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Abstract

The essay argues that colonialist literature generally supports colonial mentality and policies. Its representation of the colonized peoples through marginal characters is part and parcel of its ideological perception of these peoples vis-a-vis those colonizing them. To illuminate the connection between ideology and representation, the essay focuses on Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* and E. M. Forster's *A Passage to India* and stresses the manner in which fictional portrayal of native characters supports imperial attitudes towards the colonized people by narrowing the narrative space these people occupy. These two works have been selected for this discussion principally because both writers manage to avoid much of the habitual stereotyping of native characters in colonial literature, and both had first-hand experience in the colonies. They also illustrate the inescapable surrender, even of serious intellectuals, to contemporary ideologies in their portrayal of indigenous characters.

Introduction

"Representation" has become one of the most frequently discussed issues in recent literary discourse. Plato's early claim that representations have a questionable relation to reality has so far dominated all debate on the issue. It is hardly possible now to view representation, to judge it or criticize it without simultaneously giving
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expression to a certain understanding of reality, or of the relation of representation to it. Linguistically, to represent is to offer something that stands for something else, but a representation is also a Presentation, the thing itself. This does not imply the omission of reality, but suggests, instead, another approach to the relation between representation and reality in a way which escapes Plato's narrow neck of imitation. To represent in such a relationship is to partake of power, and this explains why representation is a way to secure power to those positively represented, or, conversely, of denying power to all others. Thus, representation is an instrument for the communication of positions and ideologies, and hence it involves not only the writers' or artists' moral responsibility toward what they represent, but also their perception of the status they have in the power structure of their respective societies.

This issue of moral responsibility and the power to show it bring us back to Plato and his insistence that representation cannot be entirely a matter of artistic nature. His approach is clearly one that takes into consideration not only philosophy, but also politics and ethics. His arguments against poets in the Republic, for instance, indicate the political and moral authority artistic discourse has in shaping or influencing attitudes. This kind of "contextualization" has been frequently assumed in subsequent discussions. Today it is unimaginable to view representation without having in mind Nietzsche, Marx, Freud, and other seminal figures, in addition to previous ones such as Plato and Aristotle. This means that the context in which representation operates is being continuously widened beyond literary conventions to include, as Edward Said observes, such transcultural forces as class, the unconscious, gender, race and structure ("Representing the Colonized" 206). Such forces are legitimate and they demonstrate that writers and artists do not function irrespective of them, and that representation is among the venues of accessing and holding onto power. Many of these forces, we should add, are manipulated by "ideology" in the Althusserian sense, and this means establishing other contexts for representation, particularly the conditions imposed by the state ideological structures on the production and distribution of representation. Representation, in other words, allows for control of what and how ideas, characters, or events are represented (Said, Culture and Imperialism 80), and can consequently be a function of an established ideology to confirm whatever sustains that ideology or, alternatively, undermines positions, attitudes, and actions that attempt to subvert it. To illuminate the connection between representation and ideology, this brief discussion of native characters in Joseph Conrad's Heart of Darkness (1899) and E. M. Forster's A Passage to India (1924) will stress the
manner in which fictional portrayal supports imperial attitudes towards the colonized people by narrowing the narrative space these people occupy in colonialist fiction.

