends to corroborate. Besides, despite my observation that Africa *is there*, still, part of Achebe's claim with regard to the passivity of the natives remains true, posing a complex situation, in which both Achebe's characterization and my claim are part of the new textual 'game' we will encounter in "Heart of Darkness." My primary step in fathoming out this textual composition is thus to approach it from its Western part, from within the European capitalist mission.

I will start from what I have 'missed' in the first chapter, my assumption being that "Heart of Darkness" reveals some ideological practices that are foundational to the rhetoric of capitalist colonialism, but which are not fully ripe to yield their timely effects in the former two novels. Most prominently, the *mission civilisatrice* is the imperialist pretext that is so evident in "Heart of Darkness" but is far less ubiquitous in Conrad's Malayan fiction. In fact, it is an important aspect of imperialist rhetoric that is usually concomitant with the colonizer's tendency to create the stereotypes that necessitate the work of 'civilization.' Simply put, because the indigenous people are 'uncivilized,' the colonizer steps in with his 'civilizational tools.' This crude formula can be gleaned from narrative 'throwaways' scattered in Conrad's Southeast Asian setting, especially through remarks attributed to Lingard. The Rajah Laut is presented as a patronizing figure for his European fellows, but such 'fatherly' impulse is sometimes extended to include the Malayans in general and the

people of Sambir in particular. He gives the impression that he adopts Mrs. Almayer, after destroying her people, and sends her to be educated out of this condescending impulse. His exploitation of Sambir by monopolizing its trade is unsuccessfully camouflaged through the same language, as he plainly tells Babalatchi, "If I ever spoke to Patalolo, like an elder brother, it was for your good—for the good of all" (*OI* 226). While here Lingard is assuming the role of the 'big brother,' in other instances he tries to behave as a father-figure: "I brought prosperity to that place. I composed their quarrels, and saw them grow under my eyes. There's peace and happiness there" (*OI* 45). This paternal image of imperialists is in fact not limited to the fiction of Conrad; it was common in late Victorian literature, especially in the works of Rudyard Kipling. This fact is stressed by McClure, who observes that "Kipling and other late Victorian apologists for imperialism liked to portray the relationship between colonized and colonizer in terms of the family: the natives were children; their European masters, gentle fathers" (107). However, according to McClure, the peculiarity of Conrad lies in "affirming it [this paternal image] in a new fashion. The imperialist is indeed a father, but not a benign one" (107). As such, if it exists at all, Lingard's paternity is far exceeded by his atrocities (while he adopts Mrs. Almayer, for example, he has already terminated her people). By the same token, what is true in the case of Lingard is also so with Willems, "the prince of good fellows" (*OI* 24), who "patronize[s] loftily his dark-skinned brother-in-law" (*OI* 3), and who "had done them [Da Souzas] the honour to marry their daughter" (*OI* 4). These are but some among other examples, which, when studied carefully, would allow us to see how this image of imperialists amounts to a recurrent motif in Conrad's early fiction.

However, in his African fiction, this motif is developed into a much more eminent impetus that is of great consequence for the capitalist enterprise in Africa. While Lingard and

his protégés are driven to the Southeast Asian front with aims inherent in capital accumulation, in Conrad's African fiction, a whole company, typical of various others, embarks on capitalist aims under the disguise of 'civilizing work.' But what is significant in this regard is not the disguise itself but rather the way this cultural practice is a guarantee for upholding the imperialist project for a long time. This point is made clear by Edward Said, who explains, "Supported jointly by the experts in ideas (missionaries, teachers, advisers, scholars) and in modern industry and communication, the imperial idea of westernizing the backward achieved permanent status world-wide" (*Culture* 131). The reason that empowers this 'permanent status' is, in line with Said's contention, the false transformation of a purely materialistic practice into a feigned spiritual sphere. Said proclaims that "[f]or the European of the late nineteenth century, an interesting range of options are offered, all premised upon the subordination and victimization of the native" (*Culture* 131). Among these options, Said asserts, "is the idea of Western salvation and redemption through its 'civilizing mission'" (*Culture* 131). This elongated power of imperialism through "redemption" and "salvation" rationalizations, previously insinuated in his early fiction, is what Conrad brings to the foreground in his African setting.

Whether in Europe or in Africa, Conrad's Europeans cling to such cultural practice far and wide. This is underscored right at the beginning of "Heart of Darkness," upon Marlow's getting appointed by the Belgian Company to be sent to the Congo. Marlow's mission is to replace Fresleven, the Danish captain who, before being killed by the natives, "had been a couple of years already out there engaged in the noble cause" ("HD" 54). The reader is intended right away to understand that the whole story will take place as Marlow sets forth for a journey that is rationalized by the same 'noble cause.' While being in the

Company's headquarters in order to sign the contract, he sees a large map that is "marked with all the colours of a rainbow. There was a vast amount of red—good to see at any time, because one knows that some real work is done in there" ("HD" 55). Again, Marlow, much the same as the reader, is to understand that the noble cause should be translated to this "real work," which he will commence very soon. The map's colors are to leave the impression that progress and civilization are not merely a language that the company disseminates; it is rather 'real,' 'tangible,' and 'sincere.' Marlow is recurrently and overwhelmingly reminded of such 'reality.' When he meets the Company's doctor, who "glorified the Company's business" ("HD" 57), he is praised and encouraged as the doctor tells him, "So you are going out there. Famous. Interesting, too" ("HD" 58). This weighty deployment of the cultural logic behind the Company's business makes Marlow almost believe in it. "It appeared," says he, "I was also one of the Workers, with a capital—you know. Something like an emissary of light, something like a lower sort of apostle" ("HD" 59). Besides, while in Europe, Marlow's experience externalizes the scope within which this rhetoric is constructed as a web throughout society, for he is subjected to it even outside the limits of the Company's business, in the very texture of society and to the last moment before he leaves for Africa. When he goes to bid his aunt farewell, she recaps what he has already understood: the "weaning [of] those ignorant millions from their horrid ways" ("HD" 59). If imperialistic 'passions' toward the natives are 'fatherly' in Conrad's Malayan fiction, here the capitalist enterprise is ironically afforded stronger 'passions' as the father is replaced by the 'mother,' who usually does the task of the "weaning." Ironically, the damages done in Conrad's Malaya are nothing compared to what Marlow witnesses in the Congo. Thus, more passions, more atrocities.

In Africa, while being at the Central Station, Marlow again encounters the linguistic clichés he used to hear in Europe. The brickmaker reminds him of "the cause intrusted to us by Europe" ("HD" 79), though Marlow becomes now fully aware of the hypocrisy behind such fallacious claims. Despite the visible, detrimental effects of imperialism in Africa, these clichés are scattered everywhere and are even encountered in unexpected loci. This coincidence of coming across the "noble cause" is exemplified in the experience of Kayerts and Carlier in "An Outpost of Progress":

> They also found some old copies of a home paper. That print discussed what it was pleased to call "Our Colonial Expansion" in high-flown language. It spoke much of the rights and duties of civilization, of the sacredness of the civilizing work, and extolled the merits of those who went about bringing light, and faith and commerce to the dark places of the earth. Carlier and Kayerts read, wondered, and began to think better of themselves. Carlier said one evening, waving his hand about, "In a hundred years, there will be perhaps a town here. Quays, and warehouses, and barracks, and—and—billiard-rooms. Civilization, my boy, and virtue—and all. And then, chaps will read that two good fellows, Kayerts and Carlier, were the first civilized men to live in this very spot!" (94-95)

What I want to ascertain here is how the "rights and duties of civilization," how "the sacredness of the civilizing work," is typified by three elemental features. First, the language of the mission civilisatrice is *distributed* and integrated in a multiplicity of economic, cultural, and even medical institutions and practices. Marlow is subjected to it at the Company's headquarters, in the speech of common people, and through the beliefs of

physicians. Kayerts and Carlier stumble upon it in the printed media. Second, it is *regulated* and maintained consistently by certain rules and codes through which such expressions of civilization and progress are filtered. Marlow, as well as the reader, can unsurprisingly predict what is to be spoken and written with regard to the European presence in Africa. Finally, it is *expanded* across a large geopolitical scope with the same degree of distribution and regulation, as it is inhered in the convictions of people throughout the continent (Marlow is English, Fresleven is Danish, Kurtz is German, the Company is Belgian, etc.).

Thus, such type of language (in its production, consistency, regulation, and distribution) is rendered essentially and predominantly a *discourse* in the literal sense described in the work of Michel Foucault. "[I]n every society," Foucault maintains, "the production of discourse is at once controlled, selected, organised and redistributed by a certain number of procedures whose role is to ward off its powers and dangers, to gain mastery over its chance events, to evade its ponderous, formidable materiality" ("Order of Discourse" 52). The discourse of progress, in Conrad's African fiction, can indeed be aligned with "those discourses which, over and above their formulation, are said indefinitely, remain said, and are to be said again" (Foucault, "Order of Discourse" 57). It is this fact that I want to set up here as a premise for consequent analysis because capitalist failure will come out from a mutilation of the very crux of this discourse. By this, I do not mean to simply argue that "Heart of Darkness" and "An Outpost of Progress" attack capitalist hypocrisy and disclose the truth behind its discursive practices. I believe it is very evident that Conrad subverts the liberal humanitarian language disseminated by colonialist powers throughout the European continent. What interests me in this chapter is rather how this discourse is produced, circulated, geopolitically transported, mutilated, and eventually transformed into

something very dangerous to the very existence of the capitalist system. For the rest of this chapter, I intend to explore this fact, within and without the text, by examining the implications of most concepts that Foucault associates with discourse, like discipline, power, knowledge, madness, and exclusion. But I will pause briefly at this point in order to establish the historical context in which "Heart of Darkness" was written and which is highly illuminating in our consideration of such seemingly humanitarian discourse.

In 1876, King Leopold II of Belgium, head of the regime whose ruthlessness is reported in "Heart of Darkness," called for what came to be known as the Brussels Geographic Conference (12-14 September) in the very city where Conrad's Marlow signs his contract. The ostensible aim of this conference is participation in the 'civilizing' work of Europe in the African continent, especially the abolition of the slave trade. The king invited experts and explorers from different countries, including "famous explorers," "geographers," "humanitarians," "business executives," and "military men" (Hochschild 43-44). It was interestingly reported that "[n]ever in the nineteenth century had so many eminent Europeans in the field of exploration gathered in one spot" (Hochschild 44). The real imperialistic aims in holding this conference were in fact veiled by the very rhetoric he uses in his opening speech:

> To open to civilization the only part of our globe where it has yet to penetrate, to pierce the darkness which envelops whole populations, it is, I dare to say, a crusade worthy of this century of progress.
>
> It appears to me that Belgium, a central and neutral state, should be territory well chosen for our meeting and it is that which has emboldened me to summon you today to my home in our little conference which I have the

> great satisfaction of opening today. Needless to say, in bringing you to Brussels I was in no way motivated by selfish designs. No, gentlemen, if Belgium is small, she is happy and satisfied with her lot. My only ambition is to serve her. (qtd. in Pakenham 21)

This type of rhetoric was always ready for the King whenever he wanted to disguise his haunting ambition of having a colony. A year before the time of the conference, he expressed to the British Ambassador his concern that it was a timely opportunity for Belgium to have a share in "the great work of civilization, following in the footsteps, however modestly, of England" (qtd. in Pakenham 14). England in fact had a leading role in the business of 'civilization' as its empire was expanded around the globe from Latin America to Southeast Asia (which is the geographical scope of this dissertation). But most European imperialist powers were drawing upon the same humanitarian impulse even to an ironic extent: "Even Portugal, an impoverished and backward European nation in the imperialist era, could still presume that it had a destiny to civilize the natives in Africa!" (Rodney 138). The normalcy of this European disposition toward 'progress' largely facilitated Leopold's proposition, which was eventually actualized.

The conference resulted in the establishment of the International African Association and the election of King Leopold as President. National committees were also founded in different countries, including Belgium, Spain, Portugal, Italy, England, Switzerland, Netherlands, and others. The task of these committees was to spread awareness about their work and raise funds for the implementation of the "noble cause" behind their plans. Predictably, people's reception of the conference news went along the lines of the same discourse prevalent in Europe at that time: "all over Europe high-minded people, who read of

this crusade in their newspapers, thought it a triumph for the King. . . . they talked of the Leopold who was leading a modern crusade against the slave trade, the *beau sabreur*, a chivalric hero like Godfroid de Bouillon" (Pakenham 22).[2] What I want to emphasize in the context of this incident is how Conrad's fiction externalizes exactly a parallel discourse whose power and effects are felt along the hierarchy of the social structure. This fact is reflected in the political, national and scientific diversity (or rather distribution) of those invited to the conference; the different social levels on which this discourse is materialized (from the king's position to the bottom of the social hierarchy); and the extent to which such a discourse is practiced as common-sense knowledge. For despite the fact that the King "had been thought dull, even boorish" (Pakenham 22), he is now conceived of as a hero due to the discourse he used.

The truth about the victimization of a whole African country could not, even by the end of the nineteenth century, challenge the validity of the liberal humanitarian clichés used in that discourse. In his book *King Leopold's Ghost*, Adam Hochschild documents the 'horror,' as Conrad puts it through the mouth of Kurtz, of the Belgian brutal system inflicted upon the Congolese: the killing, physical mutilation, forced labor and looting of the land. King Leopold, Hochschild asserts, "was after whatever could be quickly harvested. In that sense, he treated both vacant and nonvacant land as his property, claiming a right to all its products" (117).[3] While it might have been possible for someone, living in the time of Leopold, to express this truth plainly and straightforwardly, this expression of the truth is a tenuous statement because it could never be integrated into the current discourse at that time, and therefore it would remain valueless and meaningless. The insignificance of such truthful statements, according to Foucault, is conditioned by the fact that the integrity and intactness

of discourse is maintained through a number of rules of exclusion. Among these is the distinction between "true" and "false," which renders "true" all those statements that obey certain discursive rules and excludes as "false" those that do not. "It is always possible," says Foucault, "that one might speak the truth in the space of a wild exteriority, but one is 'in the true' only by obeying the rules of a discursive 'policing'" ("Order of Discourse" 61). Accordingly, to say that Leopold's campaign is a hypocritical and rapacious enterprise is to be, to use Foucault's expression, out of the "régime of truth" (*Power/Knowledge* 131). However, other verbalisms like that of Marlow's aunt ("weaning those ignorant millions from their horrid ways") are altogether predictable and are "in the true" because they obey the discursive policing of the capitalist enterprise in Africa. This dualistic configuration of "true" and "false" is the first notion I would like to demonstrate here because it is highly significant in understanding the circulation of the 'humanitarian' discourse and its ultimate fate in Conrad's work.

The second idea is that which pertains to knowledge and power. The aforesaid "true" and "false" statements, when looked at from another perspective, are ways of producing knowledge. But what further distinguish them are their respective positions in the chain of power relationships. This concern is equally important for Foucault in his analysis of discourse because, he asserts, one should attempt "to see how men govern (themselves and others) by the production of truth" ("Questions" 79). Foucault's contention in this respect can be illustrated in what had been proposed in the Brussels Geographic Conference and the knowledge constructed by its national committees. To say that Africa's political and social circumstances compel Europe's mediation is a way of engendering knowledge. Yet, producing knowledge in this way is basically a form of practicing power and exerting it over

those who are not in an equal position of power. Accordingly, power generates certain rules of knowledge construction, or rather, to use Foucault again, "the laws of a certain code of knowledge" (*Order of Things* ix). There are numerous exemplifications of this paradigm in "Heart of Darkness," the most outstanding being drawing maps. One might ask 'on what basis does Europe formulate such maps whereby some places are dark and some are not?' What is the rationalization that hinders Africans from drawing their own or at least playing upon the game of colors? Power and knowledge are, following Foucault, inter-related: "[T]here is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations" (*Discipline* 27). Thus, the production of maps helps circumstantiate the status quo with regard to the power relationship between Europe and Africa, and, conversely, this imbalanced relationship is a qualification for begetting ancillary knowledge about, for example, the geography, cultures, and languages of Africa.

The third and most imperative conception associated with the circulation of discourse in "Heart of Darkness" is that of discipline and its correlation with surveillance. By discipline, I mean the way people (like Marlow and Conrad) are expected to practice self-restraint with regard to their beliefs and utterances. The most explicative instance of this principle, I believe, is Marlow's response to his aunt's remark about the mission of "weaning." Marlow tells us, "I ventured to hint that the Company was run for profit" ("HD" 59). Notably, the words Marlow verbalizes characterize essentially the emotional and physical condition of his position within the chain of power relationships, and by 'zooming in' on these words we can analyze far larger power structures. In doing so, in fact, I am following Foucault, who contends that "in thinking of the mechanisms of power, I am

thinking rather of its capillary form of existence, the point where power reaches into the very grain of individuals" (*Power/Knowledge* 39). Of course, Marlow's response can easily be acknowledged as a statement existing outside the "régime of truth" and hence will be discursively deemed useless and redundant. What is specifically interesting in these words is his use of "ventured" and "hint," which connote a mental mood contingent upon the discursive position where he exactly expresses these words. He "ventured." Thus, there must exist an imminent risk in doing so, thereby requiring him to be cautious. Because it is dangerous, he resorts to hinting at—or disguising—his intention in order to be safe. But the mere hinting in this case is also perilous because the venture is not associated with expressing firmly and directly what he wishes to produce verbally, but with the act of doing so in disguise. Based upon these psychological and discursively material conditions, it can be deduced that Marlow is fully aware of the transgression that can result from articulating the truth. Consequently, Marlow does not say what he intends to say; rather, he exerts upon himself a form of discipline.

Marlow's self-discipline, however, is also the result of self-surveillance, and that is why he abstains from giving direct expression to his thought. It appears as though somebody were watching him, but there isn't any one, or rather this 'somebody' is invisible. It should be clear that Marlow is living in a *carceral* society. In the carceral, according to Foucault,

> There is no need for arms, physical violence, material constraints. Just a gaze. An inspecting gaze, a gaze which each individual under its weight will end by interiorising to the point that he is his own overseer, each individual thus exercising this surveillance over, and against, himself. A superb formula:

> power exercised continuously and for what turns out to be a minimal cost. (*Power/Knowledge* 155)

It is Marlow's interiorization of this gaze, or what Foucault calls more accurately the "collective and anonymous gaze" (*Power/Knowledge* 154), that explains the fear and danger behind his thought. However, why should it be at all worrisome and perilous? What would happen if Marlow utters the plain truth? I am raising this question to keep in mind for consequent analysis, its answer being very important in my discussion of Kurtz below. Suffice it to say, in this regard, that publicizing the truth would not only be considered unintelligible, or 'undiscursive,' but also devastating for its subject.

Actually, Conrad's text unfolds other narrative indicia that substantiate this concept of the carceral. When Marlow arrives at the Central Station, he meets the manager, who seems in Marlow's eyes a very ordinary person and who "could keep the routine going—that's all" ("HD" 74). Yet, what most distinguishably draws Marlow's attention is the manager's gaze: "His eyes, of the usual blue, were perhaps remarkably cold, and he certainly could make his glance fall on one as trenchant and heavy as an axe" ("HD" 73). While it could be true, based on Marlow's impression, that the manager is performing the role of the surveillor, the way Marlow perceives the weight of the manager's gaze is a reflection of its very interiorization within Marlow's consciousness. Moreover, the manager "was obeyed, yet he inspired neither love nor fear, nor even respect. He inspired uneasiness. That was it! Uneasiness" ("HD" 73). Marlow's impressionistic characterization of the manager is quite fathomable if the manager is contextualized within the confines of the carceral.

In fact, Marlow's impressions amount to factual observation when he interestingly reports that the manager "ordered an immense round table to be made, for which a special

house had to be built. This was the station's mess-room. Where he sat was the first place—the rest were nowhere. . . . He was quiet" ("HD" 74). The structure of the dining hall—its round shape and the centrality of manager's seat—is reminiscent of Jeremy Bentham's "Panopticon," on which Foucault builds his theory of the carceral. While being seated at the dining table, the Company's agents are literally and symbolically observed by the manager, who can see the rest with one gaze. His being "quiet" is perhaps an effect of his rapt gaze, rendering him a typical spy. Besides, if the manager's gaze is deductively established, that of the brickmaker, the manager's closest agent, is exposed candidly in the text. Marlow is told that the brickmaker is "the manager's spy upon them" ("HD" 77). Of course, Marlow is not simply telling a rumor circulating among the agents, for the whole conditions of the brickmaker's stay at the Central Station authenticate reasonably what Marlow has been told. The brickmaker is introduced by his profession, but Marlow does not observe any imprint of brickmaking; rather, the brickmaker is simply waiting. After all, brickmaking does not befit a "young aristocrat," as Marlow describes him ("HD" 77). What is equally outlandish is that neither the manager nor the brickmaker has name, though there are minor characters who have, like Fresleven, who is already dead. This would very likely designate the anonymity of the gaze, which is how it looks in a panoptic system. Marlow becomes finally aware of the reality behind the weirdness of this man's business when he reflects upon the reason why the brickmaker wants to socialize with him: "He alluded constantly to Europe, to the people I was supposed to know there—putting leading questions as to my acquaintances in the sepulchral city, and so on" ("HD" 78). Notwithstanding the fact that the brickmaker wants to inquire about Marlow's relationship with Kurtz, his questions evidently characterize him as a spy like those we see in *The Secret Agent*.

To sum up, then, these are the conditions which I intend to delineate in discussing the discursive practices peculiar to the European sphere: the distinction between true and false, the relationship between power and knowledge, and the reality of the carceral. All of these are conditioning and conditioned factors with regard to the 'civilization' business and its discourse. To put it more accurately, the three conditions work together as a subordinate safety-valve for the dynamism of the discourse of progress. I shall call the wholeness of these inter-related parts (discourse with its tripodal facades) a discursive tripod. Most important, the success and continuance of the capitalist system in integrating and maintaining the African periphery (or the Congo as a representative in Conrad's text) is greatly contingent upon the integrity of this tripodal structure. For that reason, my analysis will be henceforth directed toward the (con)textual strategy that violates any predictability filtered through this tripod and ultimately ruptures it. And by tearing asunder this system, the text establishes an antagonistic power that threatens the very continuity of the unequal Euro-African correlation within the global system. The quintessence of this power is generated in Africa and will transcend any geoideological barrier until it secures a European base from which danger will spread out. Of course, I am speaking in abstract terms, but my analysis below will translate into concrete details every step in this train of a backfiring, ideological tsunami (so to speak), coming from an African eruption. While doing so, specifically, I will focus on the characters of Marlow and Kurtz, and I will comment briefly on Kayerts.

I will start from the point where Marlow himself commences his journey, and I will investigate the psycho-physical shifts that Marlow goes through along the way to the Inner Station, where Kurtz works. In this respect, I would like to raise the following question: what is Marlow's journey about? Of course Marlow tells us that he was sent by the Company in

order to take the position of Fresleven and to pilot a steamboat up the Congo River to the Inner Station. However, this is merely a pretext for the construction of a larger text, and I am raising this question from a philosophical point of view. That is, why does he tell us at all about what has happened during this journey? Marlow, the sailor who presents himself as a seemingly 'naïve' person prior to the time of his journey (while in fact he is not), is not the same person aboard the *Nellie* telling his experience to his addressees and to the world. One can very easily trace this archetype of spiritual metamorphosis, which is made possible through Marlow's epiphanic experience in the Congo. This interpretation, which is quite true, can be termed the 'classical' meaning behind the text. Similarly, it has been suggested that Marlow plays the role of Plato's Socrates by managing to leave the European 'Cave' and come back as an enlightened philosopher, whose role is to help others shed their ignorance and transcend their sightlessness. This is, for example, the critical method followed by Mary Morzinski, who believes that Conrad is "a seeker of truth, a philosopher in the Platonic sense" (227). Gail Fincham, moreover, draws an analogous comparison between Plato's Allegory of the Cave and "Heart of Darkness" in order to establish what Fincham believes is a "reverse parable." That is, while European colonists are chained within the cave, "the indigenous Congolese are the philosophers capable of releasing the prisoners" (97). Despite my disagreement with the latter's argument (for the Congolese barely exist in the story), I do agree that Conrad's text, on a certain hermeneutic level, is a Platonic criticism of the imperialist blindness to the illnesses brought in the name of humanitarianism.