That representation should be under the strict control of the state was expressed by the first known literary theoretician, Plato. His republic would allow only state-controlled representations that unequivocally consolidate such a state. Representations, in fact, have been subjected to all kinds of prohibitions or restrictions wherever they were produced. These prohibitions and restrictions, as W. J. T. Mitchell observes, were "part of the 'social agreements' that constitute representation" (15). This means that the production of representations, and of course their consumption, is trafficked in such subtle ways that the detection and description of these ways is by no means easy. There is a communal consent to certain norms of behavior and thinking which helps in manufacturing representations that often enhance such consent. This is a point Mitchell also touches upon in his assertion that "representation, even purely 'aesthetic' representation of fictional persons and events, can never be completely divorced from political and ideological questions" (15). Representation's relationship to politics and ideology implies its usefulness as a tool to those who wield power and influence in a society. One point should be clarified here. Writers and artists do not necessarily "propagate" ideological positions by willfully compromising their artistic integrity. The point, rather, is that ideologies such as imperialism create social and cultural atmospheres conducive to their dissemination and consolidation. They give rise to "structures of feelings" (Raymond Williams's phrase) or "structures of attitudes and references" (Edward Said's) that facilitate sustaining these ideologies (Said, Culture and Imperialism 52). Imperial domination over distant lands and people, in this manner, becomes a "natural" order of things for the vast majority of members in those imperial societies. Thus, unacceptable actions or behaviors at home gain legitimacy in a distant territory, and, consequently, the imperial metropolis and the colony are severely polarized. Colonialist literature, then, generally supports colonial mentality and policies. Its representation of the colonized peoples, for instance, is part and parcel of its ideological perception of these peoples vis-a-vis those colonizing them. It is curious that there are no significant exceptions to this rather rigid statement. "Even the works of some of the most enlightened and critical colonial writers," Abdul R. JanMohamed writes, "eventually succumb to a narrative organization based on racial/metaphysical oppositions, whose motives remain morally fixed but whose categories flex to accommodate any situation" (61). Conrad's Heart
and Forster's *Passage* have been selected for this discussion principally because both writers manage to avoid much of the habitual stereotyping of native characters in colonial literature (such as one may find in the fiction of Rudyard Kipling, for instance), and both had first-hand experience in the colonies. They also illustrate the inescapable surrender, even of serious intellectuals, to contemporary ideologies in their representations of native characters. Conrad and Forster, however, do not fully embrace their contemporaries' colonial attitudes or policies. A fair number of critics find Conrad's *Heart* ambiguous in its representation of European imperialism, and see in Forster's novel an attempt to breach cultural differences and biases. Nevertheless, as members of a colonizing society, both Conrad and Forster offer in their portrayal of native characters numerous clues to the impact of dominant ideological attitudes on representing the colonies to their audiences.

In *Passage*, most of Forster's Indians are drawn with sympathy, but this sympathy is carefully controlled that it is almost conditional. Dr Aziz is an illuminating example of such mixed sympathy. His title, and implicitly his education under British auspices, may explain at least part of the author's attitude toward him: he is a member of the Indian society's elite. The way he is introduced to the reader is suggestive of a general attitude the novelist shows towards the indigenous population. We have our first glimpse of Aziz coming to dine with some of his friends, late as usual as Hamidullah says. The company, all men and all well educated, talks about the British, but they talk in such a manner that nothing but vague grudges are communicated. This authorial comment at a point in the company's debate is telling: "Aziz did not know, but said he did. He too generalized from his disappointments—it is difficult for members of a subject race to do otherwise" (9). If anything real about Indians is to come about, one assumes, it must come through a non-Indian. If the Indian, with his messy generalizations, cannot represent himself, he must therefore be represented by others who seem to know more about Indians and India than the Indians themselves. Thus, the authorial voice assumes full control of representation from the outset of the narrative.

When natives come into some genuine contact with the British in India, their humility often spoils all chances of communication. While slightly unwell, Aziz is visited by his sole British friend, Fielding. Aziz behaves in a strange, unbalanced way. After taking a whack at insult and sham indifference, Aziz blurts out:
Mr Fielding, no one can ever realize how much kindness we Indians need, we do not even realize it ourselves. But we know when it has been given. We do not forget, though we may seem to. Kindness, more kindness, and even after that more kindness. I assure you it is the only hope. (126)

Aziz's appeal for continuous "kindness" reduces the colonial encounter to a pathological case, where Aziz, and by implication all Indians, becomes the "object" of study. As in all pathological cases, the remedy, in this case mere kindness, becomes the focus of attention, while the supposed "subject," the colonized as an individual and as a representative case, is reduced in Forster's Aziz to a literal as well as metaphorical atmosphere of sickness and marginality. It is Aziz, we should remember, who becomes later in the novel one of the two major voices demanding independence from British rule. Such an inadequate and insecure person almost certainly suggests to the novel's readers a poor substitute to colonial rule in case nationalists do succeed in dethroning foreign domination.

In Conrad's Heart, we find a similar kind of sympathetic reduction of native Africans. Unlike Forster, Conrad does not put forward any claim of approaching the colonial condition with the intention of developing an understanding of its nature or workings. Much of his attention is devoted to the issue of the European colonizer's integrity in a locale which does not seem to offer much opportunity for the preservation of that integrity. His Europeans, however, are still the subjects who endow space with significance, and when they fail to do so, the explanation is not too far to seek. Colonial fiction somehow blames the Europeans' degeneration in the colonies on the climate of the colonies. Conrad and Forster are no exceptions. Soon after his arrival in Africa, Marlow is told about the Swede who hanged himself, and is given this possible explanation: "Who knows? The sun too much for him, or the country perhaps" (11). More important are the numerous connections made by different people between Kurtz's demoralization and the wilderness. Here is one of these:

But the wilderness had found him early, and had taken on him a terrible vengeance for the fantastic invasion. I think it had whispered to him things about himself which he did not know, things of which he had no conception till he took counsel with this great solitude--and the whisper had proved irresistibly fascinating. (57, emphasis added)

What is particularly interesting here is the manner in which "invasion" and "vengeance" are coupled. It appears that Kurtz's degeneration is due to this alien intrusion on a
native landscape, but the connection is deliberately blurred by the adjective "fantastic." It is not the colonial invasion of an African space that is eventually suggested, but a "personal" one effected by an eccentric like Kurtz. We come across such connections in Passage, too. Adela knew Ronny Heaslop well in England, but when she visits him in India she finds him quite changed: "India had developed sides of his character that she had never admired. His self-complacency, his censoriousness, his lack of subtlety, all grew vivid beneath a tropic sky" (85). Blaming the victims is one of the most difficult of human follies to explain or understand. But when one seeks to justify, it is probably the easiest and handiest of follies.

Marlow starts his narrative with drawing an implied comparison between pre-Roman Britain, "one of the dark places of the earth," and Africa (9). He seems to take it for granted that "dark" and "savage" are synonymous, and it is in this context that we should place his later references to native Africans as "savages." We should also observe the curious turnings of his take-it-for-grantedness when he comes into contact with the natives. Here is one of these turnings. Marlow does not see Africans save in groups: "Six black men advanced in a file," "black shapes," "black shadows," "moribund shapes" (20), "a whirl of black limbs," "mysterious niggers" (37), and so on. The Tunisian philosopher and critic of colonialism Albert Memmi has commented on what he calls "the mark of the plural" as a sign of depersonalizing the colonized: "The colonized is never characterized in an individual manner; he is entitled only to be drawn in an anonymous collectivity" (85). Chinua Achebe, too, observes this reduction of natives in Heart and describes it as showing "Africa in the mass" (254). Depersonalizing a content, it seems, would facilitate overlooking atrocities even for someone like Marlow who is not particularly interested in furthering the colonial cause or rationale. The natives Marlow singles out for description as individuals are either cannibals, or dying and dead savages. In a sense, Marlow thinks and acts in a universe in which the native Africans do not exist as an essential component. That is why his amazement at the chief accountant's elegance amid the "great demoralization of the land" (21) seems rather superfluous. The chief accountant is not really insensitive as Marlow takes him to be--he has merely carried the colonial line of thought to its ultimate conclusion: removal of the natives and their agonies from the scene, a removal which seems to differ from Marlow's only in degree not in nature.