A third, and more important, approach would be to argue that Marlow's journey is a Cartesian one, in which I am mostly interested. Again, this is not a new postulation in the critical tradition established on Conrad's fiction. Robert Strozier, for instance, explores the

ways in which Descartes' interiorization process is applicable to the story of Marlow. He first suggests that there are two types of knowledge that can be deducted from the Cartesian cogito: the "ascesis" (which has to do with self-knowledge) and exterior awareness (of the material world). By approaching the story from this perspective, Strozier claims that the heart of darkness in the story "cannot be known, except as self-experience" (25). He basically means that "what is missing is Kurtz's interiority, his own first-person narration," and that is why "Kurtz is always an enigma to Marlow" (25). Contrary to what Strozier posits, I maintain, first, that Marlow's story is not grounded upon the ascesis whatsoever; rather, it is structured in the context of an extrinsic materiality, which is, in this case, discourse. Second, as I will discuss below, Kurtz's experience is not enigmatic; it is quite the opposite. His experience is not only accessible to Marlow but is made so for the reader as well, though indirectly. Therefore, my approach to the Cartesian subject in the story is dissimilar in method and aim.

I am basically interested in the Cartesian cogito as a method, as a principle of doubt about the material world, not in the subject of the cogito itself. In the first place, Marlow's physical movement with regard to the material discourse under discussion can be related to the way Descartes dissociates himself from the materiality of cognitive barriers standing in his way to the cogito. Detaching himself in his stove-room, Descartes tried to transcend reality in order to question the very basis of his existence. "There was no conversation to occupy me," Descartes asserts, "and being untroubled by any cares or passions, I remained all day alone in a warm room. There I had plenty of leisure to examine my ideas" (10). What is highly noteworthy in this Cartesian method is his dissociation from entanglement in the material web of reality, first (symbolically) through his being locked up in privacy and,

second, through a process of mental independence, becoming thereby a self-contained, psycho-physical island. The significance of this condition is stressed through Descartes' reiteration of it on many occasions, especially in the following, longer passage:

> The present is opportune for my design; I have freed my mind of all kinds of cares; I feel myself, fortunately, disturbed by no passions; and I have found a serene retreat in peaceful solitude. I will therefore make a serious and unimpeded effort to destroy generally all my former opinions. (75)

Following Descartes, I want to stress the duality (material and ideological) of transference that Marlow goes through in his mission to Africa. While it seems easy for Marlow, and actually for anyone, to materialize the physical side of this condition (there is no need for such theoretical 'much-ado' about it), what matters is in fact the other side, the ideological one. But the latter, as Descartes makes clear, is conditioned by the former.

"Heart of Darkness" establishes this Cartesian rule right at the beginning, when the anonymous narrator singles out Marlow from the rest of the sailors on the basis of this accompaniment between the mental and the physical. The narrator affirms that "he [Marlow] did not represent his class. He was a seaman, but he was a wanderer, too, while most seamen lead, if one may so express it, a sedentary life. *Their minds are of the stay-at-home order*, and their home is always with them—the ship; and so is their country—the sea" ("HD" 48; emphasis added). Like Marlow (and Descartes), the narrator is fully aware of such philosophical dimensions and is alerting us to look for the Cartesian element of mental transcendence which is implied in the cogito. Therefore, Marlow is meticulously a Cartesian character thus far. I am emphasizing this superstructural mutability reflected in Marlow's cognitive transformation, but we need to recognize that the very motion of Marlow's

mentality exists also on the level of materiality. We can see this when we move another step in Marlow's journey, when we reflect upon the 'substance' of his journey. That is, while Marlow moves geographically away from Europe, he is also getting outside of its discourse, which might be considered mental, but which should be treated as material. This is basically the way Foucault approaches discourse, which he considers as a fabric with "ponderous, formidable materiality" ("Order of Discourse" 52). I am focusing on the role of materiality because it means that the outcome of Marlow's benefit upon his journey is going to be in the realm of the physically tangible. It is going to be something real that can be directly felt and which can affect the materiality of the discourse being discussed here. For if Marlow's reaction is limited only to the spiritual, that means his efforts are meaningless and useless with regard to the discourse he is criticizing. His journey, therefore, will be in the realm of truth but not "in the true." I am establishing this textual fundamentality because it is highly relevant to our discussion when we come to the level of *active* resistance.

Marlow's success in disentangling himself from the materiality of discourse (through the cogito) is also accentuated by the narrator, who again exhibits highly what Marlow's journey is about to yield. The narrator, once again, insists on the peculiarity of Marlow and his experience: "Marlow was not typical (if his propensity to spin yarns be excepted), and to him the meaning of an episode was not inside like a kernel but outside, enveloping the tale which brought it out only as a glow brings out a haze" ("HD" 48). Marlow's *positive* eccentricity is stressed recurrently, so that we can pause and think about those textual elements (or the elements of the 'yarn') that make him different. Based on this eccentricity, Marlow is aware that meaning is not inside the *Panopticon* but rather outside it, in a secluded realm of a Cartesian setting. The yarn, in this case, is not meant to designate

exclusively the story itself, but it can be generically apprehended as the material out of which larger structures are spun. Decidedly, the most prominent of these structures is the web of the discourse whence Marlow's 'exodus,' so to speak, is being reported. Besides, the yarn is bracketed together with the two women who are "guarding the door of Darkness, [and] knitting black wool" at the Company ("HD" 57). The image of these women is reminiscent of the mythological *Rota Fortunae*, who is an emblem of the same determinism that characterizes the way people behave within the confines of discourse, which stands in stark contrast with the free will pertaining to the cogito. Their other job of guarding the door of "Darkness" might be interpreted as part of the screening process discussed above, as one of these women is busy "scrutinizing the cheery and foolish faces with unconcerned old eyes" ("HD" 57).

What really authenticates such interpretation is the fact that the narrator elaborates further on Marlow's mental faculties, adding this time the following point of differentiation with regard to other sailors: "a casual stroll or a casual spree on shore suffices to unfold for him [Marlow] the secret of a whole continent" ("HD" 48). It should be evident that there exists a certain correlation between the "yarn" and the "secret of a whole continent," especially when recognizing that this latter passage comes directly after the former. The narrator, consequently, is guiding his narratees into the right direction of cognizing the nature of this yarn. In this understanding, the meaning of the "meaning" articulated by the narrator is the cogito process itself; it is what is expected to come next after establishing these conditions necessary for the Cartesian subject. Moreover, the other Cartesian condition for the cogito—the seclusion itself—is clearly set out in Marlow's Congo experience, and I believe this fact does not necessitate further elaboration. The text is replete with markers of

such physical interiorization and self-confinement, like the "great silence around and above" ("HD" 71), "the silent wilderness surrounding this cleared speck on the earth" ("HD" 76), and "the silence of the land [that] went home to one's very heart" ("HD" 80). These are but a few examples of how Marlow indeed succeeds in materializing the condition of voluntary 'incarceration,' but I have selected these because of an equally relevant provision: "silence." Mere seclusion is not enough, for it should be accompanied by a serenity of mind, which Descartes emphasizes in the passage quoted above ("I have found a serene retreat in peaceful solitude"). Silence can ensure serenity and "peaceful solitude," which will lead Marlow to his target. The more solitary and silent the setting becomes, the stronger cogito he can go through, the sharper vision he will enjoy.

When the physical conditions of the cogito are laid out, what is expected, then, is the cogito itself. Contrary to what might be supposed, the heart of the 'darkness' that is textually conveyed in the story is not actually dark, as it is conditioned by the effect of the cogito. The real darkness exists where people are handcuffed by the tripodal structure characteristic of discourse. The cogito itself is luminous in essence, as Marlow himself describes his experience in the Congo: "It [his experience] seemed somehow to throw a kind of light on everything about me—and into my thoughts" ("HD" 51). Thus, one might ask, what lightness comes out of the cogito? The text, if observed carefully, unfolds the first wave of cogitation right after Marlow signs his contract, when he emotionally gets himself ready for the long trip. Upon leaving the Company's headquarters, he is subjected to a weird sensation: "In the street—I don't know why—a queer feeling came to me that I was an imposter" ("HD" 59-60). Imposture is the right way of describing his involvement in the 'civilizing' mission, provided that he really considers himself an "emissary of light" (quoted above) by joining the

Company. But he doesn't. If he does, he will be burying himself within the very nature of the deceptive discourse whose scandal is meant to be disclosed. That is why he says, while being at the Company, that the situation "was just as though I had been let into some conspiracy—I don't know—something not quite right" ("HD" 56). Throughout the journey, cogitation becomes gradually more solid and effective, and as Marlow gets deeper in the jungle, the effects of the cogito become more visible. Before disclosing any of these effects, Marlow prepares his listeners aboard the *Nellie*, whom he assumes to be still duped in the same discourse, for the factual and unexpected world they will see. Marlow now affirms that "I would feel I belonged still to a world of straightforward facts" ("HD" 61). Of course, what he will make known to them, and to us, is his severe criticism of the absurdity, brutality, and hypocrisy of capitalists in the Congo. In this respect, I do not intend to echo what Marlow himself has already touched upon, but, for the purpose of taxonomic treatment of the cogito effects, I will briefly outline two Cartesian aspects in his criticism.

Marlow discloses the first of these effects directly to us by frankly articulating the way he is able to perceive how "insidious" capitalism is in Africa ("HD" 65). Capitalist malignance is imparted through the "flabby, pretending, weak-eyed devil of a rapacious and pitiless folly" ("HD" 65). European practices in Africa designate, in the eyes of Marlow, the foolish "devil," or rather a curse, which is not only inflicted on the colonized but equally on the colonizer as they both live in the same "inhabited devastation" ("HD" 63). Most of what Marlow witnesses at the Outer Station is mere pointlessness, a situation implied in the scene of the French man-of-war (which he sees prior to his arriving at the Station) blasting the coast for no apparent reason. They are building a railway, for example, but Marlow notices only "objectless blasting" ("HD" 64). The 'devil' is wasting his efforts and the natural

resources of the continent in a blind, useless way. This is the first aspect of his direct criticism, which is to be contrasted with the discourse of Europe, which would emphasize the positive welfare that Europe brings to Africa. The second aspect of Marlow's direct attack concerns the way Africans are mistreated: they are either driven to forced labor or left to die. He sympathizingly observes that "They were dying slowly . . . they were nothing earthly now,—nothing but black shadows of disease and starvation, lying confusedly in the greenish gloom" ("HD" 67). Instead of 'civilizing,' capitalism is basically brutalizing them. Needless to say, the text provides a large number of examples designating such type of critique, especially when Marlow arrives at the Central Station, where he meets the brickmaker, whom Marlow calls "Mephistopheles" ("HD" 81), and where he encounters the Eldorado Exploring Expedition, whom Marlow dubs "an invasion, an infliction" ("HD" 87) and its agents "less valuable animals" ("HD" 92).

The second type of the Cartesian effect is conveyed indirectly, especially in an ironic tone. For instance, while still being at the Outer Station, Marlow comes across a huge hole, the purpose of which he cannot figure out. Marlow concludes that "It might have been connected with the philanthropic desire of giving the criminals something to do" ("HD" 65). Again, this is to be juxtaposed with King Leopold's speech at the above-mentioned Geographical Conference. In addition, Marlow meets the Company's chief accountant in the Outer Station and describes in detail the accountant's clothes and outer look. Marlow is very sarcastic in being impressed by his neatness: "I respected the fellow. Yes; I respected his collars, his vast cuffs, his brushed hair" ("HD" 68). Marlow is noticeably selective in the way he enunciates what he "respects," but what he really does not respect is what is left out of Marlow's description: the man himself! The accountant is remarkable because "in the great

demoralization of the land he kept up his appearance" ("HD" 68). Marlow is actually directing our attention to the discrepancy between reality and appearance, and this is the most evident motif in the 'humanitarian' discourse of Leopold. In addition, the accountant's outer appearance is so attractive, especially when juxtaposed to the decaying landscape, but his only achievement in three years is his attempt to teach a native woman, whom the accountant refers to as having "a distaste for the work" ("HD" 68). Marlow's ironic remark, thus, is that "this man had verily accomplished something" ("HD" 68). This type of satiric critique runs incessantly along Marlow's journey up the river, particularly when he accompanies the 'pilgrims' toward Kurtz.

These are the two aspects (direct and indirect) of the Cartesian processes affecting Marlow, but these are only the cognitive dimensions of the cogito. To recognize and disclose the emptiness and hypocrisy of the imperialist enterprise means only to move in a realm extrinsic to the relevant discourse. And therefore, such reflections and criticism alone are ineffective, and I have already emphasized the significance of the material level of the cogito, which can indeed stand up to the materiality of discourse. Where is the material constituent then? I am raising this question in order to make a transition to the next stage of the cogito and in order to keep in mind the target of this analysis: a *material subversion of discourse*. Though the above cogito processes are mental, they remain necessary for a movement toward action, which starts the moment Marlow seriously ruminates over the image drawn about the indigenous people. During Marlow's stay at the Outer Station, Marlow sympathizes with the natives, but this sympathy, sharpened by the cogito, is transformed into a dynamic, visible reaction, which takes a gradual route. First, he becomes certain that the Congolese are not antagonistic: "[T]hese men could by no stretch of imagination be called enemies" ("HD" 64).

Then, when Marlow comes to a direct contact with them, he is able to realize they are not savages: "No, they were not inhuman. Well, you know, that was the worst of it—this suspicion of their not being inhuman" ("HD" 96). The cogito is not only experienced by Marlow but its effect is to be felt by his European addressees, and that is why he has to dispense his findings through several doses. His avowal of the natives' humanity is made through a negation of what has been already practiced in discourse ("not being inhuman"). Then direct affirmation is articulated as he proclaims, "[W]hat thrilled you was just the thought of their humanity" ("HD" 96). This series of realizations is finally consummated in a decisive step, which moves the cogito to the *first* layer of materiality, where "a subtle bond had been created" between Marlow and the natives ("HD" 119). Now Marlow has not only managed to step out of the discursive web, one which is so powerful due to its tripodal structure, but he starts to change his ideological affiliation, which is material in nature. "It was a kind of partnership" ("HD" 119), he further affirms with regard to his relationship with the natives.

By aligning himself with the natives, Marlow is now in the second and final stage of the Cartesian cogito, where additional mutability will follow. In short, it will amount now to the level of resistance, but with some modifications. While it is still Cartesian in nature, the cogito should be further narrowed down to fit precisely the direction in which the text detours. The moment Marlow leaves the Central Station toward the Inner one, the story indeed is moved to the level of resistance, as Marlow becomes affiliated not only with the natives (who are, I repeat, outside the crux of action), but also with some dangerous, barely perceptible agent of resistance. In order to ascertain this fact, we need first to identify what further elements are there in the cogito. I will again draw upon the work of Žižek, on whose

delineation of the cogito the level of material resistance can be grounded. Žižek's approach to the cogito lends itself well to the other subtle dimensions implied in the process of Cartesian doubt. In his article "The Cartesian Subject versus the Cartesian Theater," Žižek constructs his argument by responding to Daniel Dennett, who posits that, to use Žižek's words, the human mind is occupied by "a multitude of vaguely coordinated 'softwares': programs created by evolution" (253). In fact, Žižek's ensuing contention is generally a response to the Poststructuralist view that the human subject is 'colonized,' so to speak, by language, over which human consciousness has no control. This philosophical standpoint is directly suggested, for example, in the work of Jacques Derrida.[4] Žižek, therefore, focuses his analysis on this position toward language, which he summarizes as follows: "[I]t could be argued that not only do human beings use language to reproduce themselves . . . but also, at perhaps a more fundamental level, language itself uses human beings to replicate and expand itself" ("Cartesian Subject" 254). The result, according to Žižek, is a complete evaporation of the subject himself, his will and the Cartesian cogito. Thus, we are faced with two extreme views with regard to the cogito: the Poststructuralist (which deprives the human subject of any control over the objectivity of language) and the Cartesian (which affords him full subjective independence from it).

Žižek unravels this problematization by suggesting an in-between space, according to which the human subject can pass from the former, which he calls "nature," to the latter, or "culture," through the Cartesian cogito ("Cartesian Subject" 257). Actually, Žižek here is following exactly Descartes' method and further substantiates it, but the singularity of Žižek's analysis and the significance thereof lie precisely in the nature of this passage from nature to culture. During this passage, according to Žižek, the Cartesian subject becomes

characterized by an "absolute negativity, the 'night of the world,' [and] the point of utter madness in which fantasmatic apparitions of 'partial objects' err around" ("Cartesian Subject" 259). Žižek is drawing here upon the work of Georg W. F. Hegel, who posits that "[t]he human being is this night, this empty nothing, that contains everything in its simplicity" (qtd. in "Cartesian Subject" 259). Thus, what Žižek means by the "night of the world" is this empty space that is not empty because of emptiness per se, in the sense of a vacuum. Rather, he labels it so because of its 'negativity' with regard to all natural elements. As such, it becomes 'everything' in the context of this antagonistic relationship with the Symbolic. And concerning 'madness,' Žižek explains the necessity of it in the following passage:

> [T]he ontological necessity of "madness" resides in the fact that it is not possible to pass directly from the purely "animal soul," immersed in its natural environs, to "normal" subjectivity, dwelling in its symbolic virtual environs—the "vanishing mediator" between the two is the "mad" gesture of radical withdrawal from reality, which opens up the space for its symbolic (re)constitution. ("Cartesian Subject" 259)

The consequence of madness, accordingly, is inhered in the very radicalism of the interiorization process, in the passage itself, which denies all that is left behind in nature. Madness, for that reason, is a 'healthy' sign during and after this halfway stage. It is very important also that Žižek calls the Cartesian subject a "vanishing mediator," a concept which he also uses in his book *For They Know Not What They Do*.[5] I am emphasizing its relevance here because its illustration is highly detectible in the case of Kurtz. Finally, what is even more germane in this respect is Žižek's configuration of the outcome yielded by this passage,

the target of the Cartesian cogito which is missing in Descartes' description of it. The cogito pathway, according to Žižek, "is followed by the construction of a symbolic universe that the subject projects onto reality as the kind of substitute-formation, destined to recompense us for the loss of the immediate, pre-symbolic real" ("Cartesian Subject" 259). It is exactly in this outcome that the cogito is transferred into the level of materiality, which I have been emphasizing repetitively. Again, the cogito is not only meant to help the subject perceive but also construct a subversive actuality whose function is to displace the old form of nature, dominated (in this case) by the fabric of European discourse.

In the course of Marlow's advance from the Central Station to the next *all* the signs and elements of Žižekean cogito can be spotted with stunning correspondence, as though Žižek's theory were invoked directly from Conrad's text. It is indeed arresting, for Marlow sometimes uses the same verbatim description of his route between the two Stations, or rather between nature and culture:

> We were cut off from the comprehension of our surroundings; we glided past like *phantoms*, wondering and secretly appalled, as *sane* men would be before an enthusiastic outbreak in a *madhouse*. We could not understand because we were too far and could not remember, because we were travelling in the *night of first ages*, of those ages that are gone, leaving hardly a sign—and no memories. ("HD" 96; emphasis added)

I would like to juxtapose in this regard Marlow's words with Žižek's: "phantoms" and "fantasmatic apparitions," "night of the first ages" and "night of the world," "madhouse" and "madness." Some of these expressions are recapped again, like "night of the first ages" (on the same page) and madness, which is confirmed later in Marlow's articulation that "they

thought me gone mad" ("HD" 107). Moreover, Žižek's description of the empty space of 'negativity' is not missed by Marlow, though with difficulty. "The earth seemed unearthly," asserts Marlow ("HD" 96), and he expounds that "[w]e were wanderers on a prehistoric earth, on an earth that wore the aspect of an unknown planet" ("HD" 95). In fact, it seems that Marlow finds it arduous in choosing the right words that best communicate his experience of negativity, a difficulty that is perceptible in Žižek's jargon. Marlow concedes the existence of everything around him, but, in his eyes, *nothing exists* in the way he used to see. Marlow's journey, as Said puts it, is "reminiscent of dreams, and he looks at things with a sense of *déjà-vu*" (*Joseph Conrad* 179). To a certain point, Marlow's sensations might amount to a surrealistic experience, but this is only part of the nature of the "madhouse" he is supposed to pass through. Consequently, when Marlow's passage is successful, when he becomes a "vanishing mediator" (implied in the heavy fog between the two stations), he becomes able to see the "truth—truth stripped of its cloak of time" ("HD" 96-97). In keeping with Žižek's theory, his task then is to construct a substitute "cloak," another Symbolic world and another materiality, which will rupture the fabric of the old one and dismantle, thereby, its buttressing tripod discussed above.

This rupture takes two phases: the first is textual, through Marlow's association with the character of Kurtz, and the second is what I shall call 'paratexual,' which takes place after Marlow's return to Europe. Starting with the first, I should pause here on Kurtz, who is generally thought a degenerate character, even an epitome of imperial decadence. He is even considered "perhaps the twentieth century's most famous literary villain" (Hochschild 144). I shall argue otherwise. But I need first to problematize his space with regard to imperialism and the cogito. In particular, there are so many contradictions that make his character

unclassifiable in terms of where exactly to position him, in the imperialistic discourse of the company or in the sphere of culture with Marlow? On the one hand, there are various instances that, on the surface, render him a "literary villain," as Hochschild calls him. This is clearly established in the way he is largely favored by the Company and its agents. Marlow, for instance, is informed by the accountant of the Outer Station that Kurtz is "a first-class agent," who is "very remarkable" and who "Sends in as much ivory as all the others put together" ("HD" 69). Further, the manager of the Central Station, the surveillor in charge of panoptic activities, expresses a 'better' view of him, for he considers him "the best agent he had, an exceptional man, of the greatest importance to the Company" ("HD" 75). Like the manager, his assistant, the brickmaker, assures Marlow that Kurtz is a "prodigy" and "an emissary of pity and science and progress" ("HD" 79). The brickmaker later adds that Kurtz is a "universal genius" ("HD" 83). In fact, the text is abundant with such examples. The point is that when such highly representative exponents of the Company's 'philanthropic' business utter such judgments, it becomes firmly verified that Kurtz is in the middle of a heinous sphere, one that is part of the discursive project of Leopold.

On the other hand, there is also a thoroughly contrary reality. Marlow, who is an epitome of all that is opposite to the world of the Company (due to the defiant nature of the cogito negativity), is highly impressed as well by the same character. For him, Kurtz is "equipped with moral ideas of some sort" and, exactly as the accountant said, "a remarkable man" ("HD" 88, 138). However, Marlow's testimony here is unambiguously different from the accountant's, as each one judges him according to his ideological and *discursive* affiliation. Also, the closer Marlow is to Kurtz the stronger he becomes associated with him. Later in his journey, Marlow pledges his allegiance and loyalty to him, as he tells his

addressees that “I did not betray Mr. Kurtz—it was ordered I should never betray him” (“HD” 141). When such a potent and durable bond becomes unmistakably evident in Marlow’s behavior, the manager becomes antagonistic to both. Marlow’s comment on the manager’s resulting posture is “I found myself lumped along with Kurtz as a partisan of methods for which the time was not ripe: I was unsound!” (“HD” 138). It is important also that the manager can grasp their ‘unsoundness,’ a fact that has been already established in the case of Marlow (Kurtz’s madness is discussed below). What is significant also is the way the manager contradicts his previous views on Kurtz. Earlier in the story, notably, Marlow overhears a secret dialogue between the manager and his uncle, the leader of the Eldorado Exploring Expedition. In their conversation, the manager complains that Kurtz is intent upon the ‘civilizing’ work, as follows:

> “And the pestiferous absurdity of his talk,” continued the other; “he bothered me enough when he was here. ‘Each station should be like a beacon on the road towards better things, a centre for trade of course, but also for humanizing, improving, instructing.’ Conceive you—that ass! And he wants to be manager! No, it’s—” Here he got choked by excessive indignation. (“HD” 91)

The oddity of the manager’s speech lies in the datum that Kurtz is talking earnestly of the work of civilization. When the manager reports Kurtz’s words to his uncle, who is more rapacious and hypocritical, he means it. Those conspirators, when privately talking to each other, are not expected at all to have such a language. They already know the rules of this ‘game,’ in which they are players. This situation can be illustrated in King Leopold’s letter to his Ambassador in London, in which he says, “I do not want to miss a good chance of getting

us a slice of this magnificent African cake" (qtd. in Pakenham 22). According to Pakenham, the letter was sent only three months after the Geographic Conference, in which the King expressed all that is antithetic to the content of the letter. Likewise, had Kurtz been a hypocrite, he wouldn't have spoken so to the manager. But because Kurtz is serious, the manager can see the "pestiferous absurdity" in Kurtz's intention. As a result, in the light of what has been said (by Marlow and the manager), Kurtz is verily a figure opposed to the Company and its business. This critical outlook is further buttressed by the fact that it is Kurtz who orders the attack on the steamer that carries the "pilgrims." Why should he do so unless he is an anticapitalist figure in this power relationship?

However, there might be two objections here with regard to this latter claim. First, one might argue that this antagonism between the manager and Kurtz is rooted in the way Kurtz is referred to as a competitor of not only the manager but also other agents, like the brickmaker. And that explains, for example, the brickmaker's eagerness to obtain information from Marlow about Kurtz and his promotion prospects. Also, along the lines of this objection, there seems to be an air of jealousy in the behavior of the manager and his agents toward Kurtz, and that is why the manager is so anxious to get rid of him. My reply is simple: there is no need to make all this havoc about Kurtz's competition when the manager is able to eliminate him anytime, according to his uncle. During the conversation noted above, the manager's uncle advises his nephew to "get him hanged! Why not? Anything—anything can be done in this country" ("HD" 91). The world that Conrad visualizes in "Heart of Darkness" is detrimentally immoral, where indeed "anything can be done." If the situation is so, then what is the source of the manager's apprehension? Again, this problematic situation cannot be solved unless Kurtz is conceived as a person who exists outside the

discourse of Europe, a situation that has to be treated carefully by the manager, who is supposed to monitor from the center of the panopticon any devious behavior. Kurtz becomes a source of uneasiness for the Company not only because he is in the cogito, but because his cogito is now transformed to something deleterious and tangible, first visible in his attack on the steamer. Moreover, the most visible feature of the Company's business in Africa is the ravaging scheming that Marlow is able to see during a relatively short time. He affirms that "They beguiled the time by backbiting and intriguing against each other in a foolish kind of way. There was an air of plotting about that station, but nothing came of it, of course" ("HD" 78). Indeed, nothing comes out of it. But why is Kurtz's case the focus of the story proceedings? Why shouldn't it be treated like any other typical plotting that exists everywhere along the stations? After all, why should Kurtz receive the most severe criticism for being 'degenerate' and a 'villain' when the others, like the manager's uncle and his men, are no less villainous in this regard? Why should all this be condensed and projected on Kurtz alone, especially when Kurtz is the only agent who, like the natives, is hardly there in the story to defend himself?

What I want to propose plainly is that Marlow's experience is a copy of Kurtz's. Both of them manage to pass from nature to culture and come up with a counteractive, material discursivity. For in addition to the evidence discussed above, there are other equally telling indicia that definitely situate Kurtz within the camp of anti-discursive negativity, the most evident being Kurtz's painting at the Central Station. Importantly, the portrait exhibits a blindfolded woman holding a torch, whose light is visible only on her face. The rest is dark. This is a concise diagnosis of the imperialist mission and discourse. Whilst pretending to spread light, those capitalists are in fact spreading nothing. What seems brightness in the

portrait is in fact darkness, as the light is detectable only on the woman. Everything else is shadowy. Where are those whom the torch is supposed to enlighten? In addition, those who naively revere such illusory lore are themselves blind to the whole situation. One can see this fact only through the cogito. Accordingly, the compelling question is: how can we interpret the painting, which is an act prompted by the cogito, if Kurtz is not a Cartesian character? Admittedly, a villain never indicts himself with such unblemished evidence. Again, this should be added to the list of the problematic questions I raised above.

Moreover, there is another important element that additionally questions the validity of Kurtz's 'villainy.' This has to do with Kurtz's relationship with the Russian trader, who first appears at the Inner Station, where he is very strongly attached to Kurtz. Based on Marlow's detailed picture of him, what is appealing is his disheveled appearance, mostly visible in the patches of his clothing. This is to be contrasted with the appearances of the Company's agents, like that of the accountant. The Russian trader is dedicated to his work and is meticulous in its details. This fact is apparent, for instance, in his book and his delight upon receiving it back, and it is most obvious in the way he leaves wood for Marlow in order to enable him to reach the station. What is even more interesting is Marlow's view of him, as Marlow is now the moral center of the story whose judgment is trustworthy. Marlow is essentially impressed by the values he represents:

> I was seduced into something like admiration—like envy. Glamour urged him on, glamour kept him unscathed. He surely wanted nothing from the wilderness but space to breathe in and to push on through. His need was to exist, and to move onwards at the greatest possible risk, and with a maximum of privation. If the absolutely pure, uncalculating, unpractical spirit of

> adventure had ever ruled a human being, it ruled this bepatched youth. I almost envied him the possession of this modest and clear flame. ("HD" 126)

Marlow's portrayal of the Russian trader, who has been in the wilderness for years, aligns him with the cogito group, with Marlow himself. There is a clear discrepancy between the Russian's contentment and the insatiability of the Company and the Eldorado Expedition. Also, just like Kurtz, the Russian is a character who is deemed dangerous by the manager. That is why Marlow warns him, "The manager thinks you ought to be hanged" ("HD" 139). Finally, his views correspond with Marlow's in many respects, especially his comment on the Congolese: "They are simple people," he asserts ("HD" 139). Thus, there is a moral dimension exhibited in this character. But that also means his view about Kurtz is equally insightful and telling, and it can further clear up any remaining fogginess around the truth of Kurtz's real space. The Russian is so attracted to and respectful toward Kurtz because, as he explains more than once, he "enlarged my mind" ("HD" 125, 140), and "He made me see things" ("HD" 127). He repeatedly accentuates how one should not talk to Kurtz but rather listen to him. And like Marlow, the Russian expresses the same attitude toward Kurtz's wisdom and genius. Besides, the Russian is so concerned about the well-being of Kurtz that he asks Marlow to protect him against the Company's men who have come to escort him back.

Furthermore, Kurtz's resistance is necessarily conditioned by his passage from nature to culture, which he should have already accomplished. There are two clear signs of this transformation. First, Kurtz is, before anything else, a vanishing mediator. Kurtz almost never appears in the text, and if he does, he is only presented as an apparition, a mirage whose ontological reality is characterized by his voice. This fact is forcefully emphasized by

Marlow while telling the story to his listeners: "He [Kurtz] was just a word for me. I did not see the man in the name any more than you do. Do you see him? Do you see the story? Do you see anything? It seems to me I am trying to tell you a dream" ("HD" 82). As such, Kurtz has not only vanished, but he is also engulfed by a dreamlike world, exactly like that of Marlow. To be true, both experiences exist in the same dream, as the dream is not exclusive here to Kurtz but is characteristic of the story that harbors Marlow's cogito as well. And like the Russian, Marlow can only recognize Kurtz through his speech; "The man presented himself as a voice," he asserts ("HD" 113). On some occasions, Marlow uses the same word, "vanish," in referring to his character. For instance, he explains how Kurtz is like an "initiated wraith from the back of Nowhere [that] honoured me with its amazing confidence before it *vanished* altogether" ("HD" 116; emphasis added). Actually, it is overwhelming how Marlow stresses the ghostly existence of Kurtz, as he uses a wide range of epithets that ascertain Kurtz's incorporeality: "phantom" ("HD" 133), "apparition" ("HD" 134), "animated image of death" ("HD" 134), "shadow" ("HD" 134,141, 143), "vapour" ("HD" 142), and "voice" ("HD" 113, 135, 147). Unlike any other agent, Kurtz does not receive the detailed physical description that Marlow provides for others, except for the fact that Kurtz is thin, a characteristic that fits into his approximate non-existence. This lack of details about Kurtz's physicality might indeed amount to anonymousness.

The second condition of Kurtz's passage to Culture is his madness. Marlow directly declares that "his [Kurtz's] soul was mad. Being alone in the wilderness, it had looked within itself, and, by heavens! I tell you, it had gone mad" ("HD" 145). This, in effect, summarizes what Descartes and Žižek say about the cogito: the self-confinement, withdrawal into the self, and madness. Kurtz's madness is seen not only by Marlow but also by the manager, who

can see the "unsound method" of Kurtz ("HD" 137). That is why, he asserts, Kurtz "Shows a complete want of judgment. It is my duty to point it out in the proper quarter" ("HD" 138). Of course, it is quite understandable how his 'duty' (as a surveillor) is to write to his administration. However, the madness that Marlow perceives in Kurtz should not be confused with the 'madness' that is going to be reported to the Company. They are not equal. While the first belongs to the cogito, the second is part of a systematic treatment of deviousness. It is a form of madness that Foucault establishes as one of the discursive rules of exclusion. Foucault's theory in this respect is truly of great help. In particular, what is highly surprising in Foucault's analysis is the way madness is transferred from the realm of the scientific to the realm of the juridical and political in the sense that it is diagnosed, 'punished,' and confined. In the case of the juridical, Foucault asserts that the asylum "is a juridical space where one is accused, judged, and condemned, and from which one is never released except by the version of this trial in psychological depth—that is, by remorse" (*Madness* 269). Therefore, regardless of madness per se, unless 'deviousness' is normalized (by remorse) one is still to be confined. And regarding the political dimension, Foucault explains, "Increasingly, a political and economic explanation was sought, in which wealth, progress, institutions appear as the determining element of madness" (*Madness* 213). Foucault's analysis in this context establishes a precarious relinquishment of the scientific. It is no longer those specialist psychiatrists who can determine madness, but rather there exist a range of 'judges' (like economists, politicians, etc.) who are participating in this task. Consequently, according to Foucault, "it is useless to believe in the good or bad consciences of judges," and this is because "[t]heir immense 'appetite for medicine' … expresses the major fact that the power they exercise has been 'denatured'" (*Discipline* 304). In other

words, psychiatry (and science in general) is deregularized in a way that is made to fit into power relationships.

This form of power exercise over science is exhibited in "Heart of Darkness" through the role of the physician, who measures Marlow's head before Marlow embarks on his journey. What is essentially bizarre is the fact that the physician is performing his duty at a Company's headquarters, not at a specialized clinic! Like managers and business specialists, the 'doctor' is exercising power from within an institution that represents, to use Foucault's terms, the "eye of power." What is more is the oddity that the 'physician' does not seem a physician at all. In the first place, Marlow thinks he is a fool. Second, the doctor says he always measures the heads of those who go to Africa, but when they come back he never sees them. Third, while the doctor takes physical measurements, he is fully aware that mutability is psychological rather than physical. Finally, whenever Marlow inquires about anything the doctor's answers are not decisive, uttered with clichés like "could be," "should be." Therefore, by performing this "simple formality" ("HD" 57), as the secretary tells Marlow, the doctor is conducting precautionary measures against any dangers to business. That is, if it happens that anyone deviates from the normal, from discourse, it is 'natural' that he/she should be confined. That is because, as Robert Young puts it, "To think outside them [discursive practices] is, by definition, to be mad" (*Untying* 48). The doctor in this regard, then, is not different from the manager; both are 'judges,' but with the simple difference that the manager's surveillance complements what the doctor has started, and that is why he will report back his 'scientific'/panoptic judgment. Throughout his journey, Marlow is fully aware of this inter-relatedness between the practice of 'science' and power. When in Africa, he asserts, "I remembered the old doctor— 'It would be interesting for science to watch the

mental changes of individuals, on the spot.' I felt I was becoming scientifically interesting" ("HD" 72). He is indeed interesting, in the same way Kurtz becomes so as well.

Perhaps, "Heart of Darkness" is very remarkable for detailing precisely the mechanism through which power and knowledge are two faces of the same coin. It allows us to find answers for many of the questions Foucault raised in his work, like "how the medical gaze was institutionalised … how the new form of the hospital was at once the effect and the support of a new type of gaze" (*Power/Knowledge* 146). By the same token, Foucault's work is helpful in establishing the fact that "madness fascinates because it is knowledge" (*Madness* 21). This is one of the clues that explain why Kurtz or Marlow should be confined at all. It is the forbidden knowledge that should be excluded in the world of Conrad's work. Both Marlow and Kurtz have verily attained this type of knowledge, as Marlow perceives how Kurtz goes through "that supreme moment of complete knowledge" ("HD" 149), just before his return to Europe. Had Kurtz made it back to Europe, perhaps he would have found himself 'excommunicated' in the asylum. I am borrowing this word from Foucault again: "The old rites of excommunication were revived, but in the world of production and commerce" (*Madness* 57). This Foucauldian proclaim further explains how power is associated not only with knowledge, but also with "production" and "commerce," with capitalism itself. This connection is heightened in his discussion of the bourgeois and their practices of confining the "unemployed," the "vagabond," and all those who are considered economically 'useless.' Interestingly enough, during the nineteenth century the mad came to replace all these and occupied their place in the asylum (*Madness* 57).

I have already suggested that resistance in "Heart of Darkness" is (para)textual. Textuality here refers to Marlow's narrative only, excluding thereby the narrator's comments

and interference. Within Marlow's text, defiance is vibrantly actualized through the character of Kurtz. And in this regard, I would like to focus on some of the narrative throwaways that are seemingly unimportant. For instance, when Kurtz and 'his' ivory are secured and carried aboard the steamer, that *probably* means there is no reason why the manager, or the company, should worry, especially if Kurtz is dying. And even if Kurtz does not die he is going to be confined. However, the manager expresses what designates otherwise: "Upon the whole, the trade will suffer. I don't deny there is a remarkable quantity of ivory—mostly fossil. We must save it, at all events—but look how precarious the position is—and why? Because the method is unsound'" ("HD" 137). Thus, the Company's business is not safe. What is insightful in the manager's speech is the fact that he does not refer to Kurtz's madness (or unsoundness) in particular but to the "method" itself. That is, Kurtz's confinement or death will not solve the problem because the "method" will remain, a fact that should be seen *at least* in the survival of Marlow and the Russian trader, who leaves the Inner Station with weapon cartridges. What is threatening is madness itself, which is now spreading and assuming a challenging geoideological space. We are notably told that Kurtz, who is German, has been educated in England, and that "[h]is mother was half-English, his father was half-French. All Europe contributed to the making of Kurtz" ("HD" 117). That means the significance of Kurtz is this materialization of possibility and probability. While Kurtz's character is invisible and anonymous, such lack of personalization is also an indication that he can be anybody. Any European can be another Kurtz because madness is possible. We have seen at least one case of this possibility in the character of Marlow, who is in fact a second Kurtz.

But there is also the Kurtz of the other story, "An Outpost of Progress." Kayerts, whose name sounds very similar to that of Kurtz, goes through the same experience of the cogito. At the beginning of the story, he and the other agent, Carlier, have been left to the silent wilderness to run the business of the company that appointed them. The text draws very purely a geoideological diagram that shows how Kayerts succeeds in making it from nature to culture. The following passage illustrates how both of these agents were, prior to their coming to Africa, duped completely in the current discourse of their culture, in exactly the same way delineated by Foucault:

> Few men realize that their life, the very essence of their character, their capabilities and their audacities, are only the expression of their belief in the safety of their surroundings. The courage, the composure, the confidence; the emotions and principles; every great and every insignificant thought *belongs not to the individual but to the crowd*: to the crowd that believes blindly in the irresistible force of its institutions and of its morals, in *the power of its police and of its opinion*. But the contact with pure unmitigated savagery, with primitive nature and primitive man, brings sudden and profound trouble into the heart. ("OP" 89; emphasis added)

All their beliefs and convictions, then, are conditioned by the discursive practices of their society. What they say should be essentially filtered through the ideological "'police" of institutions. Again, it is indeed striking how Conrad's and Foucault's terminology converge in the same words. The idea of the ideological "police" is expressed as "discursive policing" by Foucault (quoted above). Thus, when left to the possibility of cogito and madness in the wilderness, only Kayerts is able to get out of such discursive policing. During the course of

events, signs of the cogito start appearing on Kayerts, who "thought it must be a horrible illusion; he thought he was dreaming; he thought he was going mad!" ("OP" 112). It is the same 'dream' experience of Marlow and Kurtz, the same negativity and madness. Kayerts' cogito even receives heavier emphasis as the text repeatedly articulates it, especially after he kills Carlier: "He sat by the corpse thinking; thinking very actively, thinking very new thoughts" ("OP" 114). Later, the text reiterates the same fact: "He, Kayerts, was a thinking creature. He had been all his life, till that moment, a believer in a lot of nonsense like the rest of mankind—who are fools; but now he thought! He knew! He was at peace; he was familiar with the highest wisdom!" ("OP" 115). Kayerts' arrival at the 'highest wisdom' echoes exactly Kurtz's "supreme moment of complete knowledge." As a result of this passage to culture, and according to the rules of power, Kayerts should be punished for the twofold crime of madness and the cogito. "Madness will be punished in the asylum, even if it is innocent outside of it," asserts Foucault (*Madness* 269). Kayerts is fully aware of such a fate, as he hears the "shrieking" of the coming steamer, for which he has been waiting. "Progress was calling to Kayerts from the river," says the narrator, "Society was calling to its accomplished child to come, to be taken care of, to be instructed, *to be judged, to be condemned*" ("OP" 116; emphasis added). Unlike Kurtz, however, Kayerts prefers committing suicide to being confined. Yet, at least he has shown some act of resistance before his death. By killing his companion and committing suicide, he might be translating an extremist belief that those whose mere existence is a materialization of the discourse of progress should be exterminated.

This brings us back to Kurtz again and, in particular, to his report to the Company, which he concludes, "Exterminate all the brutes" ("HD" 118). And I would like here to ask:

who are the brutes? Before answering this question, I should go back again to the narrative 'throwaways' which I started discussing in the context of Kurtz's resistance. Significantly, the Russian tells Marlow that, recently, "Kurtz had come down to the river, bringing along with him all the fighting men of that lake tribe" ("HD" 129). Thus, Kurtz has levied a sort of an armed militia, whose attack on the steamer is asserted. Moreover, before the incident of attacking the steamer, while Marlow is listening to the aforementioned dialogue between the manager and his uncle, Marlow grasps the following fragments: "Military post—doctor—two hundred miles—quite alone now—unavoidable delays—nine months—no news—strange rumours" ("HD" 91). Most of these fragments are quite understandable and can be reconstructed in complete sentences, and some of them, like the "doctor," have been already discussed. The distance to the Inner Station is "two hundred miles," Kurtz is "quite alone now," they have faced "unavoidable delays" in getting there, it has been "nine months" since they have heard about him, and there is "no news" in this regard. My attempt in reconstructing these statements is based upon their consequent speeches and on the context of the whole story. However, there are two fragments that remain ambiguous: the "military post" and the "strange rumours." How can we reconstruct these? I am particularly interested in the former. If we look carefully at the totality of these linguistic scraps, we will discern that all of them are related by their circulation around Kurtz, or rather around the antagonistic relation between the manager and Kurtz. Thus, the military post should be at the heart of this relationship. What I want to suggest is that this enmity between the two parties amounts to military activities. This should explain why the manager does not "get him hanged" as his uncle advised. And that is why his uncle eventually can think only of leaving him to the lethal conditions of the environment, which alone can ensure his death. Also, this clarifies

why the manager wrecked the steamer that is to convey Kurtz back to Europe. But how do they arrive at Kurtz safely and take him without being endangered if there exists a military war? The answer is very simple. First, the 'pilgrims' do not reach the Inner Station without harm; they are stricken by the natives. Second, Kurtz is really sick and needs medication, and that is why he agrees to return with them. What further substantiates this interpretation is the fact that the Russian reminds Marlow that "if he [Kurtz] does not say the right thing to them [the natives] we are all done for" ("HD" 133). But Kurtz doesn't.

I will return to the question about Kurtz's report that led us thus far. My interpretation of the "brutes" is that they are the manager and his capitalist cohorts. Like Kayerts, Kurtz believes that his struggle should take the violent form of "extermination." But I would like also to focus on the report itself, as it is equally illuminating with regard to Kurtz's ideological position. We are told that the report is seventeen pages long and, according to Marlow, "it was a beautiful piece of writing" ("HD" 118). Marlow further adds,

> The opening paragraph, however, in the light of later information, strikes me now as ominous. He began with the argument that we whites, from the point of development we had arrived at, "must necessarily appear to them [savages] in the nature of supernatural beings—we approach them with the might of a deity," and so on, and so on. "By the simple exercise of our will we can exert a power for good practically unbounded," etc., etc. From that point he soared and took me with him. The peroration was magnificent, though difficult to remember, you know. It gave me the notion of an exotic Immensity ruled by an august Benevolence. It made me tingle with enthusiasm. ("HD" 118)

If Marlow is the moral center, then we have to deal with his 'enthusiasm' as sincerity. That is, Marlow indeed believes that the report is of great benefit, not otherwise, and we will believe him accordingly. Yet, what should be taken into account also is the way we are *not permitted* to know what the report incorporates. What we need to see is exactly the "so on, and so on" and the "etc., etc." that have been omitted. And I argue further that they have been omitted *on purpose*, in the same way the fact of the military clash mentioned above is also deliberately shrouded. Moreover, the word "savages" between brackets in this passage (which is original in Conrad's text) is also inserted by the same interventional hand. It seems also due to his sickness, Kurtz changes the nature of his resistance to another direction, which could have been spelled out candidly in the text had it not been for the same kind of textual 'fiddling,' so to speak. This is clear in his angry speech to the manager: "I'll carry my ideas out yet—I will return. I'll show you what can be done. You with your little peddling notions—you are interfering with me. I will return. I. . . ." ("HD" 137). Again, what should have meaning is replaced by dots! Similarly, Kurtz's speech is impeded when he is about to tell Marlow what he plans to do: "'I was on the threshold of great things,' he pleaded, in a voice of longing, with a wistfulness of tone that made my blood run cold. 'And now for this stupid scoundrel—'" ("HD" 143). A dash! It should be unmistakably ascertained that Kurtz is silenced. He is not allowed at all to disclose his dispositions or at least defend himself. The question is why? And who is responsible for these textual gaps and interference?