This removal needs to be seen against the background Marlow establishes
early in his narrative when he marks the route of his relation, and presumably the European relation with Africa. Africa, he says, was to his childhood "a blank space of delightful mystery--a white patch for a boy to dream gloriously over" (12, emphasis added). The course of events, however, further qualifies the color of the territory: it becomes not only dark but the Heart of darkness. The novel's structure and imagery, in fact, clearly set a host of dichotomies which revolves around a central one of white versus black: light versus darkness, civilization versus savagery, good versus evil. These polarizations are epitomized in a microcosm of an unmistakable and well-established dichotomy: Europeans versus natives. Frantz Fanon has described the colonial world as essentially "Manichean," formed of two exclusive parts, and these are the colonizers and the colonial subjects (38-41). Building on the Fanonian schema, Abdul R. JanMohamed characterizes the opposition between the supposed superiority of the Europeans and the assumed inferiority of the natives the "manichean allegory," which he sees as the "central feature of the colonialist cognitive framework and colonialist literary representation" (63). It is clear that literary representations of natives share some of the ideological assumptions on which colonial subjugation is based. The colonizer/native polarity demonstrates a tendency at the Heart of both imperialism and colonialist fiction to develop some vital sphere in a borrowed space and to set in place a mechanism which operates irrespective of that space. Such a mechanism works wonders: it transfers what is visual (difference in skin color, for instance) into the metaphysics of goodness and evil. It also reduces the natives into insignificant background strokes in a scene fully occupied by the Europeans.

Indeed, colonial writers' resort to metaphysical or mysterious explanations demonstrates their tendency to muffle oppressive realities in the colonies. Instead of confronting the material and psychological damage resulting from the colonial encounter, both Conrad and Forster choose to channel their narratives away from confronting the consequences of imperialist subjugation. No where is this more obvious than in the endings of both novels. In Passage, for instance, Forster leaves the issue of normalizing relations between Indian nationalists and the British unresolved. "Why can't we be friends now?" Fielding asks Aziz, and the omniscient narrator answers the question through a chorus of a hundred voices that include the "earth," the "temples," "birds," and the like:

"No, not yet,' and the sky said, 'No, not there'" (362). It is not clear from Forster's narrative why the earth and the sky do not recognize the possibilities of postcolonial
normalization. It is the Britisher, we should note, who sounds concerned about the possibility of losing his Indian friend. Aziz, on the other hand, seems indifferent. Although Aziz is completely "silenced" by the omniscient narrator in that final Passage of the novel, the mystified atmosphere created by the novelist indicates that the Indian nationalist is not interested in retaining relations with the British. Aziz's rejection of colonial rule, consequently, is represented as a mere reaction to a certain personal experience (Miss Quested's accusations) rather than a legitimate form of resistance to an alien hegemony. In this fashion, Forster suggests that foreign rule does not seem to interrupt the Indian historical narrative, and hence, he mystifies the Indians' attempt to break away from this rule.

Similarly, in Heart rejections apropos of imperial manipulation of the colonies is expressed through colonial officials' regrets that Kurtz has gone too far. His unsatiated desire for ivory and the racial philosophy he gives expression to in his Report to the "International Society for the Suppression of Savage Customs," especially its demands for the extermination of all "brutes" (50-51), are too extreme. But Marlow's as well as other Europeans' discomfort with such extremism should not be equated with condemning the colonial enterprise as a whole. At best, the reader will come out of this narrative with the feeling that only extreme manipulation is not tolerated. Rejection of Kurtz's extremism may also imply that Europe's scramble for Africa was not dominated by senseless profit. Hence, the numerous references in the novel to "moderation" seem to whitewash Europe's drainage of the continent's material and human resources. In such an atmosphere, even Kurtz emerges less guilty than Marlow or we may think. Indeed, he manages to come out morally victorious towards the end of the narrative through Marlow's interpretation of his cry, "The horror, the horror," as a climactic moment of self-realization. Kurtz has realized that placing ivory before the assumed purpose of colonization, which is to enlighten savage races, is wrong. His end in Conrad's narrative absolves him of all wrongdoing and takes the sting out of ruthless colonization. On the other hand, Kurtz's victims, the indigenous population, are submerged as part of the collateral damage to the European's moral survival.