In fact, answering this question should also account for one last, multi-faceted objection. That is, how can we account for Kurtz's 'ruthlessness,' conveyed by his raiding the country looking for ivory, the skulls that decorate the rail of the Inner Station, the large amounts of ivory he sends, and so on? Also, how can we interpret the way Africans, within

Marlow's text, are represented as 'savages' and 'cannibals' despite the fact that they are "simple people" and "humans" as the Russian and Marlow respectively assert in quotes above? What about Fresleven, who is, according to Marlow, "the gentlest, quietest creature that ever walked on two legs" ("HD" 54), but who was killed in a quarrel with the natives over some hens? After all, how can we reply to Achebe's enquiries in the lecture cited at the beginning of this chapter? What can explain Said's proclaiming that while Conrad's text condemns imperialism it simultaneously justifies it? All of these questions are actually legitimate, and there can be even a very long series of similar ones. Conrad's text does *seem* to be harboring many gaps and contradictions, and such incongruities have, in fact, puzzled a number of critics, who attempted to solve them in different ways. This problem is pointed out, notably, by Fredric Jameson, who wrote in 1981 that "after eighty years, his [Conrad's] place is still unstable, undecidable, and his work unclassifiable" (206), and this is the reason why he calls Conrad's writing "schizophrenic" (219). Though speaking primarily about *Lord Jim* and *Nostromo*, Jameson's critical judgment is made in generality, its applicability being understandable in "Heart of Darkness." Jameson's solution to the problem lies in his analysis of Conrad's style, arguing that Conrad's work exhibits a clash between "romance" and what he calls "'impressionistic' will to style" (208). I am invoking Jameson here because his approach to the ostensibly "schizophrenic" nature of Conrad's work summarizes what I need to say about how others endeavored to bridge such gaps and discrepancies. Generally speaking, I find most of these attempts focused primarily on impressionism and style.[6]

My reply to all of the above inquiries, and my explanation of the gaps, silences, and contradictions in the particular case of Kurtz lie in what I need to say about the paratextual dimension of the work. This has to do with the frame of Marlow's narrative. Marlow is

narrating his story to a number of listeners aboard the *Nellie*; these are the Lawyer, the Director of Companies, the Accountant, and the unnamed narrator, who is telling what Marlow says *and* provides what might be termed an 'editorial' intervention. The narrator, in fact, is the only 'odd' character in this gathering because, unlike the others, we know nothing about him. The narrator, in other words, is not personalized, not at least by his profession. But this anonymousness should mean something, or a number of things. First, that the only unidentified character among Marlow's addressees is chosen *in particular* to recite the story means a narrative gap, or rather a socio-ideological distance created between the author (i.e., Marlow) and the reader. The unnamed narrator, by probability, might be *anybody*, and in this case he might represent a whole society, circulating a story they have heard from somebody who took it directly from Marlow. Moreover, though we don't know anything *of* this narrative gap, we can know *about* it and delimit its vast boundaries by characterizing his position in the paratextual milieu. That is, in addition to his association with the rest of Marlow's addressees in terms of space and time (with regard to the telling of the story), the narrator can be anyone of these, or at least can be similar to them. Is there any specific feature that is common to the Lawyer, the Director of Companies, and the Accountant? In fact, it has been rightly suggested by Laura Chrisman that "[t]he crew's professional occupations are directly implicated in the financial capitalism of the City of London" (23). Thus, we can argue that the narrative gap is capitalist in nature and essentially represents all that is emblematic of capitalist discourse. Further, it is equally important that "[t]he Lawyer evokes notions of transgression, restraint, judgement, and a regulated social order in contrast to the moral anarchy on which Marlow's story focuses" (Stape and Knowles 114). I am principally concerned here with the "regulated social order" which is accurately the first

characteristic that can be established about capitalist discourse. This interpretation is validated by Marlow's remark to his listeners in the middle of telling the story: "You can't understand. How could you?—with solid pavement under your feet . . . stepping delicately between the butcher and the policeman, in the holy terror of scandal and gallows and lunatic asylums" ("HD" 116). Marlow's frustration in this extract establishes lucidly the type of society of his narratees. It is the same carceral society probed by Foucault, a society that is screened and regulated by the "butcher," the "policeman," "gallows," and "asylums." What I want to suggest is that Marlow is relating his story in the heart of the Panoptic, inside the eye of power, through which his narrative is filtered to us. This is exactly the paratextual condition of Conrad's work.

Most essentially, Marlow's text is a 'statement.' I am again drawing upon Foucault's terminology, whereby a statement, roughly speaking, is the minimal unit of discourse. In *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, Foucault defines discourse as "a group of statements in so far as they belong to the same discursive formation" (117). Within this discursive formation, according to Foucault, there exist "exclusions, limits, or gaps that divide up their [statements'] referential, validate only one series of modalities, enclose groups of coexistence, and prevent certain forms of use" (*Archaeology* 110). This explains precisely the case of Marlow's text. When it emerges as a statement within the discursive formation of progress and civilization, it *collides* with other powerful statements existing in the same discursive field, in the same capitalist narrative gap of Conrad's work. And it is this collision that is responsible for the text's illogicalities and gaps. We should never imagine that Marlow's statement will be received 'cordially,' so to speak, within a society whose discursive formation harbors extremely hostile statements, which surely will try to create

some ‘editorial’ modifications in accordance with their rules of exclusion. These statements are responsible for distorting the image of the natives, for demonizing and silencing Kurtz, for hiding his report and future plans, for secreting the truth about Fresleven (who probably could be another Kurtz), and for many other enigmas. Probably, that is why the Russian trader asks Marlow to protect Kurtz’s reputation. But on top of what has been said, what is greatly important is the mere fact that Marlow’s statement has a material reality, that it exists in the fabric of its discursive field, and that it is acknowledged as an element within the network of power. So, Marlow’s prophetic declaration that “mine is the speech that cannot be silenced” comes true (“HD” 97).

Though it is subversive in nature, Marlow’s story is integrated in the discourse of Europe because, according to Foucault, “discourse can be both an instrument and an effect of power, but also a hindrance, a stumbling-block, a point of resistance and a starting point for an opposing strategy” (*History* 101). Not only that it exists, but also that it is being widely retold and disseminated, and its truth (its cogito and madness) can be reconstructed despite its gaps and contradictions. As such, Marlow is one of those whom Foucault calls “founders of discursivity,” who generate “the possibilities and the rules for the formation of other texts” (“What is an Author?” 114). That is, his counteractive discourse becomes a material reality because it is socially disseminated and practiced; it is now a destabilizing common sense. And this accounts for those parts of the story which are kept intact; otherwise the whole text will be subject to corruption. And that explains why the narrator(s) occasionally seems to be guiding the reader in the right textual direction, why he is aware of the cogito process, and why he positively singles Marlow out of the social class of seamen. Therefore, rules of the textual game are largely inhered in this friction between discursive blocks, whereby the old is

being eroded.[7] And the erosion of the older discourse means necessarily that its supportive tripod (true/false distinction, power/knowledge relationship, and the carceral) is also being dismantled. Once the new 'Marlovian' discourse is established in Europe, any verbal utterance subverting the older discourse will *exist* in the emerging regime of truth engendered by the new discourse. The production of these 'deviant' utterances, in effect, means also the collapse of the Panopticon that used to filter and hamper their circulation. As for the power/knowledge paradigm, the widespread dissemination of Marlow's statement is an indication of a novel system of knowledge whose source of power is its (con)textual cogito.

Resistance, to conclude, is practiced on both fronts: Africa and Europe. In Africa, there are the Kurtzes and the Kayertses who are intent on 'exterminating' whom they consider the 'brutes', and in Europe there are the Marlows who are spreading the cogito. Indeed, in return for capitalism, Marlow's text brings madness, which now threatens the very guarantee that, as Said notes above, is responsible for maintaining and prolonging the capitalist enterprise in the African periphery. Conrad's text is mad on all levels, as madness exists within Marlow's narrative and outside it, in Africa and in Europe, which is now being approached by the night of the world, by the "immense darkness," the last two words of the text. Perhaps, our discussion of Conrad's version of Western epistemology and its shift by an African-generated discourse might be considered one way of illustrating Aimé Césaire's remark that "[a] civilization that uses its principles for trickery and deceit is a dying civilization" (9). Of course, Conrad is not denying the existence of the humanitarian impulse in the Western sphere. He is rather rejecting its being malignantly utilized by capitalism, whose "dying" moment is envisioned in Conrad's work.

NOTES

[1] Reference to this lecture will be made to "An Image of Africa: Racism in Conrad's Heart of Darkness."

[2] Though the anti-slavery pretext is hypocritical, it was within the interests of European imperialist powers to go against slavery per se. Walter Rodney, for instance, explains, "Many changes inside Britain had transformed the seventeenth-century necessity for slaves into the nineteenth-century necessity to clear the remnants of slaving from Africa so as to organize the local exploitation of land and labor" (137). Slavery, in this sense, "had become a fetter on further capitalist development" (Rodney 137). Yet, while slavery in its strict sense was being abolished, a new form of it was introduced (Rodney 138; Brantlinger 261). That is, forced labor.

[3] I am emphasizing the role of Leopold because, in the first place, his plans and ambitions are the reason of all that can be seen in "Heart of Darkness." And though he does not directly emerge in this story, he does in Conrad's *The Inheritors* through the character of Duc de Mersch (Hochschild, note 147; Brantlinger 258), whose speech really looks like that of the capitalist agents we see in "Heart of Darkness": "[W]e have never forgotten the mission entrusted to us by Europe—to remove the evil of darkness from the earth—to root out barbarism with its nameless horrors, whose existence has been a bolt on our consciences" (110).

[4] For further elaboration on this philosophical view, see Jacques Derrida, "Différance."

[5] In this book, Žižek uses the concept of the "vanishing mediator" in a different context but with approximately an equivalent meaning. Drawing upon Hegelian dialectics,

Žižek explains how the "vanishing mediator" is that which mediates the transformational process from one concept to its opposite. He discusses the transition from feudalism to Protestantism, whereby content is mutated within the old form of religion, and how Protestantism moves then into capitalism, by the vanishing of the old form (*For They Know Not* 185).

[6] Like Jameson, Ian Watt tried to bridge "the gap between impressionism and understanding" (176-77), which he also calls "delayed decoding" (175). This stylistic device, according to Watt, is the reason why Marlow's direct perception cannot be immediately understood. Similarly, Brantlinger believes that "[t]he politics of Conrad's story is complicated by the story's ambiguous style" (256). It has been suggested also that Conrad's works "might be said to fetishise modernist self-questioning" (Jeffery 148). See also Van Pletzen (153), and for further elaboration on impressionism in "Heart of Darkness" see Kershner.

[7] I am borrowing here the idea of the 'rules of the textual game' from Derrida's declaration that "A text is not a text unless it hides from the first comer, from the first glance, the law of its composition and the rules of its game" (*Dissemination* 63). Derrida's contention, in fact, explains why texts like those of Conrad seemingly, or at 'first glance,' unfold many gaps and contradictions.

CHAPTER FOUR

IN LATIN AMERICA: DIVERTED BY HISTORICAL DEMENTIA

Our consideration of the capitalist undertaking in the African periphery has been, for the most part, focused on the emergence, circulation, and collision of certain discursive statements whose dynamism accounts for the definitive breakdown of the imperialist venture. Yet, Conrad's African fiction exposes, though less markedly, other austere malfunctions whose effects are devastating for the whole capitalist system. In specific, among the many critical observations conveyed through the Marlovian 'camera eye' is the "devil of a rapacious and pitiless folly" ("HD" 65), which I briefly discussed in the previous chapter. Marlow's encounter with the imperialist irrationality is traceable in a multiplicity of occasions where Marlow, much the same as the reader, is utterly baffled by the idiocy and pointlessness of various activities being conducted by capitalists. (Marlow, for instance, sees a French man-of-war blasting the land aimlessly, a big hole in the ground dug for no purpose, etc.). The absurdity of such practices indeed bespeaks a baleful *inefficiency* that, in my view, is second only to the discursive factor in the ability to bring about the cessation of the capitalist mission in Africa. What I want to ascertain is the fact that while not giving primary prominence to capitalist wastefulness in his *African* works, Conrad *does* bring this highly burdensome concern to the fore in his Latin American masterpiece, *Nostromo*, published in 1904, four years after the composition of "Heart of Darkness." Thus, the aim of this chapter is to scrutinize Conrad's grappling with a *certain* type of inefficiency responsible for capitalist failure in the third and last peripheral zone: Latin America.

Perhaps, *Nostromo* is the 'most' capitalist among all Conrad's works, for, I believe, nowhere does Conrad give such a weighty ubiquity of capital accumulation and capitalist

destructiveness as he does in this work. To be true, it is highly plausible to subtitle it "A Tale of Capital" or "A Capitalist Story" instead of "A Tale of the Seaboard," which Conrad chose. And because it is deeply entangled with capitalist concerns, *Nostromo* reveals the most deleterious outcome of pursuing capitalist policies for a whole society. Such a damaging effect is the other face of the inefficiency I am going to analyze here. More precisely, I find the world of *Nostromo* deadly crippled by what the Swedish cultural anthropologist Alf Hornborg rightly calls "thermodynamic inefficiency."[1] In his analysis of 'productive' industrial systems, Hornborg diagnoses how such systems do not yield the expected output they are supposed to produce. The waste caused by the processes and dynamics of these systems is far larger than the value of their outcome. Indeed, when examined holistically (i.e., from economic, cultural, psychological, natural, and social perspectives), the expenditure of industrialism, like that of nineteenth-century England, would make us question the feasibility of achieving the progress and profitability expected of such systems. In this sense, Hornborg's concept of "thermodynamic inefficiency," I suggest, characterizes precisely the political, economic, social, and, most important, psychological dilemmas in *Nostromo*.

These damages will be established within the scope of this chapter while studying the most perilous and disruptive power effectuated by the dysfunctionality of a certain form of capitalism (discussed below) imposed on the whole social structure of *Nostromo*. This rupturing power pertains to the *history* of Sulaco, the "Occidental Province" of the Republic of Costaguana, where the events of the novel take place. Thus, I will primarily focus on what I shall call the 'thermodynamics of history' and its inefficiency that inflict the Sulacan people with irreparable psychological, social, economic and political damages. That is, my interest

in this chapter is centered on pursuing the subtle failure of capitalist enforcement in Sulaco by observing its historical outcomes, which are, I posit, the most hazardous of all other effects. In fact, the significance of Sulacan history and its pivotal essentiality to any literary analysis of *Nostromo* is consciously established in the "Author's Note" to the work, written thirteen years after the work's publication. Interestingly, what seems consequential in Conrad's remarks about his work is his intentional amalgamation of the two categories of fiction and history. He asserts, for instance, "My principal authority for the history of Costaguana is, of course, my venerated friend, the late Don José Avellanos, Minister to the Courts of England and Spain, etc., etc., in his impartial and eloquent 'History of Fifty Years of Misrule'" (*N* x). Had not we known that Don José and his book, as well as the rest of the whole world of *Nostromo*, are the creation of Conrad, we would indeed have believed that they really existed. Conrad extends his *ostensibly* jocular remark about Don José's book: "That work was never published—the reader will discover why—and I am in fact the only person in the world possessed of its contents. I have mastered them in not a few hours of earnest meditation, and I hope that my accuracy will be trusted" (*N* x). These authorial comments constitute notably what might be termed a 'literary catalog' for the novel's readership, for Conrad does instruct us on how to deal with his fiction. Accordingly, *Nostromo* is, above anything else, based on the history of Costaguana, or rather the historical development of its Occidental Province.

The historical characteristic of *Nostromo* is further endorsed by other instances of 'historicalizing,' so to speak, Sulaco itself and many of its people. "If anything could induce me to revisit Sulaco," Conrad elaborates, "it would be Antonia. And the true reason for that—why not be frank about it?—the true reason is that I have modelled her on my first

love" (*N* xiii-xiv). It is not only that Sulaco is historical but also some of its people are inseparable from Conrad's real acquaintances. What is more is that a considerable part of the novel's events are narrated as a history by a number of its fictional historians. In addition to Don José, Captain Mitchell, the most eminent of Conrad's historians, takes Sulaco's visitors on a tour in order to unfold for them the historical secrets of the city, especially those about the transformational secession of Sulaco. The other historian, and basically the journalist of Sulaco, is Martin Decoud, who relates part of this history in a more sober and sinister tone. Therefore, what should indistinctly be established in this regard is Conrad's equation between the historicalness of his fictional work and the fictionality of historical composition. In other words, the writing of history and fiction in *Nostromo* converge as such in one category: that which might be dubbed *histofiction* or *fictohistory*. This claim is not equal to saying that Conrad's fiction is a reflection of a certain historical era or transformational events (i.e., a historicization of, for example, nineteenth-century capitalist imperialism or global imperialist rivalry). My argument is rather about the interconnectedness between fiction and Conrad's *philosophy* of capitalist history. In the light of this view, *Nostromo* represents Conrad's anticipation of historical possibilities that will result from establishing a capitalist system in the geopolitical periphery of Latin America. And while the work under study is itself one of fiction, what remains is to approach it from a historical perspective, or rather with historical tools. It is exactly in this latter remark, then, that my analysis of the capitalist paradigm in Conrad's Costaguana can be justifiable.

In fact, there have been a significant number of studies attempting to interpret and solve this entanglement between *Nostromo*'s fictional reality and historicity. In this regard, I will very briefly single out some of these critical attempts and then reflect on some of their

implications relevant to the intention of this chapter so as to particularize precisely my contribution to this bulk of criticism. As early as 1977, Gareth Jenkins was able to pick up *Nostromo*'s reflection of Conrad's historiographical philosophy in his claim that "[t]he relationship between literature and history is part of *Nostromo*'s own reflection on the history outside it" (138). Accordingly, Jenkins believes that *Nostromo*'s historical aspect lies, in particular, in its characterization of the history of social groups. His eventual findings revolve around two conclusive remarks: "On the one hand, Conrad depicts in *Nostromo* the folly of all historical social movements and revolutions; on the other, he endorses, quietly but irrefutably, a particular type of class undertaking and a bourgeois-democratic revolution, no matter how fragile and brief the achievements of the society born therefrom" (174). Jenkins' argument, in my view, boils down Conrad's work to a mere complicity with the rising capitalism of his time, especially the capitalist invasion of the periphery. Three years later, Peter Christmas tried to reconstruct the work's historical intention by connecting it to European history. He avers that in the background of the novel there is the hegemonic imperialistic control of the Anglo-Saxons; yet, "the foreground is held by the history of nineteenth-century France, whose particular shape took on the status of myth for so many Europeans" (72). Christmas' focus on the Anglo-French relationship in the work aims at showing that both paradigms are "bankrupt" (79). As such, his study is an attempt to contextualize Conrad's work in the imperialistic rise of nineteenth-century Europe.

Another study conducted by Pamela Demory in 1993 endeavored to establish Conrad's philosophical stance toward the writing of history, arguing that *Nostromo* basically "critiques both the traditional nineteenth-century notion of history and the nineteenth-century realistic novel" (317). Notably, Demory's conclusion establishes the peculiarity of Conrad's

work that is at odds with the nineteenth-century European notion of the relationship between historiography and history. That is, Conrad's work ruptures any reliability of historiography in its representation of what went on in history. The last study I would like to take into consideration, and the most recent one, is Richard Niland's *Conrad and History* (2010). Niland approaches the historical aspect of *Nostromo* from a geo-cultural perspective by highlighting the historical development of cultural diversity within the geopolitical boundaries of Costaguana. More specifically, he argues that "Costaguana authentically represents the hybrid and evolving identity of a South American nation" (95). Despite the diversified components of such identity, Niland concludes, what renders them unified is the newly emerging economic reality in Sulaco, which is based on the Gould Concession. Therefore, cultural relationships are being superseded by the industrial capitalist interests whose hegemonic umbrella encompasses every individual within society.

Of course, these are only a few examples of the critical tradition trying to fathom out *Nostromo*'s philosophical implication about history and historiography. But I believe the four studies above encapsulate what has been reiterated in this regard over more than thirty years. Accordingly, I need henceforth to specify a number of characteristics for this chapter in the light of the above representative views. First, contrary to the critical assessment that reads Conrad's novel on the basis of its complicity with the capitalist enterprise, I argue that Conrad is attacking the same social group whose capitalist agenda has managed to establish a new political reality in the Latin American periphery. This attack is most evident in the eventual failure of such crippled political schema affecting, before anybody else, its enthusiastic supporters. Second, rather than looking for what I consider the farthest aspect of *Nostromo*'s historical critique that has to do with the European continent, [2] I intend in this

chapter to show that the history that the novel deals with is a history peculiar to a peripheral zone integrated violently within the emerging global system. In this case, the form of capitalism that is laid out in Sulaco, as I explain below, is a very advanced one. Third, whereas Demory, among others, reconstructs the deconstructive implications of *Nostromo* with regard to the relationship between historiography and history, I postulate that Conrad's work is a philosophical declamation in fictional form of the future historiography of capitalist development. It is, as I previously spelled out, an anticipation of the fate of such an economic system. Last, while it has been suggested that Nostromo is a configuration of the unifying power that results from material interests, my view is quite the opposite; the San Tomé mine and the values it represents are further disruptive factors that obliterate any trace of national identity.

Thus, we now come to the pivotal question: what is Conrad's historiographical philosophy with regard to capitalism in the Latin American peripheral zone? The answer to this question, in fact, can be attempted by tracing the Sulacan social and political developments, which are necessarily conditioned by the emergence of the new economic policies that appear before and after the secession of Sulaco. The novel focuses particularly on a limited historical span that externalizes exactly the circumstances that decisively and irreversibly bring about this transformation. This period extends from the time Charles Gould returns to Sulaco from Europe up to several years after Sulaco becomes an independent state. What is highly important with regard to this period, I posit, is that it is narratively, politically, and socially divided into three major parts, and it is within the relationships between these three phases that the failure of the capitalist system becomes more evident. More particularly, I find the structure of this triadic sequence governed by the logic of Hegelian dialectics, for it

truly represents a paradigm of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis whose causal connections are tightly dialectical, especially in terms of temporality and politics. To illustrate my claim, I need to pause here once again in order to sketch in the Hegelian framework of dialectical development, as it was usually understood in Conrad's time.

The logic of dynamic movement within this Hegelian thesis-antithesis-synthesis, which is usually attributed to Hegel (especially to his book *Phenomenology of Spirit*),[3] is best elucidated succinctly in the words of Marx in his book *The Poverty of Philosophy*. In this book, Marx articulates the understanding of the Hegelian dialectic while discussing "the movement of pure reason" whose formulation exists in three stages: "To pose, oppose and compose itself, to be formulated as thesis, antithesis and synthesis" (117). Marx elaborates further that

> once it has placed itself in thesis, this thesis, this thought, opposed to itself, doubles itself into two contradictory thoughts, the positive and the negative, the yes and no. The struggle of these two antagonistic elements, comprised in the antithesis, constitutes the dialectic movement. The yes becoming no, the no becoming yes, the yes becoming at once yes and no, the no becoming at once no and yes, the contraries balance themselves, neutralise themselves, paralyse themselves. The fusion of these two contradictory thoughts constitutes a new thought which is the synthesis of the two. This new thought unfolds itself again in two contradictory thoughts which are confounded in their turn in a new synthesis. (*Poverty* 117)

In the light of Marx's account of the Hegelian dialectics, I would like here to pinpoint two elemental features that are of great value to my discussion below of Sulaco's history and its

capitalist failure. First, the dynamism of temporal and structural changes in the Hegelian thesis-antithesis-synthesis is determined by causality. For the emergence and effects of the antithesis components are originated necessarily by the thesis. That is, they are born *from within* the boundaries of the thesis. The antithesis is not an outer reaction to the thesis; it is rather an intrinsic effect of the same thesis. By the same token, the structural constituents of the synthesis can be traced back to the thesis as well because they are the end product of the interactions that take place in the antithesis stage. And because the latter interactions themselves belong in essence to the thesis, the synthesis is the other 'daughter,' so to speak, of the original 'mother' thesis. What I want to establish here is the fact that the moment the thesis poses itself in this chain it becomes responsible for whatever comes next, regardless of whether the ensuing changes are positive or negative.

Second, when this Hegelian triad becomes effectual in a historical context, its dialectical movement turns essentially teleological. The reason of this teleology lies in the *self-conscious* development of the triadic chain. According to Hegel's philosophical views about historical development, the whole world is moving in accordance to a supreme plan, or universal *logos*, that determines the direction and the goal for this developmental movement. Hegel simply dubs this overarching logos the *spirit*. "Nothing is higher than the spirit, and nothing is more worthy of being its object," avers Hegel (*Lectures* 63). More important, the process through which the spirit motivates historical development, according to Hegel,

> consists essentially of a series of separate stages, and world history is the expression of the divine process which is a graduated progression in which the spirit comes to know and realise itself and its own truth. Its various stages are stages in the self-recognition of the spirit; and the essence of the spirit, its

> supreme imperative, is that it should recognise, know, and realise itself for what it is. (*Lectures* 64)

If the spirit is the ultimate governing principle of world history at large, then the temporal progress of any part of this history should essentially be determined by the same logic and spirit. This argument, therefore, applies to any single triadic chain of history such as the aforementioned thesis-antithesis-synthesis. As such, not only is this chain teleological and self-conscious in its movement, but also its development is in the direction of the most positive and sublime form of history. The ensuing discussion of this chapter will, therefore, trace the development of Sulacan capitalist history, which is part of the Hegelian world history, and test it against four Hegelian criteria: the triadic structure, the causal connectivity, the teleological development, and the positive progress. It is through these Hegelian conditions that I intend to show how capitalism is detrimentally dysfunctional in Conrad's *Nostromo*. In particular, while the first three conditions are precisely applicable in Sulaco's history, the fourth is not. Instead of being characterized by the sublime Hegelian spirit, Sulaco's history is cursed by a regression toward a past time whereby those who seek material interests are severely punished. I call this temporal regression a *historical dementia* because, as my analysis will clarify, the more we move along this historical triad, the more deteriorating history becomes, and this is my ultimate argument in this chapter.

I will start with the first phase, which, as I stated, will usher dynamic transformations within its limits and those of the consequent phases. But I will argue, tentatively, that the inflammatory destructions of the three phases are basically unified by the emergence of the San Tomé mine, or rather the revival of its 'lucrativeness.' The recent rehabilitation of the mine in the history of Sulaco is actually the temporal starting point of phase one. Because the

whole series of the Hegelian historical development of Sulaco is centered on the mine, the narrative prepares the reader for the damning 'substance' that characterizes this highly important economic resource. Right from the beginning, then, the reader will never expect to see any recuperation of a peaceful life in the city after a long history of social turbulences and political upheavals. "Worked in the early days mostly by means of lashes on the backs of slaves," says the narrator, "its [the mine's] yield had been paid for in its own weight of human bones. Whole tribes of Indians had perished in the exploitation" (*N* 52). This is the earliest history we know of the mine. The thermodynamic inefficiency of such initial history lies in the pricy expenditure of "human bones" wasted for the silver yield that is stained with human blood. Next, the mine is worked by an English company, but soon the local miners rise up against the mine's bosses and massacre them. Consequently, the government in Sta. Marta, the capital of Costaguana, confiscates the mine and explains to the public the conditions of bloody mischief that befall it: "Justly incensed at the grinding oppression of foreigners, actuated by sordid motives of gain rather than by love for a country where they come impoverished to seek their fortunes, the mining population of San Tomé, etc. . . ." (*N* 52). Thus, the mine is *nationalized* and is handed over to the government, who significantly declares that the mine "reverts now to the Government as national property" (*N* 53). The mine, as a result, has a dark history that is ascribed to the mismanagement of many successive governments. The problem is absolutely not in the mine itself; it is rather in the various, erroneous ways of dealing with it.

But the government does not learn from this hard lesson, for it then privatizes it by establishing the Gould Concession, which is, I argue, the spark that inaugurates the first phase of the Hegelian organic, historical segment under study. The mine is conceded to

Gould the senior in an attempt to settle the government's heavy debts to him, but this concession does not satisfy Gould the father and remains a haunting nightmare that consumes him completely. However, before his death he warns his son, who is studying in England then, against coming back to Costaguana or planning to make anything of the Gould Concession. The narrative sometimes conveys a sense of foreboding horror in the letters of Gould the father to his son where he dearly urges him "never to touch it [the mine], never to approach it, to forget that America existed, and pursue a mercantile career in Europe. And each letter ended with bitter self-reproaches for having stayed too long in that cavern of thieves, intriguers, and brigands" (*N* 57). Gould the son is fully aware of such warnings, and he confesses to Emilia, before they get married, that "[i]t [the mine] has killed him!" (*N* 61). Despite this, and despite the "eternal character of that curse" (N 57), and notwithstanding the infinite variety of destructiveness of the mine along the history of Sulaco, Don Carlos (as he is named occasionally) chooses to challenge this intimidating tradition and brings the Gould Concession to another socio-economic level that characterizes Sulacan life in phase one. I have emphasized this pre-Hegelian history of the mine in order to argue that the mine's wastefulness that befalls Sulaco before the coming of Gould from Europe is nothing compared to that which ensues after the recent revival of the Gould Concession.

Thus, what is that which is 'unique' and more destructive in the mine's new emergence in phase one? My answer lies in the new economic and political system brought with the mine and spurred by Gould's new plans for Sulaco. The reader of *Nostromo* will absolutely encounter a dramatic alteration to all aspects of life in Sulaco. At the beginning of the novel, we are informed that Sulaco has remained for a long time disconnected from the political and economic proceedings not only in Costaguana but in the whole world. The

narrator says, “Sulaco had found an inviolable sanctuary from the temptations of a trading world in the solemn hush of the deep Golfo Placido” (*N* 3). But, again, with the coming of Charles Gould it becomes evident that a new system imported from outside is being imposed on Sulaco. Notably, Conrad critics have extensively debated the nature of this neoteric, economic system, suggesting a multiplicity of descriptive analyses. Among these various views, the following are interesting labels for this new aspect of Sulacan economy: “capitalist finance,” “economic liberalism,” “modernizing economic rationality,” “global capitalism,” “economic imperialism,” “finance capitalism,” “capitalist modernization,” “modernity,” and simply “capitalism.”[4] What I find very noteworthy in surveying these critical evaluations is that there seems to be confusion about Sulaco’s economic model. In particular, some Conrad critics are not settled on a decisive and definite term for designating the new scheme being generalized in the Occidental Province of the novel. J. Hillis Miller, for example, characterizes this new system as belonging to global capitalism, which “was already in full swing in Conrad’s day. Of course that invasion is still going on today” (168). It is fully understandable that Sulaco is being radically revolutionized by global capitalism, but what form of capitalism? Is it imperialist competition, finance capitalism, or something else? This question is significant in the context of *Nostromo* because this work in particular is highly entangled with history, and such forms of capitalism can be easily spotted in terms of historical development and therefore can be helpful in establishing Conrad’s treatment of the history under study. Also, while I can agree that Conrad’s time was marked by the rise of global capitalism (evident in the imperialist rivalry between the major European powers), I find it difficult to see how exactly that same imperialism is still going on today. For the global capitalism of today is utterly distinguishable from that of Conrad’s time. While I do

agree with many of the implications suggested in the aforementioned views, still I believe that my study of *Nostromo*'s capitalism reveals a more focused characterization. In fact, the real issue here is not simply labeling the sort of capitalism in Sulaco; it has rather to do with a detailed delineation of that system and then locating it in its right historical context. I am stressing historicization here because it is an integral part of the overall textual effect that I am attempting to establish in the Hegelian dialectical approach designated above.

Consequently, I shall argue that the new system that we encounter in Sulaco, strangely enough, is that of modern-day neoliberalism, which historically started to dominate the global economy after the 1970s. In order to see how the economic and political policies of neoliberal capitalism are meticulously followed by Gould and his supporters, I will first lay down the theoretical framework of this capitalist theory, against which I will then examine the case of Sulaco. What precisely interests me in discussing the neoliberal application in *Nostromo* is a twofold aim. First, it is significant to establish firmly the fact that Conrad is indeed foreseeing the coming of such a capitalist paradigm in his envisioning of the future of the Latin American periphery. This goal is conditioned by the relationship of phase one with the consequent phases of the Hegelian historical segment under study because, again, this relationship will lead us clearly to the subtle inefficiency conveyed in *Nostromo*. Second, I will pinpoint a number of minor dysfunctions and contradictions in this initial, neoliberal phase that will add up to the ultimate failure of Sulaco's capitalism at large before moving to the second phase.

Perhaps, the most succinct and informative elucidation of this recent form of capitalism is David Harvey's *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. In his introduction to the book, Harvey recapitulates the way neoliberalism emerged and outlines the major pillars of

its theory. He asserts, "There has everywhere been an emphatic turn towards neoliberalism in political-economic practices and thinking since the 1970s. Deregulation, privatization, and withdrawal of the state from many areas of social provision have been all too common" (2-3). The key component of neoliberal policies is, in fact, the nearly downright absence of the state from the economic arena, except in those cases where the state's interference is needed to ensure the intactness of the system (as explained below). "State interventions in markets (once created) must be kept to a bare minimum" says Harvey, according to the neoliberal theory (2). This pivotal neoliberal element characterizes precisely the economic transformation that Sulaco undergoes. The most important public asset in Sulaco, and probably in the whole country of Costaguana, is the San Tomé mine. Again, prior to the time of Nostromo, the mine is reclaimed by the government and made a national property. And despite the Gould Concession, the government continued to extract royalties from Gould the senior. But the governmental position with regard to the mine after Don Carlos arrives in Sulaco becomes extremely minimized, and the government seems utterly compliant with the privatization of its previous asset.

The mine's privatization is intentionally planned by the chief capitalists in the world of *Nostromo*. While in Europe, Gould manages to coordinate with the American financier, Holroyd, who is dubbed "that capitalist of shrewd mind and accessible character" (*N* 65). Gould strikes a deal with Holroyd to finance the rehabilitation of the mine because, though he has the right to make use of the mine, Gould is financially unable to materialize his plan on his own. In one of their meetings, Holroyd lays out his preconditions for financing the enterprise. The following passage unfolds the neoliberal seeds that will be implanted in Sulaco's economy:

> "Very well," had said the considerable personage [Holroyd] to whom Charles Gould on his way out through San Francisco had lucidly exposed his point of view. "Let us suppose that the mining affairs of Sulaco are taken in hand. There would then be in it: first, the house of Holroyd, which is all right; then, Mr. Charles Gould, a citizen of Costaguana, who is also all right; and, lastly, the Government of the Republic. So far this resembles the first start of the Atacama nitrate fields, where there was a financing house, a gentleman of the name of Edwards, and—a Government; or, rather, two Governments—two South American Governments. And you know what came of it. War came of it; devastating and prolonged war came of it, Mr. Gould. However, here we possess the advantage of having only one South American Government hanging around for plunder out of the deal. It is an advantage; but then there are degrees of badness, and that Government is the Costaguana Government." (*N* 75-76)

The gist of Holroyd's concerns is clearly about the intervention of the Costaguana government. Holroyd is very willing to go for Gould's plans if, *and only if*, the government is kept out of their business. Holroyd unequivocally spells out this condition when he tells Gould, "The main question for us is whether the second partner, and that's you, is the right sort to hold his own against the third and unwelcome partner, which is one or another of the high and mighty robber gangs that run the Costaguana Government" (*N* 78-79). Holroyd is using the same political rhetoric that is usually drawn upon by neoliberal apologists in vindicating the neoliberal project. Harvey explains how neoliberal exponents propagate the threat that the intervention of the state might pose on concepts and ideals like "human

dignity" and "individual freedom": "These values, they held, were threatened not only by fascism, dictatorships, and communism, but by all forms of state intervention that substituted collective judgements for those of individuals free to choose" (5). By the same token, Holroyd avails himself of the same argument by reminding Gould and the reader of the devastation that arose out of the interference of three Latin American governments in the Atacama nitrate fields.

However, Holroyd's fears are not quite valid because the government is indeed moving in that direction by neoliberalizing all aspects of the country's economy. Holroyd himself is fully aware of this governmental policy and makes it clear for Gould: "Now, what is Costaguana? It is the bottomless pit of 10 per cent. loans and other fool investments. European capital has been flung into it with both hands for years" (*N* 76-77). The fact that the government is deregulating the economy and lifting all barriers for foreign capital is what makes Holroyd think seriously about investing his capital in Sulaco. These neoliberal practices conform exactly to the strategies of what came to be known as the Washington Consensus, which some economic historians consider to be an epitome of neoliberalism. For example, Richard Peet and Elaine Hartwick, based on John Williamson's argument, enumerate the tenets that constitute the Washington Consensus. These include the encouragement of direct flow of foreign capital. They affirm that, according to theory, "Barriers impeding the entry of foreign firms should be abolished. Foreign and domestic companies should be allowed to compete on equal terms" (86). But it might be argued that while Holroyd is a foreigner to the land, Gould, who is the owner of the business, is not. Yet, neoliberalization in the first place has to do with privatization and deregulation whether these processes will serve the interests of foreigners or natives. Even though this is the case, the

text, on more than one occasion, emphasizes the Englishness of Gould. The narrator, for instance, tells us that "in the talk of common people he was just the Inglez—the Englishman of Sulaco. He looked more English than a casual tourist, a sort of heretic pilgrim, however, quite unknown in Sulaco" (*N* 47).

Moreover, competition here is a natural result of deregulation, and it is stressed as a separate tenet in the above Consensus, whose ninth item is based on the condition that "[a]ll enterprises should be subject to the discipline of competition" (Peet and Hartwick 86). But competition is simultaneously a responsible factor for eventual monopolies, and this is foreshadowed in Holroyd's monopolistic plans when he delineates the role that the United States will play in the future: "We shall be giving the word for everything: industry, trade, law, journalism, art, politics, and religion, from Cape Horn clear over to Smith's Sound, and beyond, too. . . . We shall run the world's business whether the world likes it or not" (*N* 77). Significantly, it is necessary in this regard not to confuse the "we" that Holroyd uses with the Government of the United States, for it basically designates the private sector. Holroyd is keen to make this very evident when he declares that "we here—we, are not this country's Government, neither are we simple souls" (*N* 78). Eventually, when Holroyd becomes thoroughly convinced that such neoliberal policies are being implemented in Costaguana, he agrees to support Gould in the mining business. His worry about governmental interference then becomes evaporated in his speech; he is later concerned only about Gould's loyalty and seriousness. "You go ahead in your own way," Holroyd reminds him, "and I shall know how to help you as long as you hold your own" (*N* 82).

The Holroyd-Gould corporate business is just one among many others whose prosperity is the result of this vast neoliberalization process. There are, for example, the

private businesses of the Oceanic Steam Navigation Company (or the O.S.N. Co.), the National Central Railway, and the cable telegraph company. The activities of these companies are conducted in accordance with the same neoliberal theory, and they are being helped in this regard by the government that tries to facilitate all difficulties in the privatization processes. We see, for instance, Sir John—the chairman of the railway company and "the man who brings us a million and a half of pounds" (*N* 120), as General Montero puts it—trying to solve the problem of establishing the railway routes. Importantly, "What concerned him most at the time," says the narrator, "was the acquisition of land for the railway" (*N* 37). The major problem that Sir John encounters in this task is the reluctance of some private owners to sell their land to the company. However, this problem is solved with the interference of the government, which, according to the narrator, "was bound to carry out its part of the contract with the board of the new railway company, even if it had to use force for the purpose" (*N* 37). The use of force (on which I will elaborate shortly) is one of the major conditions that may be effectuated when any barrier emerges in neoliberalization. This is affirmed in Harvey's book, where he explains that, according to theory, "the state must use its power to impose or invent market systems" (65). What is equally notable is the observation that if the government is using force to 'privatize' what is already private (i.e., to corporatize private assets), that necessarily means it will not hesitate to denationalize any public possessions. This applies most probably to ecclesiastical holdings, of whose fate we know nothing, but at least we are aware of the futile efforts that Father Corbelan exerts in "the restitution of the confiscated Church property" (*N* 188-89). The land is indeed corporatized on a wide scale, and what is happening in Sulaco in this regard, as it is seen in

the eyes of Martin Decoud, is a process of "colonization of vast tracts of land in one great financial scheme" (*N* 153).

Actually, what facilitates the application of neoliberal beliefs in Costaguana is the premise that those senior officials of the government, in some way or another, are entangled with the world of business. When Sir John meets them in Sta. Marta, he finds them "cultured men, men to whom the conditions of civilized business were not unknown" (*N* 37). In addition, it is in the interests of such officials that figures like Gould and Sir John have large, privatized businesses in Sulaco because these officials are among the beneficiaries of these companies. The narrator also relates that "[t]he great of the earth (in Sta. Marta) reserved the posts in the old Occidental State to those nearest and dearest to them … for the San Tomé mine had its own unofficial pay list" (*N* 116). The clearest example of such corrupt people is the "provincial Excellency" of Sulaco, whom Gould visits in order to get his approval for building the new mining villages. The "Excellency" does so only when he gets bribed. Certainly, this corruption leads to the rise of a certain group of people with identical financial goals. In short, these practices augment the power of certain classes, and this condition is among the important features of neoliberalization. Harvey asserts this fact when he argues that neoliberalism can be understood as "a *political* project to re-establish the conditions for capital accumulation and to restore the power of economic elites" (19). Indeed, *Nostromo* externalizes the way neoliberal values are exclusively of interest to those trying to be in control of not only the political arena but also of economic proceedings. This is most evident, in the first place, in the case of Gould, who is called "El Rey de Sulaco" and the "King of Sulaco" throughout the novel, and whose mine is repeatedly referred to as "Imperium in Imperio." This name truly reflects the powerful position that Gould holds in the

consciousness of people within all social classes. Among business people, he is seen as a man who can easily influence the government in the direction that serves their ends. Upon encountering the impediment of land acquisition, Sir John is told by the engineer-in-chief that Gould "seems to have the ear of every provincial authority" (*N* 42), and accordingly Sir John seeks his help. And among the autocratic officials of Sulaco, Gould symbolizes for them mysterious power, for they eventually acknowledge the fact that Gould "remained in most effective touch with the higher authorities in Sta. Marta" (*N* 92). This is a compelling reason for them not to make barriers in his business ways; rather, they opt for trying to be on Gould's corrupt payroll.

And for those who are even greater than Gould, it is worth their while that Gould remains a highly potent figure in Sulaco because they conceive of him as a tool that actualizes their agendas. When Holroyd ultimately expresses his conviction that Gould "may yet become a power in the land" (*N* 80), he is earnestly anxious about this prospect, and that conviction triggers his investment in the Gould Concession. I am saying 'agendas' because, of course, such largely injected capital into Costaguana is not done out of a humanitarian impulse. Such economic designs can be clearly seen by those who are watching the dynamic situation in Constaguana's politics and economy from a distance. For instance, some experienced officials in Holroyd's headquarters in San Francisco believe that Holroyd's business in Sulaco "meant by-and-by to get hold of the whole Republic of Costaguana, lock, stock, and barrel" (*N* 81). Of course, the reader already knows this truth (as Holroyd himself expresses these plans to Gould), but the public in the world of the novel might not see this with the same clarity. Also, in the same way Holroyd is exerting power through Gould, the latter does the same through powerful agents in Sta. Marta. At least we know one of such

agents who "seemed, without official position, to possess an extraordinary influence in the highest Government spheres" (*N* 38). He is said to have even direct relationships with the successive Presidents, who are willing to listen to his advice and suggestions. As a result of this convergence between the interests of governmental figures and business people, both groups get completely homogenized to the degree whereby distinguishability becomes nearly impossible. As one of the high-ranking bureaucrats puts it, "The political Jefé, the chief of the police, the chief of the customs, the general, all, all, are the officials of that Gould" (*N* 111). The ensuing group that manages to lay its hands on every aspect of life in Sulaco is what is referred to as the "Blancos," who succeed in bringing President Ribiera to power. Despite the observation that neoliberalization has been ongoing before this time, the coming of Don Vincente Ribiera accelerates dramatically this process. All of the Blancos seem very energetic in their attempts to inaugurate what I shall call the Ribierist phase, which constitutes the thesis of the Hegelian dialectical history under study. Importantly, the revolution that brings Ribiera to power is financed primarily by the San Tomé mine and, secondarily, by Sir John (through the big loan he secures for the government) and Holroyd (through the credit granted by the Third Southern Bank in the United States).

I would like in this context to establish henceforth a number of dysfunctions of the new system being imposed on Sulaco, which are themselves additional features of neoliberalism. The discussion of class power above is clearly simultaneous with externalizing the concomitant corruption without which the dominant class cannot keep its exceptional position. This is the first form of inefficiency to be outlined here, and it does not necessitate further elaboration. Thus, I will move to the second neoliberal dysfunction in *Nostromo*, which has to do with other classes. If these political and economic policies brought with the

vast neoliberalization processes mean the restoration of class power, there will definitely exist those who will pay the price. In this case, it is the common people, in general, and the proletariat class, in particular, who will suffer these inequitable privileges. Worse still, as capitalist people accumulate more capital, more poverty will befall the proletariat. The maldistribution of wealth will create a social rift whose locus within the social structure will fuel upheavals and riots in the whole system (the best example being the Monterist coup discussed in phase two). This rupturing feature is asserted in Harvey's argument about the "creative destruction" instigated by neoliberalism, which, according to Harvey, will ruin social connections (3). But equally important are the miserable conditions of people under this capitalist model. The best example that illustrates this fact is the titular character, Nostromo, whose name (which means 'our man') designates the servitude and exploitation of the class whom he represents. It has been suggested in this regard that "Nostromo's career represents the history of an entire class, the proletariat—its enlistment and exploitation in the industrialization of the country" (Fleishman 163-64), and that Nostromo symbolizes "the slave morality" (Ross 130). I completely agree with both views because Nostromo's association with the "people" is persistently underpinned in the novel. Even in his note to the work, Conrad insists that Nostromo is to be conceived of as a "Man of the People" (*N* xi, xii, xiii). Yet, at the end of phase one, just by the rise of the Monterist coup, we should ask: who is Nostromo? He is simply and literally a penniless man after he donates the last dollar he has to a begging woman. He is utterly a vagabond as we always see him either on errands for his bosses or loitering on the streets, just homeless! He is not treated as a human at all. In eyes of Captain Mitchell, "he was one of those invaluable subordinates whom to possess is a legitimate cause of boasting" (*N* 44). And Mitchell does boast indeed as he declares, "The

fellow is devoted to me, body and soul!" (*N* 44). As such, Nostromo is commodified, or rather 'privatized' in exactly the same way other private and public properties are corporatized.

Since he is a "Man of the People," those whom he represents are analogously commodified. But in this context, I would like to focus particularly on the commodification of labor power, which is another feature/dysfunction of *Nostromo*'s neoliberalism. The rehabilitation of the mine brings into existence three villages, where miners can find a place to live. As the news of the newly constructed mine spreads in the country, we see a large number of families moving to these villages in the hope of finding means of subsistence. Many of them, including children, are working at the mine. And, of course, we can imagine the tough conditions of such kind of work. Yet, what is more important (though less noticeable) is the reason why all this large number of unemployed people seek the San Tomé mine. We are told, ironically, that "the ignorant were beginning to murmur that the Ribierist reforms meant simply the taking away of the land from the people" (*N* 195). Appropriation of the land leads eventually to the emergence of a class of landless peasants who, in effect, will resort to selling their labor, which is the only asset they have. Harvey reminds us that "accumulation by dispossession" is one of the main characteristics of neoliberalism. Accumulation by dispossession, according to Harvey, entails necessarily "privatization of land" and the "commodification of labour power" (159). *Nostromo* unfolds both of these mechanisms, and that is why it should be seen that the former leads to the latter.

The next malfunction is a disguised form of tyranny and dictatorship. This is one of the hardly noticeable illnesses in the political and social practices of Sulaco. The best way through which this argument can be ascertained is to trace it in the rhetoric that the Ribierists

use in propagating their project. Throughout the novel, the Blanco party and their supporters draw upon a media war in order to realize their neoliberal policies by securing the people's consent for what they do. Whether in their official meetings, public celebrations or 'national' occasions, the Blancos and supporters of Ribiera use the same discourse in support of their cause. This discourse comprises mainly a number of values that do indeed cater to the aspirations of the majority of people. During President Ribiera's visit to Sulaco, he gives a short speech about "the safeguards of national honour" (*N* 119). These, in Ribiera's political understanding, include "honesty, peace, respect for law, [and] political good faith abroad and at home" (*N* 119). The same ideals are also propagated in the oratory speeches of Don José, the most prominent intellectual of the Blancos. Don José is not only enthusiastic about these values, but also he "expatiate[s] upon the patriotic nature of the San Tomé mine" (*N* 51). His book, "Fifty Years of Misrule," is an attack on previous methods of governance like those of Guman Bento, at the hands of whom Don José suffered greatly. The values that the Ribierist cause comes to oppose are exactly those followed by dictators like Bento. The other important propagandist of the Blanco ideals in Sulaco is Decoud, the "Costaguana boulevardier" and journalist of Sulaco. The role of Decoud is particularly influential after Montero's coup and especially through his writings in *The Porvenir*. This newspaper is essentially established upon Don José's suggestion in order to "voice the aspirations of the province" (*N* 158). Moreover, what Ribiera, Gould, Don José, and Decoud are enthusiastically defending in Costaguana is also paralleled by similar values propagated by business people outside. In his letter to his sister in France, Decoud says, "as long as the treasure flowed north, without a break, that utter sentimentalist, Holroyd, would not drop his idea of introducing, not only justice, industry, peace, to the benighted continents, but also

that pet dream of his of a purer form of Christianity" (*N* 240). Holroyd's invocation of justice, peace and progress are the same Ribierist ideals being discussed. There is also the value of freedom, which gratifies significantly Giorgio Viola, the Italian Garibaldino who is one of the important Ribierist figures in the novel. Viola continually reminisces about his fight under Garibaldi for the cause of liberty. After all, neoliberalism is originally rooted in what is ostensibly believed to be freedom.