Literary critics as well as anthropologists and historians have frequently noted and commented on the relationship between the two components of the colonial encounter. Johannes Fabian, for instance, maintains that "distancing" and "Othering" colonial societies is a means of denying these societies "coevalness."
empirical presence," he states, "turns into his theoretical absence, a conjuring trick which is worked with the help of an array of devices that have the common intent and function to keep the Other outside the time of anthropology" (xi). He also states that a discourse which employs terms such as "savage" does not observe or study the "savage" but observes or studies in terms of the savage. The savage becomes "essentially a temporal concept . . . a category, not an object, of Western thought" (17-18). Said speaks of the "production of Europe's inferior Others" and argues that in colonial discourse the Europeans impose "muteness" on the Other to the effect that the Other becomes an object not an interlocutor in the dialogic situation ("Representing the Colonized" 210; "Orientalism Reconsidered" 93). "To be one of the colonized," he also wrote, "is potentially to be a great many different, but inferior, things, in many different places, at many different times" ("Representing the Colonized" 207). This is true of the Indians of Passage and the Africans of Heart, not because Forster or Conrad were viciously prejudiced Europeans, but because they could not escape the anonymous but effective pressure of their day's colonial ideologies. What JanMohamed says of colonialist writers might seem severe but it is not very far from the truth: "Just as imperialists 'administer' the resources of the conquered country," he wrote, "so colonialist discourse 'commodifies' the native subject into a stereotyped object and uses him as a 'resource' for colonialist fiction" (64). One of numerous examples of stereotyping natives in Passage, for instance, could be seen in the narrator's reference to "the comparatively simple mind of the Mohammedan" (80, emphasis added) even though that "Mohammedan" is an educated professional like Aziz. Both as an Indian and as a Muslim, he is ruled out as an equal to the British who, presumably, possess a higher intelligence. The essentializing attitude underlying the assumption that neither education and training nor contact with colonial agents is going to change the natives' innate mental simplicity is another characteristic of colonial representations of native subjects. Colonial fiction is abundant in examples of such commodification. In Heart, Kurtz's followers (or worshipers?) swarm the river bank as they see the steamboat approaching, dumb with sorrow and pain because the boat is to take Kurtz away. Marlow describes them thus: "They had given me an irresistible impression of sorrow. The glimpse of the steamboat had for some reason filled those savages with unrestrained grief" (44). For Marlow, it would probably make little difference to know the reason behind this sorrow, but the reader is invited to contemplate the plight of the natives which seems not the degenerate
and ruthless enslavement imposed on them by Kurtz, but Kurtz's departure, or death. If these savages know anything, the reader would probably conclude, they know that they need a master. The ending of Passage makes the suggestion more bluntly. Fielding is outraged that Aziz seems more determined on ridding India of British rule. He asks him: "Who do you want instead of the English? The Japanese?" (361). It is difficult for Fielding, as it is probably for Forster, to imagine the Indians without some master around. Imperial centers and their cultures become the only alternatives for the natives to choose from. Bernard Cohn is right, I think, when he remarks that British colonial officials based their dismissal of the natives' ability to rule their own country on the assumption that Indians were just too weak to do that: "The apparent fact of Indian incompetence for self-rule was accepted by all the British concerned with ruling India" (166-7). For someone like Fielding appreciation of certain natives' personal capabilities falls short of transcending the dominant colonial discursive context in which incompetence, rather than merit, becomes the overriding factor.