Of course, the ideals of peace, justice, freedom, and respect for the law are great. Yet, the problem with these principles in the world of *Nostromo* exists on two levels. First, what is being achieved in Sulaco is quite the opposite, and the dysfunctions of corruption, exploitation, and commodification discussed above will ultimately lead to a situation whereby such values are shattered. Second, and most relevant, the point that I am trying to establish here is what is being ignored in this propagandist campaign: *democracy*. Nowhere in all of their writings, speeches, and discussions do these Ribierists, before the Monterist coup, mention or even hint at the ideal of democracy. They solely start talking about democratic principles after Montero captures the city because Montero does so in the name of democracy. The same situation applies also to their political practices. Decisions, for example, are taken exclusively by the elites and members of the Provincial Assembly, like Goud, Don José, and Don Juste Lopez. We never see parliamentary activities. But the question is: why? That is, why should business and political figures stress the significance of the law, justice, and progress but avoid democracy. The answer to this question is explained by Harvey, who argues,

> Neoliberal theorists are, however, profoundly suspicious of democracy. Governance by majority rule is seen as a potential threat to individual rights

> and constitutional liberties. Democracy is viewed as a luxury, only possible under conditions of relative affluence coupled with a strong middle-class presence to guarantee political stability. Neoliberals therefore tend to favour governance by experts and elites. A strong preference exists for government by executive order and by judicial decision rather than democratic and parliamentary decision-making. (66)

It should be clear that democracy, in the world of *Nostromo*, is an antonymous value to the neoliberal theory. The Blanco party will never be convinced that democracy is a workable principle simply because it stands against their interests. And, again, it is the people who will pay the price of this additional neoliberal dysfunction. Perhaps it is for this reason that Ribiera is sometimes referred to as the "President-Dictator."

The last two aspects of neoliberal adversity that I would like to highlight in the context of phase one are also pointed out by Harvey in his comments on "accumulation by dispossession." These include "the national debt and, most devastating of all, the use of the credit system as a radical means of accumulation by dispossession. The state, with its monopoly of violence and definitions of legality, plays a crucial role in both backing and promoting these processes" (Harvey 159). Harvey's characterization of these two features is opaquely evident in *Nostromo*. The first, which has to do with "national debt," is clearly an inevitable consequence of invading the country with huge sums of capital by investors, shareholders, creditors, and so on. A substantial portion of this capital is offered directly to the government, like the loans that Ribiera's government obtains from Europe. Such creditors and investors will eventually retain their capital, but with the surplus value expected from these economic ventures. Also, the treasure that pours from the San Tomé mine toward

foreign destinations is symbolic of the way the country is being impoverished. Governmental loans also might have been indeed of value had it not been for the ongoing corruption discussed above. All of these factors will create an economic crisis for the whole country whereby economic, political and social turbulences are inescapable. The next neoliberal characteristic, which pertains to the "monopoly of violence and definitions of legality," is also equally harmful on a national level. The Ribierists and their enthusiasts do not hesitate to resort to violence when it comes to enforcing their schemas. As I formerly pointed out, the government contract with the railway company impels it to materialize the agreement "even if it had to use force for the purpose" (*N* 37); that is, to use force against land owners. Even at the level of conducting the routine and daily activities of neoliberal companies, the use of force is possible. It has been claimed about this point that "[w]henever force is required to defend the material interests . . . Nostromo and his *cargadores* control the mob" (Ross 124). For that reason, Nostromo (who is "of the People") is being exploited against the people, generating social feuds and enmities. The use of violence sometimes takes a shocking direction, as when the chief magistrate suggests the killing of Father Corbelan in one of the nearby islands because of Corbelan's counter-demands.

Accordingly, with this last dysfunctional aspect we come to the end of phase one of the dialectical history under study. The threats of corruption, exploitation, commodification, dictatorship, impoverishment, and violence that are discussed in phase one of the dialectical history of Sulaco are more than dangerous to the whole country of Costaguana. Yet, still there is another supreme danger that I will establish toward the end of this chapter, after discussing the two consecutive phases. Again, this danger lies in the historical dementia that makes Sulaco's history regress toward a past, disruptive time. For the purpose of doing so, it

is necessary at this stage to see the historically weird starting point in this chain of dialectical phases. It is indeed bizarre that a novel published in 1904 unfolds a capitalist model that came into being seventy years later. It is argued even that the "neoliberal economic policy reform became widespread in the 1980s, and continued to spread dramatically throughout the last two decades of the twentieth century" (Auerback 31). Conrad's time was historically marked by imperialist capitalism, or the capitalist rivalry between the major imperialist powers that controlled every geopolitical zone of the whole globe. That model of capitalism is totally different from the pattern being discussed in this novel in terms of political and economic dynamics. It is because of this important differentiation that I argue there seems to be a confusion characterizing the historical reading of Conrad's *Nostromo*, as expressed in the critical views I survey above. In many respects, capitalism *is* indeed a form of imperialism, but when considering these two concepts in historical terms, more focused phraseology and terminology become important. All in all, the fact that Conrad was able to prophesize this advanced form of capitalism, which is the dominant model in phase one of the dialectical history of Sulaco, is what I am trying to ascertain here.

I will thus move to the second stage in this dialectical chain, which is the antithesis. I shall call this historical part the Monterist phase, launched by General Montero and his brother, Pedro Montero. One of the essential characteristics of the Hegelian antithesis, according to Marx's descriptive analysis cited above, is that it is the result of the process whereby the thesis "doubles itself into two contradictory thoughts." That is, once again, the antithesis belongs originally and thematically to the thesis. The emergence of the second phase in *Nostromo* conforms precisely to this condition because the originators of this phase are the product of the Ribierist cause. General Montero, Pedro Montero, Colonel Sotillo,

Señor Gamacho, and Señor Fuentes are all Monterists in origin. They are not only supporters of President Ribiera, but also some of them used to occupy highly sensitive positions. Montero is the Minister of War in Ribiera's government and the "the military head of the Blanco party" (*N* 38). He is praised in the Costaguana press as the leader who performs the "most heroic military exploit of modern times" and the "greatest military exploit of modern times" (*N* 39, 119). Pedro Montero, his brother, is at the outset an official in the Costaguana Legation in Paris, but then he is promoted to a high position in Sta. Marta. Similarly, Colonel Sotillo "had been influenced in his adoption of the Ribierist cause by the belief that it had the enormous wealth of the Gould Concession on its side" (*N* 284). But when he is informed of Ribiera's defeat, he suddenly becomes a Monterist. Señores Gamacho and Fuentes also change their neoliberal convictions in the same way. Decoud reports in his letter that "when the downfall of the Ribierist cause became confirmed beyond the shadow of a doubt, they have blossomed into convinced Liberals . . . ultimately taking charge, as it were, of the riot in the name of Monterist principles" (*N* 227). All of these figures, then, cannot be said to exist outside the neoliberal boundaries in the first phase, regardless of their intentions for launching this coup. What I want to make unmistakable is that their 'revolution' is actually an effect of the Ribierist era, and this fact will be additionally substantiated in my discussion (below) of the pretext under which they initiate the Monterist transformation. Whatever comes in this phase, whether 'positive' or 'negative,' should be thus ascribed to the neoliberal thesis.

I am using the term 'Monterist transformation' because the whole country of Costaguana, including Sulaco, does fall under the control of General Montero. This fact is stressed more than once throughout the novel and is narrated in different ways by the

narrator, Captain Mitchell, and Decoud (in his letter to his sister in Paris). The beginning of the novel is marked by the chaos of the military riots in Sulaco. We see president Ribiera and the local authorities of Sulaco trying to evade the mob by resorting to the O.S.N Co., where they are saved by Nostromo and his *Cargadores*. Later, Decoud discloses to his sister the news that comes from Cayta about the Ribierist defeat at the hands of the Monteros. Perdro Montero is on top of an 'army,' under the leadership of Señores Gamacho and Fuentes, marching toward the city, while Sotillo is leading another military faction coming from Esmeralda by sea. Sulaco, in short, is captured from all directions. But what is more important is the fact that, at first, those deputies and high-ranking officials in Sulaco surrender the city and accept Montero as the new chief executive of the country. Don Juste, Don José, and the other members of the Provincial Assembly meet in the great "sala" and start talking favorably of Montero. They are severely reproached by Decoud, who rushes out to Antonia shouting in her face, "It is a surrender" (*N* 238). The Provincial Assembly even prepares a deputation to receive Montero upon his arrival, despite Gould's refusal to join and in spite of Don José's conservative attitude toward the proceedings in the city. I am emphasizing the fact of Sulaco's surrender to Montero's power because the disruptive narrative form, I believe, does not externalize lucidly this transitional period. Most of the events that pertain to Montero's rule of the city are told as reminisces, either during the time of Ribiera's presidency or after Sulaco's independence, as though the Monterist coup were a fleeting, unimportant 'moment' in the history of the city. Eventually, Pedro Montero enters Sulaco in the middle of a ceremonious welcome by the mob, and he becomes the local governor.

But why do Montero, his brother, and followers embark on this *coup d'état*? What is wrong with their acquiescence to the neoliberal regime in which some of them, especially Montero, are financially compromised? The answer to this question is actually a further elaboration on the thermodynamic inefficiency being traced in this chapter. The narrator explains, "The Minister of War . . . had declared the national honour sold to foreigners. The Dictator, by his weak compliance with the demands of the European powers—for the settlement of long outstanding money claims—had showed himself unfit to rule" (*N* 145). Neoliberalism, in Montero's eyes, is the selling of "national honour." It is, in other words, a breach of the sovereignty of the state. This is made clear in the Monterist press when it announces a prospective alliance with the Republic of the North "against the sinister land-grabbing designs of European powers, cursing in every issue the 'miserable Ribiera,' who had plotted to deliver his country, bound hand and foot, for a prey to foreign speculators" (*N* 146). Montero's followers are convinced that the country is seriously threatened by foreign speculators and investors, who have managed to dominate the way national decisions are made in Costaguana. We are told that "[a]mongst the cries of the mob not the least loud had been the cry of death to foreigners" (*N* 307). Therefore, what is being attacked in this Moterist 'revolution' is one of the major dysfunctional aspects of neoliberalism, and it is this Moterist pretext that makes the antithesis here become indeed of and against the thesis. The other detrimental effect of neoliberal policies that is blasted in the antithesis is the dictatorship of Ribiera's neoliberal regime. As explained earlier, democracy is never spoken of among the elites of Ribierist circles, and that is why Pedro Motero is "going to take possession of Sulaco in the name of the Democracy" (*N* 242). And once again, those who are enthusiastic toward the Monterist cause are easily driven by the 'democracy' pretext, as the

rioting mob in Sulaco yell "Viva la Libertad!" and "Down with Feudalism!" (*N* 227). In the eyes of the Sulacan people, neoliberalism is a form of feudalism because they, especially those at the bottom of the social hierarchy (and particularly the proletariat), are the social class who continually pay the price of the Ribierist experimentation with the new economic paradigm. And that is why Montero's reasons behind his coup are successful in catering to the needs of the majority of such oppressed classes.

Yet, the reasons stated above do not truly represent the *real* triggering impetus of Montero's takeover. These motives are meant only to convince his followers of the just cause behind what they intend to do. As such, Montero knows well how to win the oppressed class to his side by pretending to fight for their cause, for the restoration of their rights as citizens. However, Montero and his brother are hypocrites in this regard since the political and economic goals they aspire to are totally different from the propagandist aims they spell out. This fact does not contradict the claim that the neoliberal thesis is the real cause of this Monterist antithesis because if the Ribierists had not effected such political and social destructiveness, Montero would never have found the convincing pretext for his followers to rise against the present regime. After all, most of the additional damage done in this Monterist coup (discussed below) is performed at the hands of the people themselves.

With regard to the real intentions of the upheaval, I shall argue that Montero's political and economic designs have analogous, vicious results, if not worse. That is why, importantly, Conrad's attack on the neoliberal model in Nostromo does not mean that Montero's 'revolution' is better. On the contrary, the aspirations of the Montero brothers are more greedy and despotic. The first cause of the riots is to appropriate the treasure of the San Tomé mine. This goal is ascertained clearly on many occasions and by many characters. For

example, in his letter to his sister, Decoud asserts that Montero's "primary object was undoubtedly the getting hold of the San Tomé silver" (*N* 227), and later he insists, "The real objective is the San Tomé mine itself" (*N* 244). In fact, because Decoud knows for sure what the real objective of Montero is, he tells Antonia angrily that the authorities of Sta. Marta are to be blamed because Montero "ought to have been bought off with his own stupid weight of gold—his weight of gold, I tell you, boots, sabre, spurs, cocked hat, and all" (*N* 183). Moreover, Pedro Montero himself reveals his aims when he encounters the engineer at the railhead: "Pedrito made many pointed inquiries as to the silver mine, and what had become of the product of the last six months' working" (*N* 242), and he orders the engineer to get the answers to his inquiries from his chief. Similarly, Sotillo changes his alliance out of a materialistic impulse: "The only guiding motive of his life was to get money for the satisfaction of his expensive tastes" (*N* 286). Later, Sotillo's behavior becomes completely driven by his obsession with the silver of the mine to the extent of hysteria. After his arrival from Esmeralda, he becomes always furious with all those who are brought for investigations about the silver. Believing mistakenly that Hirsch knows where the silver is, Sotillo severely tortures and eventually kills him. And when he reasons that he will not be able to get hold of the silver before the coming of Pedro, he decides to break his alliance with him.

Thus, the general intention of the Monterist antithesis is materialistic in nature, but there is even more. It is worth mentioning that, despite General Montero's leadership of the riots, the executive of the coup is his brother. General Montero never appears after Ribiera's visit to Sulaco, and the one who dominates the 'revolutionary' scene thereafter is Pedro, and the whole 'revolution' becomes then associated with his ambitions. The narrator affirms, "The general himself probably could have been bought off, pacified with flatteries,

despatched on a diplomatic mission to Europe. It was his brother who had egged him on from first to last" (*N* 388). Therefore, Pedro is the engineering mind behind this political transformation, and, significantly, it is in Pedro's supreme plan that the historical role of the antithesis, being studied here, becomes more apparent. While being in France, Pedro becomes highly affected by the political and economic life of the French Second Empire, especially the exceptional privileges of the French court. In particular, Pedro has a pipedream of having a position in Costaguana like that of Charles Auguste Louis Joseph Demorny (1811-1865), or the Duc de Morny, the half-brother of Emperor Napoleon III. This fact is asserted more than once. The narrator tells us, for example, "like the Duc de Morny, he would associate the command of every pleasure with the conduct of political affairs and enjoy power supremely in every way" (*N* 387).

In fact, Pedro is infatuated not only with the political power of Morny but also with the wealth that Morny was able to accumulate. In the following longer passage, the narrator provides more details on how exactly Pedro aspires to be like Morny:

> He wanted to become the most brilliant statesman of South America. He did not desire supreme power. He would have been afraid of its labour and risk, in fact. Before all, Pedrito Montero, taught by his European experience, meant to acquire a serious fortune for himself. . . . Sulaco was the land of future prosperity, the chosen land of material progress, the only province in the Republic of interest to European capitalists. Pedrito Montero, following the example of the Duc de Morny, meant to have his share of this prosperity. This is what he meant literally. Now his brother was master of the country, whether as President, Dictator, or even as Emperor—why not as an Emperor?—he

> meant to demand a share in every enterprise—in railways, in mines, in sugar estates, in cotton mills, in land companies, in each and every undertaking—as the price of his protection. (*N* 388)

Conrad's characterization of Morny conforms precisely to the historical reality of Morny, who was known as a businessman more than as a politician. Indeed, according to his biographers, Morny was greatly entangled with the world of business and was highly 'successful' in this regard. Morny started his business career by having a share in the beet-sugar industry, and he gradually enlarged his speculations and shareholding until he became involved in every industrial sector, like those sought by Pedro. Morny's time was actually marked by economic and industrial boom, which helped him greatly establish the wealthy position he enjoyed. In this regard, Rosalynd Pflaum explains,

> The political history of Napoleon III's government is, in fact, less important than the social and economic transformation it brought with it. In the latter field Auguste left an indelible mark. In tune with the times which he understood as few contemporaries, he personified the economy of the Second Empire. A speculator and an unscrupulous profiteer in an era clouded by the shadow of financial disrepute, he was also a successful pioneer, a daring industrial innovator who assembled hitherto undreamed-of business combinations which set trends for France of the future. (146-147)

But Morny's wealth was largely made through his political power, in the same way Pedro intends to use his position as a statesman in order to enjoy a well-to-do status. In any economic project, the mere fact that Morny was involved was an assurance that the undertaking would succeed. But there was an air of corruption in this process. Pflaum asserts

that “the rumor ‘Morny’s in it’ was sufficient to sell out any stock issue. Later, whenever a large-scale fraudulent speculation was uncovered, people would whisper, ‘Morny’s been in it!’” (147). This is also affirmed by Roger Williams, who argues, “Anyone with court connections, including the imperial half-brother, was watched or bribed. ‘*Morny est dans l’affaire*’ [or ‘Morny was in the business’] was the investor’s clearest guarantee of handsome earnings” (49). It is exactly this sense of venality that characterizes the business life of Morny and which is reflected in Pedro’s dreams about a similar Morny-position in a Costaguana Empire.

Pedro’s corrupt ambitions, in fact, externalize the sheer blunder and rapacious practices that are peculiar to the second phase of Sulaco’s Hegelian history. This is the major injurious dysfunction of this stage, which is to be added to the list of destructive features discussed in the first phase. It is true that the neoliberal economy that the Ribierist government establishes in the city is based upon a number of contradictions that are harmful for the majority of people, but there exist some productive activities that are undoubtedly beneficial in some way or another, regardless of who are the profiteers. They make advancements in transportation (through railways), communication (through the telegraph company), and industry (through the mine). Eventually, there remains the hope that someday these activities will be directed differently to serve the interests of common people as well as the capitalist class. Yet, the Monterist model never allows for such constructive aspects, neither does it even leave the mere hope of a better future. What Montero and his brother bring with them is only a ‘system’ of sheer rapaciousness, for they intend only to be parasitic feeders of what has been already constructed. In fact, they have no political or economic

strategy for the country, whether good or bad. While the neoliberal era is constructive and destructive all at once, the Monterist phase is only hurtful.

All of the Monterist leaders and followers are driven by the same pillaging incentive, as in the case of Sotillo and his cruel investigations about the silver. Sotillo is indeed a very savage man as one of the Cargadores once tells Nostromo that Sotillo "had once ordered a man to be flayed alive in the remote Campo" (*N* 281). Sotillo represents the type of people whom Montero can depend on while trying to build the Costaguana Empire he dreams of. Señores Fuentes and Gamacho are not better in this regard, for under their leadership the mob have plundered whatever they can on their way to Sulaco. When they enter the city, calling themselves "the 'army' of Pedro Montero," most of them are riding stolen horses, being "clad in the heterogeneous stock of roadside stores they had looted hurriedly in their rapid ride through the northern part of the province" (*N* 384). Their practices are so repulsive that the narrator describes their image as "a torrent of rubbish" (*N* 384). When Pedro arrives among this chaotic ceremony and enters the major official building of Sulaco, he finds that it has been completely looted and left bare. He becomes angry, claiming, "We are not barbarians" (*N* 391). Yet, what is called the Monterist army is precisely characterized by barbarity, or, more accurately, rapacious barbarity. At the beginning of the novel, Captain Mitchell recounts how "[w]e were infested, infested, overrun, sir, here at that time by ladrones and matreros, thieves and murderers from the whole province" (*N* 13). Truly, the Monterist phase has attracted thieves and criminals from all over the country, as the city becomes utterly governed by lawlessness. It can hardly be said that those rioting people are driven by any political agenda or economic principles. Old Viola rightly observes, "These were not a people striving for justice, but thieves" (*N* 20). Moreover, the most barbaric aspect

of their 'revolutionary' activities can be perceived in the scene where President Ribiera and the local authorities in Sulaco are chased by the rabble, who furiously want to avenge themselves upon Ribiera with whatever weapon they have, like knives, stones, and sticks. The barbarity of the scene lies in the collective punishment being performed. A decent, revolutionary regime would resort to legal channels, which are completely lacking under Montero's rule. The Monterist riots have also resulted in randomly killing people on the streets. Upon his attempt to avoid the rebelling crowds, Hirsch stumbles more than once upon the dead bodies of people killed in the upheaval.

The barbaric violence that Montero brings with him triggers similar counter-violence on the part of the Ribierists, despite the surrender of the city. Apart from the military preparations that the Blancos make (like the army of Barrios), I want here to focus only on the most effective weapon in the hands of Gould: the mine. Upon bringing Gould to the Intendencia of Sulaco, Pedro asks Gould threateningly to surrender the mine without any resistance, which Gould refuses to do. Gould, instead, threatens Pedro by revealing his intention to blow up the whole mine the moment he feels the mine is going to be robbed again, and he has entrusted Don Pépé with this task with the use of large amounts of dynamite. What is equally jeopardizing is Gould's explanation "that the destruction of the San Tomé mine would cause the ruin of other undertakings, the withdrawal of European capital, the withholding, most probably, of the last instalment of the foreign loan" (*N* 403). Gould knows very well the economic and *symbolic* significance of the mine to the whole country. By exploding the mine, Gould is not only evaporating Perdo's dream of laying his hands on it, but also he will utterly shatter Pedro's 'Morny-dream' of being a wealthy statesman. The destruction of the mine will surely destroy every other project in the city.

What I want to establish in this regard is that the Monterist coup is destructive in every respect: in its premise and in the reaction it triggers. But again, this destructiveness should ultimately be blamed on the Ribierist regime, which, at least, could not neutralize such ensuing riots. That is, in its quest for the exclusive benefits of a limited class, it completely ignores the highly important security dimension. It not only impoverishes the country but also leaves it an easy prey for barbaric practices.

The last, and most important, feature of the Monterist antithesis is its position in the Hegelian history of Sulaco under study. Despite the various injuries brought up with the Montero's short rise to power, and despite his barbarous 'regime,' the historical antithesis of Sulaco can be positioned, at least in theory, somewhere in the middle of the nineteenth century. That is, regardless of the 'real' historical time within the fictional boundaries of *Nostromo* (i.e., the time when some of the events of the novel can be temporalized according to real historical events and figures like Garibaldi of Italy), the plausible time of this particular phase can be said to exist in exactly the time mentioned above *according to theory*. The political and economic 'model' that Montero is trying to apply conforms theoretically to the time of Morny. In his meeting with Gould, Pedro expresses frankly his intention to bring to Sulaco the historical model of "what the Second Empire had done for France. It was a régime which delighted to honour men of Don Carlos's stamp. The Second Empire fell, but that was because its chief was devoid of that military genius which had raised General Montero to the pinnacle of fame and glory" (*N* 405). Thus, if we observe the direction of this Hegelian history of Sulaco, it will be easily noticed that the Monterist antithesis has moved Sulaco more than a hundred years back in history. We have already contextualized the first phase in the late twentieth century, and therefore Sulaco's antithesis is a step of historical

regress instead of progress. This is the first symptom of its historical dementia. The movement of history is Hegelian, so far, in terms of structure, but not in development. Yet, we still need to examine the third phase in order to establish an overall evaluation of the Hegelian history of Sulaco.

The third phase is, of course, the outcome of the conflict that takes place between the thesis and the antithesis. The Ribiersts emerge victorious at the hands of General Barrios, Hernandez, and Don Pépé. Sulaco becomes an independent state, and neoliberalism is back again, as material interests assume yet a much more powerful position in the political and economic life of Sulaco. "Material changes swept along in the train of material interests," the narrator avers (*N* 504). The San Tomé mine, the materialistic symbol of the neoliberal city, has 'prospered' and grown into the San Tomé Consolidated Mines, "whose territory, containing gold, silver, copper, lead, cobalt, extends for miles along the foot-hills of the Cordillera" (*N* 504). The same economic boom is also true of the other companies like the O.S.N. Co., which now has a larger fleet. Yet, what I shall argue is that the third phase, the synthesis of the first two phases, is not simply a return to the political and economic model adopted in the thesis. The synthesis is rather a heterogeneous amalgamation of neoliberal principles and Monterist, barbaric elements. Both Ribierist neoliberalism and Monterist barbarism survive completely into the third phase, and this fact will soon be established in surveying the new types of dysfunctions that pertain to the terminal period. The synthesis is essentially a monstrous product, a model that is peerless in its destructive realities and probabilities. It might truly be termed a neoliberal monstrosity or barbaric neoliberalism. All of the malfunctions discussed in the thesis above (corruption, exploitation, commodification, despotism, etc.) are continued in the third period, but now they are colored with a very

dangerous dimension inherited from the second phase. What I want to trace in this last phase consists of four major threats to the newly independent state of Sulaco.

First, a state whose Minister of War is Hernandez is a terribly imperiled state. Hernandez, who is called the "bandit" and the "robber" throughout the novel, has been kidnapped during one of the Costaguana incessant wars in order to serve in the army. But later he kills his colonel and flees to the wilderness, where he organizes a big gang of outlaws and dissidents of all sorts. There, he becomes a threat to people, especially the bourgeois class. Hernandez' power is worrisome because no government has ever succeeded in putting an end to his threats. Importantly, despite their knowledge of Hernandez' history of lawlessness, the Ribierists strike a deal with him on the terms of Hernadez' defense against Montero in return for appointing him a Minister of War. After the war, Captain Mitchell tells Sulaco's visitors, "This is the famous Hernandez, Minister of War. *The Times*' special correspondent, who wrote that striking series of letters calling the Occidental Republic the 'Treasure House of the World,' gave a whole article to him and the force he has organized—the renowned Carabineers of the Campo" (*N* 480). Hernandez is praised in the public imagination! What is being praised in fact is sheer lawlessness. Anarchy and disorder become a road for greatness and high esteem in Sulaco.

Anarchy and the probabilities of future political and social disasters constitute the second dysfunctional feature of the third phase. After all, in the case of Hernandez, there is no guarantee that Hernandez would not rise up, in the future, against the government of the new state. Significantly, it is easier for Hernandez to do what Montero has already done because he doesn't need to impose his authority on the whole country of Costaguana. He can control Sulaco and become the new governor without difficulty. In his note to the work,

Conrad tells us that there are still those in Sulaco who are waiting "the Dawns of other New Eras, the coming of more Revolutions" (*N* xiv). Thus, the Monterist experience in Sulaco remains an actual possibility in the future. But disorder and anarchy are also visible in other dangerous realities in the city. Before the end of the novel we see anarchists and secret societies beginning to infiltrate the place, threatening its peace and security. Captain Mitchell would again tell Sulaco's visitors, "The Democratic party in opposition rests mostly, I am sorry to say, on these socialistic Italians, sir, with their secret societies, camorras, and such-like" (*N* 478). More important, anarchist activities and plotting become associated mysteriously with Nostromo, the Man of the People, who is now called Captain Fidanza. This fact is affirmed by Doctor Monygham when he tells Mrs. Gould there is certainly a conspiracy that finds its power in "the secret societies amongst immigrants and natives, where Nostromo—I should say Captain Fidanza—is the great man" (*N* 511). Monygham's warning is very serious, especially when we take into consideration how Nostromo, according to Monygham, is now "greater with the populace than ever he was before" (*N* 511). Indeed, Conrad insists on putting Nostromo in the middle of these secret circles as he tells us in his note that Nostromo would meet with such anarchists in the "Lodge," where he is "listening in unmoved silence to anarchist speeches at the meeting" (*N* xiii). Among these circles, Nostromo is now "the enigmatical patron of the new revolutionary agitation, the trusted, the wealthy comrade Fidanza" (*N* xiii). The novel indeed ends with a number of baffling mysteries hovering over the city. For it can hardly be imagined that Nostromo, the rich and the lover, is an anarchist who finances terrible practices. How and why? It is difficult to tell. All his dying moment, one of the comrades, who is described as "bloodthirsty" and a "hater of capitalists," asks him "Have you any dispositions to make,

comrade?" and reminds him also that "we want money for our work. The rich must be fought with their own weapons" (*N* 562). He also adds, "[Y]ou have refused all aid from that doctor. Is he really a dangerous enemy of the people?" (*N* 562-63). To these questions and remarks, Nostromo does not make any answer or comment, leaving the reader with an enigmatic scene that is too arduous to reconstruct. What dispositions is this comrade talking about? What type of work do they need money for? And who is this doctor? Is he Monygham? If the 'doctor' is dangerous, does the comrade mean to kill him? These will remain unanswerable questions. Yet, I believe that this mystification is intentional because it adds a sense of emergency to the already existing dangers in the city. We, as well as the people of Sulaco, know that there are anarchists but cannot anticipate what they intend to do and when. The indeterminacy of their intentions can spread terror in the whole place, a terror very similar to what we see in the London of *The Secret Agent*. Social and political eruption is expected at any moment, and therefore the place is not safe to live in. In addition to being a threat to the lives of people, Sulaco's lack of safety can rupture the whole economic system that makes the city 'boom.' Of course, economic development and security are inseparable.

The political eruption of Sualco is not confined to secret societies and anarchists; it can be seen rather openly in the types of social disharmony that befalls the city, which is the third dysfunction of the third phase. In the Ribierist period, exploitation of people is evident to the degree that many of them believe in the Monterist cause and participate in the resulting barbarism. But in this phase, the consciousness of such people becomes more developed and organized so that they no longer need the type of leadership they experienced in the Monterist coup. That is, the proletariat in the third phase can organize themselves on their own and act according to their cause, not the cause of others. Significantly, one of the

reasons why the Monterist 'revolution' fails lies in the false and corrupt pretext that the Montero brothers have in their minds, coupled with the disorganized, chaotic invasion of the city. But now, in the concluding phase, people are fully aware of their oppression. When Gould and his wife return to Sulaco after their long tour in North America and Europe, they have an important conversation with Monygham, Dona Antonia, and Corbelan, who is now the first Cardinal-Archbishop of Sulaco. During their meeting, Antonia wholeheartedly complains, "How can we remain blind, and deaf without pity to the cruel wrongs suffered by our brothers?" (*N* 509). To this enquiry, Monygham replies that "the material interests will not let you jeopardize their development for a mere idea of pity and justice" (*N* 509). More notably, the doctor adds, "Let them [capitalists] beware, then, lest the people, prevented from their aspirations, should rise and claim their share of the wealth and their share of the power" (*N* 510). What is noticeable in this talk is the awareness by the aristocrats of the danger that might come from the oppressed. Never before do they express such worries, and this fact designates the near certain probability of a proletarian revolution in the city. There is definitely an increasing social gap in the new republic that threatens to tear the country into conflicting social factions.

The other aspect of social eruption is a natural result of the characteristic 'un-citizenship' of Sualcan people. That is, the 'citizens' of the new republic are loyal to anything but to the state. There is no sense of nationalism among them. By nationalism, I do not mean a chauvinistic attitude of their belonging to their country but rather the sincerity and loyalty to their fellow citizens in whatever service they perform for the state. What is being externalized in the third phase is quite the opposite of this meaning. Most people are defined by their root countries. They are, for example, English, Spanish, French, or Italian.

Sub-communities are formed in Sulaco according to these closed categories. While this is true of the first and second phases, it becomes clearer in third one. Captain Mitchell, while escorting Sulaco's visitors, shows them the various social clubs that are built on the basis of this social division. There is no such thing called Sulaco 'community'; instead, following Miller's characterization, there is the "Sulaco noncommunity" (164). This view is also supported by Maureen Whitebrook, who argues that "the connections between individuals and the system are weak or non-existent" (159). Indeed, the most powerful connection that is common to these people, especially the capitalist class, is their material interests. It is in this observation that one of the most dangerous features of neoliberalism becomes apparent. In this regard, Harvey asserts that neoliberalism "poses the problem of how to ensure citizen loyalty. Nationalism is an obvious answer, but this is profoundly antagonistic to the neoliberal agenda" (79). Harvey concisely recapitulates this specific dilemma, which is most visible in the case of those who retire in Sulaco. As Monygham tells Mrs. Gould, "we who played our part in it had our reward" (*N* 507), meaning that those who have participated in the war of secession have already been rewarded and thus need not care about the country any more. This is true in the cases of Barrios, Father Roman, Don Pepe, and Captain Mitchell, who is now retired in England. We never see them any longer. Consequently, whether because of people's attachment to their mother nations, or because of their exclusive loyalty to material interests, Sulaco will remain only a name for them, a hotel-like resort where they can spend some time and then leave.

The fourth and last injurious dimension of the third Hegelian phase pertains to the human soul. This aspect, I believe, is the most devastating of all the thermodynamic dysfunctions that I have discussed thus far. The ultimate and most precious 'asset' that is

being wasted in the world of *Nostromo* is the human soul, either literally or figuratively. The best way of establishing this fact is through a reading of the short legendary tale related in the first pages of the work. The events of the tale take place on the peninsula of Azuera, which is very close to Sulaco. "The poor," says the narrator, "associating by an obscure instinct of consolation the ideas of *evil and wealth*, will tell you that it is deadly because of its forbidden treasures" (*N* 4; emphasis added). Despite its evil nature, two "Americanos" and a "mozo" venture upon searching for the cursed treasure, stealing a donkey for this purpose. Yet, all of them never appear again:

> The impious adventurers gave no other sign. The sailors, the Indian, and the stolen burro were never seen again. As to the mozo, a Sulaco man—his wife paid for some masses, and the poor four-footed beast, being without sin, had been probably permitted to die; but the two gringos, spectral and alive, are believed to be dwelling to this day amongst the rocks, under the fatal spell of their success. Their souls cannot tear themselves away from their bodies mounting guard over the discovered treasure. They are now rich and hungry and thirsty—a strange theory of tenacious gringo ghosts suffering in their starved and parched flesh of defiant heretics, where a Christian would have renounced and been released. (*N* 5)

The religious language that is used in this legend is meant to externalize how exactly *evil* can be associated with the process of seeking *wealth*. These adventurers are "impious" not because they attempt to search for the treasure but because of their greedy, obsessive attachment to it. This argument is evidenced by the donation of the mozo's wife, which reduces his punishment to death. It is important that this act of goodwill is not performed by

the mozo himself, and that is why he still needs to be punished. The other adventurers are severely punished because there is no redeeming act to be associated with them. Their eternal suffering, being hungry and thirsty, matches exactly their insatiability, the ultimate 'sin' for which they should pay dearly.

This legendary tale is indeed a short summary of the whole work and the thematic implications being conveyed in it. The tale is not told at the beginning without reason; it is rather meant to be kept in mind while reading the novel till the end. In order to ensure this aim, the narrative leaves traces and reminders of the inaugural legend, especially when approaching the concluding chapters. Most of these traces are associated with Nostromo, likening him to the legendary adventurers. He declares, for example, that "I shall linger on earth after I am dead, like those Gringos that haunt the Azuera" (*N* 258). He later asks Monygham, jokingly, "Doctor, did you ever hear of the miserable gringos on Azuera, that cannot die? Ha! ha! Sailors like myself" (*N* 460). Moreover, after he becomes very obsessed with the silver hidden in the Great Isabel, the narrator tells us that "he compared himself to the legendary Gringos, neither dead nor alive, bound down to their conquest of unlawful wealth on Azuera" (*N* 526). Last, and for the same obsessive reason, we are told, "He was afraid, because, neither dead nor alive, like the Gringos on Azuera, he belonged body and soul to the unlawfulness of his audacity. He was afraid of being forbidden the island" (*N* 531). I am invoking all of these examples in order to show how insistent Conrad is on the hermeneutic association between *Nostromo* and its legendary prototype.

The character of Nostromo, I believe, is the *historical parameter* of Sulaco's political and economic reality. In particular, the third phase begins when Nostromo undergoes an utter transformation of personality after realizing his miserable exploitation by the capitalists of

the city. His epiphany is largely stressed as he keeps reiterating the fact that he has been "betrayed." Thus, Nostromo decides to avenge himself upon those who have exploited him by keeping the treasure for himself. Like the legendary adventurers, Nostromo becomes obsessed with the silver ingots he has stolen, to the extent that he never cares about the fate of his fellow, Decoud, who helps him in the mission of taking the silver to the Great Isabel. The narrator repeatedly characterizes him as a slave of his cursed silver. Nostromo's capitalist transformation is concomitant with his immoral behavior, as he asks Linda's hand in marriage while simultaneously expressing his love for Giselle, effecting psychological suffering for both. This inhumane act on Nostromo's part is another indicator of the decadent condition he has undergone. Because of his obsessive materialism and its ensuing immorality, Nostromo has to be punished according to the same justice that governs the legendary story. His punishment is exactly like that of the mozo because Nostromo has in his 'account' some deeds of goodwill, like the dollar he donated to the poor woman just before he embarks on the taking of the silver to the Great Isabel. Nostromo, in short, is permitted to die.

Similarly, Decoud is penalized for the same reason. Despite the fact that Decoud is not driven by the same materialistic impulse of Sulaco's capitalists (for he confesses that his only drive is his love of Antonia), Decoud is even more enthusiastic toward the Ribierist cause than others are. He is the journalist who participates in the false propaganda of the neoliberal regime. He is, after all, the one whose suggestion of Sulaco's secession is the spark that motivates the dramatic conflict between the thesis and its antithesis. According to the law of the legend, those who are not sinners (in the sense of being haunted by material interests) should be punished if they merely participate in any act of 'sinning.' The donkey,

though not human, perishes for this reason. That is exactly why Decoud is made to commit suicide. Don José meets the same fate because of his support of the sinners' cause. Like Decoud, the character of Don José never shows any sign of infatuation with materialism for its own sake; he is rather defending the capitalist model of the Ribierists out of his suffering at the hands of previous political paradigms. Again, Don José is permitted to die "in the woods of Los Hatos worn out with his lifelong struggle for Right and Justice at the dawn of the New Era," as captain Mitchell tells us (*N* 477). Finally, the pivotal character who is punished like the Americanos is Gould, who is in the third phase very rich but always "hungry" and "thirsty." Gould very rarely appears in this concluding stage because he is always at his mine, becoming a capitalist maniac completely devoured by the great 'sin' of material interests. Mrs. Gould, by the end of the work, feels miserably forsaken by her husband, who cannot see anything or care about anything but his mining business. Doctor Monygham, while being with Mrs. Gould, "saw clearly the San Tomé mine possessing, consuming, burning up the life of the last of the Costaguana Goulds; mastering the energetic spirit of the son as it had mastered the lamentable weakness of the father" (*N* 522). Gould is indeed another Gringo who will never be permitted to die, living with his continuous suffering as long as *Nostromo* exists. Revisiting the work thirteen years after *Nostromo*'s publication, Conrad reminds us again of the punishment of "Charles Gould, the Idealist-creator of Material Interests whom we must leave to his Mine—from which there is no escape in this world" (*N* xi).

This is the ultimate dysfunction of this phase, whereby human souls are wasted in the capitalist expenditure. But there is also the overarching, crippling facet that is being traced along the three dialectical stages. It has been established thus far that Sulaco's dialectical

history is regressing more than a century between the first two phases, reaching by the end of phase two the middle of the nineteenth century. With the open ending of phase three, the historical 'development' of the city has moved further hundreds, probably thousands, of years back in time. The temporal position of the synthesis converges with the time of the legendary tale, and, needless to say, legends' antiquity is very deep in history. Thus, Sulaco's historical movement is consistent in its temporal regression. And, consequently, Conrad's philosophy of *Nostromo*'s capitalist history is Hegelian only in structure but not in teleology. While the Hegelian causal connectivity is meticulously applicable in the three phases, the supreme spirit that governs the Hegelian dialectics is displaced, in the capitalist history of *Nostromo*, by a corrupting and dismantling dementia. I am borrowing this word from Decoud's view that "every conviction, as soon as it became effective, turned into that form of dementia the gods send upon those they wish to destroy" (*N* 200). I understand this "conviction" to take the level of obsessive dogma, which is what is being depicted in *Nostromo*, whose material interests, following Said, constitute "a general *dementia* of which silver fetishism is a particular branch." (*Beginnings* 110; emphasis added). But the dementia I am tracing in Conrad's work is most visible in Sulaco's history, which is *diverted* to the opposite, anti-teleological direction, by the effectuation of an advanced form of capitalism. It is exactly this historical dementia that makes up the ultimate thermodynamic inefficiency in Conrad's Latin American Periphery.

Before closing this chapter, I would like to comment on relevant suggestions made by Daphna Erdinast-Vulcan and Christophe Robin about *Nostromo*'s legend. Importantly, Erdinast-Vulcan and Robin have rightly pointed to the significance of the legendary tale to the thematic interpretation of *Nostromo*. However, I cannot agree with the way they explain

the thematic 'return' of the legend and how it returns. Erdinast-Vulcan argues, "Against the supposed linearity of historical progression and its underlying teleology, the regime of legend and myth seems to engender a cyclical conception of human life" (185). By this she means "the cycle of revolution and counterrevolution is not over" (185). Likewise, Robin avers, though not directly in the context of discussing the mythic shift, "Chronology seems to become mad and is replaced by a spiraling structure as the same events recur several times in the course of the narrative. The present repeats the historical past as the Sulaco revolution is revealed as just one more crisis in the cycles of bloody revolutions that punctuate the history of Costaguana" (198). This argument is rejected in my analysis, as the history of Sulaco is never cyclical. In the world of the novel, history does not repeat itself; it is rather diverted toward a different direction, which is *past*, but *not the past*. The history of Sulaco literally goes into a past that is simultaneous with the time of the legend, and that does not entail the story's retreat into the legend itself. For notwithstanding the appearance of legendary elements, especially in the final chapters of the novel, still there is the neoliberal, capitalist model which does not exist in Sulaco's pre-Hegelian history. Thus, if I would label the peculiar time of the novel's ending, I would call it "neoliberal legendariness." Erdinast-Vulcan also touches upon the teleological movement in her argument above, but she does not elaborate on how and why should it be "supposed" teleological.

Moreover, Erdinast-Vulcan explains the return of the legend on the basis of a certain curse: "The mythicity—the desire of sameness, self-identity, and totality—is the real curse, or the nightmare of history. It is same desire, I believe, which accounts for the lack of emotional focus, and the absence of a protagonist in *Nostromo*" (187). That is, the legendary curse that appears on the story's characters lies in a case of unchangeability. A similar

explanation is maintained by Robin, who argues that Nostromo "wants to keep on being what he is, to preserve in his being, to perpetuate the heroic image of himself" (203). Robin adds that "the having-been emerges in the present in the form of a disruptive, asystemic principle" (203). Erdinast-Vulcan's and Robin's assumptions about what they believe to be the curse of unalterability are equally rendered unacceptable in my study because continuous instability and unpredictability are the two basic rules in the flux of Sulaco's chain of events. Most of the major characters change their beliefs and political alliances according to the continually changing conditions of Sulaco's politics. This is notably what happens with all Monterist leaders who used to be supporters of Ribiera. Nostromo himself cannot evade this law because he eventually turns his beliefs against those who exploit him. The real curse that befalls Nostromo, Gould, and the neoliberalists is a type of punishment for being haunted by the 'sin' of material interests. Erdinast-Vulcan and Robin miss the Hegelian dialectical frame that helps position the legend in its right place. The only way to contextualize the legend is to read it in the context of phase three of Sulaco's history, whereby historical movement becomes completely diverted by the dementia that characterizes the whole novel.

NOTES

[1] In particular, I am borrowing Hornborg's use of the term in his argument that "Industry's demand for profit is not, as Marx saw it, a specifically 'capitalist' problem that can be neutralized by altering the system of ownership and distribution, but a symptom of the thermodynamic *inefficiency* of industrial production" (104).

[2] The novel, however, does indeed unfold some aspects of European history, whose reading, I believe, is only possible by considering its characters as representative types in a large-scale parable. This is because the novel harbors complicated relationships between English, French, Spanish and Italian characters.

[3] It has been argued that the terminology and argument of the thesis-antithesis-synthesis is wrongly ascribed to Hegel. Walter Kaufmann, for example, argues, "Whoever looks for the stereotype of the allegedly Hegelian dialectic in Hegel's *Phenomenology* will not find it" (168). However, this triadic set can easily be traced in Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit*, especially in his discussion of Lordship and Bondage, on which many of Marx's ideas about class struggle are based.

[4] The following views are representative but by no means exclusive. To begin with, Maureen Whitebrook, for instance, believes, "The story recounted in *Nostromo* takes place in a country experiencing the introduction of capitalist finance" (156). Paul Delany, moreover, uses a number of descriptions for the new system of Sulaco: "economic liberalism" (78), "modernizing economic rationality" (79), and "the Cobdenite system of free-trade economism" (79). Another view by Avrom Fleishman boils down the conflict in Sulaco to that which takes place between "imperialism and capitalism, nationalism and socialism" (161). Yet, Fleishman is convinced that Sulaco, in general terms, is undergoing a "transition

from precapitalist to capitalist—and, prospectively, to postcapitalist—society" (171). It also has been suggested that the changes that are effected in the world of *Nostromo* reflect a "meditation on modernity" (Adams 156). This modernity is concomitant with a process of "transplanting of European political institutions and ideologies to alien settings" (Adams 156). Cannon Schmitt, on his part, argues that "*Nostromo* chronicles the arrival in Latin America not of capitalism per se but specifically of finance capitalism" (184). However, Schmitt believes at the same time that "*Nostromo* treats capitalist modernization as a kind of imperialism that, however different from classic imperialist expansion in its workings, is similar in its results" (188). The last view I would like to highlight here is posited by Stephen Ross, who uses more than one label for the emergent phenomenon under discussion. While he argues that *Nostromo* "contrast[s] explicitly the forces of capitalist globalization with the nationalist impulses behind nineteenth-century imperialism" (114), he elaborates further that *Nostromo* also "remains a focused vision of the human experience of modernity" (115).

CHAPTER FIVE

CAN THE CENTER HOLD?: A CONCLUSION

When considering the totality of the global system's effectiveness in the Conradian peripheries, we might construe Conrad's vision as allowing for a multiplicity of routes for failure. Conrad explores different scenarios whereby the global capitalist system might undergo an eventual disintegration. In the Southeast Asian periphery, the collapse of capitalism is worked out at the hands of subalterns. Failure in the African continent is also anticipated by Conrad to come out from within the capitalist self, from Europeans themselves. And in the Latin American Costaguana, the capitalist downfall results from internal contradictions of the system, without interference from the self or the other. But notwithstanding the geopolitical singularity of each setting, these scenarios can additionally be considered simultaneously possible in any of the peripheries under study, amounting thereby to a complete blockage of capitalist 'success.' That is, each periphery has the three probabilities: if the subaltern factor is ineffective, the self might be so, and if not, the system itself might bring about its own breakdown, and so forth. Thus, these odds make it look as though there is no way for the continuation of capitalism. While this study establishes these plausible outcomes, it might still be also suggested that perhaps there could be other alternatives to the forms of failure noted above. Certainly, this dissertation does not imply in the least the exclusiveness of these three capitalist mechanisms, and there remains a considerable space for future research on other capitalist dysfunctions in Conrad's fiction.

The fact that Conrad perceives the global system as already decaying in the periphery does not entail that one can treat him as a Marxist philosopher, and I am accentuating this fact because Marxism is generally believed to be the most resistant ideology to the capitalist

paradigm. When scrutinized carefully, the drama of failure in Conrad's fiction unfolds a number of deviatory trajectories away from the capitalist ways anticipated by Conrad's contemporaneous, well-known Marxists. It is important in this regard to contextualize his theoretical ideas and show their highly critical responses to major assumptions by such Marxist exponents. In his Southeast Asian fiction, for example, Conrad allows for a highly critical role played by subalterns in deciding the ultimate outcome of the political and economic conflict. As such, Conrad totally refutes the very passive role accorded to subalterns in key Marxist texts, where the colonized peoples of the Third World are either barely mentioned or thoroughly absent from the political and historical transformations that took place on a global scale. This is the condition in the diagnostic and predictive visions provided by Marx and Engels, whose interest in the future of capitalism and the anticipated socialist revolution was not disconnected from the colonial expansion at that time. While it remains true that Marx and Engels were critical of the new global system (referred to as the global expansion of the European bourgeois model), they were quite sure of the ultimate incorporation of the whole globe within the capitalist system. "The bourgeoisie," according to Marx and Engels, "draws all, even the most barbarian, nations into civilization. . . . It compels all nations, on pain of extinction, to adopt the bourgeois mode of production; it compels them to introduce what it calls civilization into their midst, i.e., to become bourgeois themselves. In one word, it creates a world after its own image" ("Communist" 249). In the teleological analysis of Marx and Engels, capitalist colonialism is the necessary evil that effects the first phase of the transformation process toward socialism. Accordingly, the bourgeoisie are performing a historical task, which is "the establishment of a world market, at least in outline, and of production based upon this world market" (*On Colonialism* 286).

Only then can the socialist revolution take place since, in the Third World, such a revolution cannot be materialized without being preceded by the same social conditions that took place in Europe. This theory is made clear in Marx's argument about the "double mission" of England in India: "one destructive, the other regenerating – the annihilation of old Asiatic society, and the laying of the material foundations of Western society in Asia" (*Surveys* 320). Therefore, "whatever may have been the crimes of England," Marx concludes, "she was the unconscious tool of history in bringing about that revolution" (*Surveys* 307). The significant implication of this argument is the following: if the inclusion of the periphery within the global system is definite, leading to the historical metamorphosis awaited by Marx, then what is the role of subalterns within this historical drama? The answer is 'nothing.' Subalterns can at best be passive onlookers in the whole historical scene, not players in it.

Again, these views agree on the inevitable subjugation of Third World countries to capitalism. Therefore, Conrad's text can be considered a direct negation to this basic Marxist assumption, for in Conrad's fictional world, capitalism would have to face the deadly obstacle of subalterns, whose influence in historical change is not only depicted as one among many but rather a decisive one. It is the idea of subaltern agency that has recently been defended by Postcolonial and Marxist critics in their development of Subaltern Studies. Gayatri Spivak, for example, objects to the way subalterns were not accounted for in Indian historiography and explains that the "Subaltern Studies group" aims at revising how change is theorized in this historiography. "The most significant outcome of this revision or shift in perspective," she asserts, "is that the agency of change is located in the insurgent or the 'subaltern'" (3). Ranajit Guha, moreover, supports Spivak's argument with regard to Indian historiography and avers that there exists another historiography "in which the principal

actors were not the dominant groups of the indigenous society or the colonial authorities but the subaltern classes and groups constituting the mass of labouring population and the intermediate strata in town and country—that is, the people" (40). What Spivak and Guha speak of with regard to India applies also to the Southeast Asia depicted in Conrad's fiction. Conrad is providing another historiography according to which the incorporation of this region into the global is not as easy and definite as it seems to Marx and Engels.

Also, we can trace another deviation from the futurology of Marx and Engels in Conrad's works, which particularly question the theory that the displacement of the capitalist mode of production will be effected by a consequent communist model. The predictive vision of Marx and Engels is maintained even in the writings of many succeeding economists. Lenin, for instance, was anticipating the "transition from capitalism to a higher social and economic system" ("Imperialism, the Highest Stage" 265), and he argues very clearly that "monopoly, which grows *out of* capitalism, is *already* dying capitalism, the beginning of its transition to socialism" ("Imperialism and the Split" 107). Accordingly, the point that can be made about Conrad's response to this Marxist thesis has two important implications. First, Marx, Engels, Lenin, and other Marxists had anticipated historical transformation according to a western epistemological reading. The mere transformation to socialism is only an application of a second Western theory of historical movement (capitalism being the first), and that historical movement, in this case, is set in motion by another ideology coming from Europe. Such Western writing of world history is utterly rejected in Conrad's fiction, as he provides, in his depiction of Malayan subalterns for instance, a vision of epistemologically incomprehensible forces that replace the socialist model of Marx. Second, even when considering the future of capitalism from a Western outlook, the questioning value in

Conrad's fiction remains valid: why should it be a transition toward socialism? *Nostromo*, which structurally follows the futurological Hegelian dialectics, foregrounds historical possibilities that exclude the Marxist model. These possibilities are themselves capitalist continuations exemplified in the neoliberal model. Conrad is more far-sighted in his prolonging of the capitalist life cycle than his contemporary Marxists, who couldn't see beyond the imperialist boundaries. Conrad's *Nostromo* even relegates the communists in its world to a passive level as we see them initiate nothing by the end of the work. The 'active' agents, other than capitalists, are anarchists, whose interference can yield but a disastrous outcome. That is why, I believe, Conrad is not suggesting any alternative scheme to capitalism despite the fact that his fiction explores different mechanisms of capitalist failure.

Having said that, I will finally go back to the question I am raising in the title of this last chapter: can the core zone of the global system remain intact, in Conrad's fiction, after these failure scenarios are established in Conrad's peripheries? In fact, I am not suggesting this question in order to answer it; rather, I would like here to recommend clues for answering the above question in another study that would complete the cycle I have started in this dissertation. The critical remarks I would like to make are based on Conrad's probably most prominent European book, *The Secret Agent*. At first glance, this novel might well seem different from the works discussed thus far because its capitalism is ostensibly spotlighted with less weighty criticism. It might be thought, generally speaking, that Conrad's European settings focus on issues different from those touched upon on foreign lands. In the case of *The Secret Agent*, anarchism is perhaps the major concern, and capitalism is pushed back to the background in a way that makes it seem difficult to trace Conrad's treatment of it. Of course, there is a certain degree of validity in this observation. However, I believe that, in

The Secret Agent, Conrad attacks the same capitalist ideology whose global scale is documented in his previous novels, and I suggest that this hypothesis might be gleaned and externalized through a totalistic analysis of the whole novel. *The Secret Agent* was published in 1907, after the writing of all the works I examine in this study. Thus, having established his vision of capitalist failure in the global system's peripheries, Conrad seems to be thereafter concerned with capitalist proceedings in the core, and this is the case in *The Secret Agent*.

In the third chapter of this novel, Mr. Verloc is in the parlor behind his shop with three of his International Red Committee friends. One of these friends, Michaelis, is discussing capitalism and its role in the social disorder and chaos witnessed in the London of the work. He says,

> All idealization makes life poorer. To beautify it is to take away its character of complexity—it is to destroy it. Leave that to the moralists, my boy. History is made by men, but they do not make it in their heads. The ideas that are born in their consciousness play an insignificant part in the march of events. History is dominated and determined by the tool and the production—by the force of economic conditions. Capitalism has made socialism, and the laws made by capitalism for the protection of property are responsible for anarchism. No one can tell what form the social organisation may take in the future. (*SA* 37)

In the light of Michaelis' view, capitalism is an oppressive system that yields the economic, political, and social illnesses hinted at in his speech. As a reaction to capitalism, antithetical movements aim at creating havoc in the capitalist status quo. However, instead of being

'successful' in doing so, these reactionary practices add more to the destruction of society. Socialism and anarchism, created by the injustices of capitalism, are not a better choice. The whole process then is a series of accumulative, destructive forces devouring social life in the European world of the novel. In the course of the same chapter, Yundt asks "Do you know how I would call the nature of the present economic conditions? I would call it cannibalistic. That's what it is! They are nourishing their greed on the quivering flesh and the warm blood of the people—nothing else" (*SA* 44). Capitalism, therefore, is not only responsible for the destructive reaction brought about by its oppressive reality, but it also accounts for the miserable condition of those under its "cannibalistic" effect. This is basically the second dimension of capitalist dysfunctions in *The Secret Agent*. A third dimension is articulated in Michaelis' belief that "The great capitalists [are] devouring the little capitalists, concentrating the power and the tools of production in great masses . . . making ready the lawful inheritance of the suffering proletariat" (*SA* 43). Thus, capitalist dynamism entails a corrosion of the system from within.

Yet, these three levels can be re-studied and reconstructed in another order that might be a clue to assessing the capitalism of the novel. That is, what seems to me in the above short passages is a social and political structure toppled down by a similar triadic destruction. In the first place, because capitalists are "cannibalistic," anarchists are trying to wipe out the capitalist scheme and establish a model that is very similar to the Monterist of the previous chapter. This is evident in the case of the Professor, who always walks around the streets of London with a bomb ready for explosion in case the police ever try to arrest him. The Professor's bomb is his only support of anarchist beliefs. As such, the anarchism of *The Secret Agent* is another face of terrorism, most visible in setting a bomb in the Greenwich

Observatory. This first cataclysmic effect can be traced back to the Latin American periphery discussed in this study. The second trace, which comes from Conrad's African fiction, is detectable in the mere articulation of the passages above. That people are conscious of capitalist illnesses and that such complaints are *discursively* circulated mean the material existence of anti-discursive statements. However, such anti-discursivity is 'developed' in the London of this novel into being accompanied by the threat of terrorist counter-surveillance, as London is a polarizing place for spies from all over the European continent. The third destructive aspect might be traced back to the self-erosive ideology discussed in Conrad's Southeast Asian fiction. The image of capitalists annihilating each other, in Michaelis' belief, is not different from, for example, the hindering element of Willems against his supposed allies in *An Outcast of the Islands*. It seems, thus, that Conrad is bringing major defects we see on the peripheries back to the core of the system, and this is what needs to be ascertained in another study.

WORKS CITED

Achebe, Chinua. "An Image of Africa: Racism in Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*." *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*. Gen. ed. Vincent B. Leitch. New York: Norton, 2001. 1783-94

Adams, David. *Colonial Odysseys: Empire and Epic in the Modernist Novel*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2003.

Althusser, Louis. *For Marx*. Trans. Ben Brewster. New York: Pantheon, 1969.

---. *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. Trans. Ben Brewster. New York: Monthly Review, 1971.

---. *Philosophy and the Spontaneous Philosophy of the Scientists and Other Essays*. Ed. Gregory Elliott. Trans. Ben Brewster, et al. London: Verso, 1990.

Amin, Samir. *Accumulation on a World Scale: A Critique of the Theory of Underdevelopment*. Trans. Brian Pearce. 2 vols. New York: Monthly Review, 1974.

Auerback, Nancy Neiman. "The Meanings of Neoliberalism." *Neoliberalism: National and Regional Experiments with Global Ideas*. Ed. Ravi K. Roy, Arthur T. Denzau, and Thomas D. Willett. London: Routledge, 2007. 26-50.

Bignami, Marialuisa. "Joseph Conrad, the Malay Archipelago, and the Decadent Hero." *Review of English Studies* ns 38 (1987): 199-210.

Borschberg, Peter. Introduction. *South East Asia: Colonial History*. Ed. Paul H. Kratoska. Vol 1. London: Routledge, 2001. 3-6.

Brantlinger, Patrick. *Rule of Darkness: British Literature and Imperialism, 1830-1914*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1988.

Brewer, Anthony. *Marxist Theories of Imperialism: A Critical Survey*. London: Routledge, 1980.

Bukharin, Nikolai. *Imperialism and World Economy*. New York: Howard Fertig, 1966.

Césaire, Aimé. *Discourse on Colonialism*. Trans. Joan Pinkham. New York: Monthly Review, 1972.

Chandler, David P., et al. *In Search of Southeast Asia: A Modern History*. Ed. David Joel Steinberg. Rev. ed. Honolulu: U of Hawaii P, 1987.

Chrisman, Laura. *Postcolonial Contraventions: Cultural Readings of Race, Imperialism and Transnationalism*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2003.

Christmas, Peter. "Conrad's *Nostromo*: A Tale of Europe." *Literature and History* 6 (1980): 59-81.

Clemens, Florence. "Conrad's Malaysia." *College English* 2 (1941): 338-46.

Conrad, Joseph. *Almayer's Folly: A Story of an Eastern River*. 1895. Ed. Floyd Eugene Eddleman and David Leon Higdon. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.

---. *The Collected Letters of Joseph Conrad*. Ed. Frederick R. Karl and Laurence Davies. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983.

---. "Heart of Darkness." 1902. *Youth and Two Other Stories*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1926. 45-162.

---. *Lord Jim: A Romance*. 1900. Garden City: Doubleday, 1926.

---. *Nostromo: A Tale of the Seaboard*. 1904. Garden City: Doubleday, 1926.

---. *Notes on Life and Letters*. 1921. Garden City: Doubleday, 1926.

---. *An Outcast of the Islands*. 1896. Garden City: Doubleday, 1926.

---. "An Outpost of Progress." 1898. *Tales of Unrest*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1926. 86-117.

---. *A Personal Record*. 1912. Ed. Zdzisław Najder and J. H. Stape. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2008.

---. *The Rescue: A Romance of the Shallows*. 1920. Garden City: Doubleday, 1926.

---. *The Secret Agent: A Simple Tale*. 1907. Ed. Bruce Harkness and S. W. Reid. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990.

Conrad, Joseph, and F[ord] M[adox] Hueffer. *The Inheritors: An Extravagant Story*. 1901. Garden City: Doubleday, 1926.

Delany, Paul. *Literature, Money and the Market: From Trollope to Amis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002.

Demory, Pamela H. "*Nostromo*: Making History." *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 35 (1993): 316-46.

Derrida, Jacques. "Différance." *Margins of Philosophy*. Trans. Alan Bass. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1982. 1-27.

---. *Dissemination*. Tans. Barbara Johnson. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1981.

Descartes, Rene. *Discourse on Method and Meditations*. Trans. Laurence J. Lafleur. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1960.

Dryden, Linda. *Joseph Conrad and the Imperial Romance*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000.

Elson, Robert E. "International Commerce, the State and Society: Economic and Social Change." Chapter 3. *The Cambridge History of Southeast Asia*. Ed. Nicholas Tarling. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992. 131-195.

Erdinast-Vulcan, Daphna. "*Nostromo* and the Writing of History." *Joseph Conrad: Voice, Sequence, History, Genre*. Ed. Jakob Lothe, Jeremy Hawthorn, and James Phelan. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 2008. 178-95.

Fincham, Gail. "'Heart of Darkness' and Plato's *Republic*: A Reverse Parable." *L'Epoque Conradienne* 29 (2003): 95-109.

Fleishman, Avrom. *Conrad's Politics: Community and Anarchy in the Fiction of Joseph Conrad*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1967.

Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*. Trans. A. M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Vintage, 1972.

---. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage, 1977.

---. *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1: An Introduction*. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage, 1978.

---. *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. Trans. Richard Howard. New York: Vintage, 1965.

---. "The Order of Discourse." *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader*. Ed. Robert Young. Boston: Routledge, 1981. 48-78.

---. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. New York: Vintage, 1970.

---. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*. Ed. Colin Gordon. Trans. Colin Gordon, et al. New York: Vintage, 1980.

--- "Questions of Method." *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality with Two Lectures by and an Interview with Michel Foucault*. Ed. Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1991. 73-86.

---. "What Is an Author?" *The Foucault Reader*. Ed. Paul Rabinow. New York: Pantheon, 1984. 101-20.

GoGwilt, Christopher. *The Invention of the West: Joseph Conrad and the Double-Mapping of Europe and Empire*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1995.

Goodman, Daniel Justin. "Conrad in the Crawl Space of Capitalist Colonialism." Diss. Temple U, 1994.

Gramsci, Antonio. *Further Selections from The Prison Notebooks*. Ed. and Trans. Derek Boothman. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1995.

---. *Pre-Prison Writings*. Ed. Richard Bellamy. Trans. Virginia Cox. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.

---. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. Ed. and Trans. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1971.

Guha, Ranajit. "On Some Aspects of the Historiography of Colonial India." *Selected Subaltern Studies*. Ed. Ranajit Guha and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. New York: Oxford UP, 1988. 37-44.

Hampson, Robert. *Cross-Cultural Encounters in Joseph Conrad's Malay Fiction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2000.

---. *Joseph Conrad: Betrayal and Identity*. New York: St. Martin's, 1992.

Harvey, David. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005.

Hawkins, Hunt. "The Issue of Racism in *Heart of Darkness*." *Conradiana* 14 (1982): 163-71.

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Lectures on the Philosophy of World History. Introduction: Reason in History*. Trans. H. B. Nisbet. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1975.

---. *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Trans. A. V. Miller. Oxford: Clarendon, 1977.

Henthorne, Tom. *Conrad's Trojan Horses: Imperialism, Hybridity, and the Postcolonial Aesthetic*. Lubbock: Texas Tech UP, 2008.

Hochschild, Adam. *King Leopold's Ghost: A Story of Greed, Terror, and Heroism in Colonial Africa*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1998.

Hornborg, Alf. *The Power of the Machine: Global Inequalities of Economy, Technology, and Environment*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira, 2001.

Jameson, Fredric. *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1981.

Jeffery, Beth. "Joseph Conrad and General Booth's *In Darkest England and the Way Out*: Mapping the Discourses of England and Empire." *Conrad in Africa: New Essays on "Heart of Darkness."* Ed. Attie De Lange, Gail Fincham, and Wiesław Krajka. Boulder: Social Science Monographs, 2002. 129-52

Jenkins, Gareth. "Conrad's *Nostromo* and History." *Literature and History* 6 (1977): 138-78.

Kaufmann, Walter. *Hegel: Reinterpretation, Texts, and Commentary*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1965.

Kautsky, Karl. "Ultra-imperialism." *New Left Review* 59 (1970): 41-46.

Kershner, R. Brandon. "The Reader, the Frame, and Impressionism in *Heart of Darkness*." *Conradiana* 35 (2003): 41-47.

Krenn, Heliéna. *Conrad's Lingard Trilogy: Empire, Race, and Women in the Malay Novels*. New York: Garland, 1990.

Lenin, Vladimir. "Imperialism and the Split in Socialism." *V. I. Lenin, Collected Works*. Vol. 23. Moscow: Progress, 1964. 105-120.

---. "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism: A Popular Outline." *V. I. Lenin, Collected Works*. Vol. 22. Moscow: Progress, 1964. 183-304.

Lieberman, Victor. *Strange Parallels: Southeast Asia in Global Context, c. 800-1830*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003-2009.

Luxemburg, Rosa. *The Accumulation of Capital*. Trans. Agnes Schwarzschild. London: Routledge, 2003.

Marx, Karl. *The Poverty of Philosophy*. Trans. H. Quelch. Amherst: Prometheus, 1995.

---. "Preface to *A Critique of Political Economy*." *Karl Marx: Selected Writings*. Ed. David McLellan. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000. 424-428.

---. *Surveys from Exile*. Ed. David Fernbach. New York: Random, 1973.

Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. "The Communist Manifesto." *Karl Marx: Selected Writings*. Ed. David McLellan. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000. 245-272.

---. *On Colonialism*. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing, n.d.

McClure, John A. *Kipling and Conrad: The Colonial Fiction*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1981.

McLauchlan, Juliet. "Almayer and Willems—'How Not To Be.'" 1979. *Joseph Conrad: Third World Perspectives*. Ed. Robert D. Hamner. Washington, D.C.: Three Continents, 1990. 79-106.

Miller, J. Hillis. "'Material Interests': Conrad's *Nostromo* as a Critique of Global Capitalism." *Joseph Conrad: Voice, Sequence, History, Genre*. Ed. Jakob Lothe, Jeremy Hawthorn, and James Phelan. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 2008. 160-77.

Morzinski, Mary. "*Heart of Darkness* and Plato's Myth of the Cave." *Conradiana* 34 (2002): 227-33.

Najder, Zdzisław. *Joseph Conrad: A Life*. Trans. Halina Najder. Rochester: Camden, 2007.

Niland, Richard. *Conrad and History*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2010.

O'Connor, Peter D. "The Function of Nina in *Almayer's Folly*." *Conradiana* 7 (1975): 225-32.

Orr, Leonard. "*Almayer's Folly* (1895) and *An Outcast of the Islands* (1896)." *A Joseph Conrad Companion*. Ed. Leonard Orr and Ted Billy. Westport: Greenwood, 1999. 27-48.

Pakenham, Thomas. *The Scramble for Africa, 1876-1912*. New York: Random, 1991.

Peet, Richard, and Elaine Hartwick. *Theories of Development: Contentions, Arguments, Alternatives*. New York: Guilford, 2009.

Pflaum, Rosalynd. *The Emperor's Talisman: The Life of the Duc de Morny*. New York: Meredith, 1968.

Reid, Anthony. *Southeast Asia in the Age of Commerce 1450-1680, Vol. 2: Expansion and Crisis.* New Haven: Yale UP, 1993.

---, ed. *Southeast Asia in the Early Modern Era: Trade, Power, and Belief*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1993.

Robin, Christophe. "Time, History, Narrative in *Nostromo*." *Joseph Conrad: Voice, Sequence, History, Genre*. Ed. Jakob Lothe, Jeremy Hawthorn, and James Phelan. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 2008. 196-213.

Rodney, Walter. *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. Washington, D.C.: Howard UP, 1972.

Ross, Stephen. *Conrad and Empire*. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 2004.

Said, Edward W. *Beginnings: Intention and Method*. New York: Columbia UP, 1985.

---. *Culture and Imperialism.* New York: Vintage, 1993.

---. *Joseph Conrad and the Fiction of Autobiography*. New York: Columbia UP, 2008.

Schmitt, Cannon. “Rumor, Shares, and Novelistic Form: Joseph Conrad’s *Nostromo*.” *Victorian Investments: New Perspectives on Finance and Culture*. Ed. Nancy Henry and Cannon Schmitt. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 2009. 182-201.

Sewlall, Harry. “The Postcolonial Space in Joseph Conrad: A Consideration of Two Early Novels.” *Journal of Literary Studies* 19 (2003): 33-51.

Simmons, Allan H. “Ambiguity as Meaning: The Subversion of Suspense in *Almayer’s Folly*.” *Conradian* 14.1-2 (1989): 1-18.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. “Subaltern Studies: Deconstructing Historiography.” *Selected Subaltern Studies*. Ed. Ranajit Guha and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. New York: Oxford UP, 1988. 3-32

Stape, J. H., and Owen Knowles. “Marlow’s Audience in ‘Youth’ and ‘Heart of Darkness’: A Historical Note." *Conradian* 31.1 (2006): 105-16.

Strozier, Robert. “Interiority, Identity, Knowledge: Unraveling the Cartesian Cogito.” *Thresholds of Western Culture: Identity, Postcoloniality, Transnationalism*. Ed. John Burt Foster, Jr. and Wayne Jeffrey Froman. New York: Continuum, 2002. 14-31.

Tarling, Nicholas, ed. *The Cambridge History of Southeast Asia.* Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992.

Van Pletzen, Ermien. “‘Mine Is the Speech That Cannot Be Silenced’: Confession and Testimony in ‘Heart of Darkness.’” *Conrad in Africa: New Essays on “Heart of Darkness.”* Ed. Attie De Lange, Gail Fincham, and Wiesław Krajka. Boulder: Social Science Monographs, 2002. 153-76

Wallerstein, Immanuel. *The Capitalist World-Economy: Essays by Immanuel Wallerstein*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1979.

---. *Historical Capitalism with Capitalist Civilization*. London: Verso, 1983.

Watt, Ian. *Conrad in the Nineteenth Century*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1979.

Webster, Anthony. *Gentlemen Capitalists: British Imperialism in South East Asia 1770-1890*. London: Tauris Academic Studies, 1999.

White, Andrea. *Joseph Conrad and the Adventure Tradition: Constructing and Deconstructing the Imperial Subject*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993.

Whitebrook, Maureen. "Capitalism, Order and Moral Value: Joseph Conrad's *Nostromo*." *Good Novels, Better Management: Reading Organizational Realities*. Ed. Barbara Czarniawska-Joerges and Pierre Guillet de Monthoux. Chur, Switzerland: Harwood Academic, 1994. 154-74.

Williams, Roger L. *Gaslight and Shadow: The World of Napoleon III, 1851-1870*. New York: Macmillan, 1957.

Yeow, Agnes S. K. *Conrad's Eastern Vision: A Vain and Floating Appearance*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Young, Robert, ed. *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader*. Boston: Routledge, 1981.

Žižek, Slavoj. "The Cartesian Subject versus the Cartesian Theater." *Cogito and the Unconscious*. Ed. Slavoj Žižek. Durham: Duke UP, 1998. 247-74

---. *For They Know Not What They Do: Enjoyment as a Political Factor*. London: Verso, 2002.

---. *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. London: Verso, 1989.