But savages can also be a menace. Conrad portrays such a threat through the cannibals on board, whose hunger alone is enough to make them the epitome of preying savagery to the tired and severely outnumbered whites on the boat. A more concrete example of native menace, however, is Kurtz's woman, whom Marlow describes in some detail. As Kurtz prepares to leave the jungle, the nameless companion loses her material being and turns into "a wild and gorgeous apparition of a woman" (60). She approaches the boat threateningly, despite her helplessness: "She stood looking at us without a stir and like the wilderness itself, with an air of brooding over an inscrutable purpose" (60). For Marlow, that purpose is "inscrutable" because as a savage that woman's agitation cannot be due to her emotional ties to the departing Kurtz. Another white character, the Russian, states that he "would have tried to shoot her" had she ventured aboard (61). The climactic point of Passage also confirms the native's fluctuation between passivity and menace. The lovable Aziz, for instance, mimics his British "superiors" much of the time, but suddenly becomes a threat to the community after the Marabar picnic. Although Miss Quested's accusations turn out to be unworthy of the trouble they generate, the native's potential threat is unmistakable: "All over Chandrapore that day the Europeans were putting aside their normal personalities and sinking themselves in their community. Pity, wrath, heroism, filled them, but the power of putting two and two together was annihilated" (183). The narrator, admittedly, is wary of such a collective overreaction,
but the numerous details in the long section comprising Aziz's arrest, trial, and eventual release (178-257) confirm the stereotypical image of the native as a psychological, if not a physical, menace to the ruling class.

Recent literary theory has shown that narrative is not only at the Heart of literature, but also at the Heart of everyday experience whenever the occasion for an anecdote arises. But the colonialist writer's representation of indigenous characters, Indians or Africans, is one that dispenses with narrativity. The colonialist writer's tendency to deny his native characters narrativity raises the question of ideological and political intentions, and of the writer's relation to power and authority. The relation of narrative to legitimacy, normativeness and authority is undeniable. Writers give or deny narrative consequence, or meaning, according to the position they choose in their relation to authority. In Hayden White's words, "narrative in general, from the folktale to the novel, from the annals to the fully realized "history," has to do with the topics of law, legality, legitimacy, or, more generally, authority" (13). Thus, a complete narrative is a normative and legitimate one because its narrator has imposed upon its account of reality the form of a "story." One aspect of denying narrative status could be seen in what JanMohamed characterizes as colonialist fiction's indifference to "the truth-value of its representation" (63). Imperialist writers, to be more specific, tend in their creation of fictional events and people to produce an image of the colonized, the effect and interpretation of which is in harmony with official rationales for colonialism. Writers distort or exaggerate, then, in order to produce their literary approximation of colonial rationale. In his commentary on Conrad's several references to cannibalism in Heart, Patrick Brantlinger asserts that "exaggerating the extent and nature of cannibalism is also standard in racist accounts of Africa" (372). JanMohamed has also ascribed the characterization of Africa as the epitome of evil and barbarity to the establishment of the slave trade (61).

Similarly, one may question Forster's intention in injecting in a Passage the following commentary on India: "She calls 'Come' through her hundred mouths, through objects ridiculous and August. But come to what? She has never defined. She is not a promise, only an appeal" (150). The dismissive tone is unmistakable, and probably unjustifiable except in the eyes of those who accept the colonial enterprise. But the dismissal is a "natural" one, too, and as normal as Marlow's association of the African scene with savagery and evil. The Indians and the Africans are peripheral, and they are silenced in fictions that, to quote Said once more,
"reconstitute difference as identity" (Culture and Imperialism 166). That's why it is more accurate to say that natives in colonial literature are unrepresented rather than misrepresented. It is quite natural for the colonialist writer not to see them. Speaking of Conrad specifically, Chinua Achebe has succinctly described this tendency in colonialist representation: "White racism against Africa is such a normal way of thinking that its manifestations go completely unremarked" (257).

Notes

1. Michel Foucault's writings on power and representation, especially on how communities isolate and exclude undesirable elements by designating them "abnormal," have considerably widened the context of such a relationship. My choice in this paper not to discuss Foucault is justified by his neglect of colonialism and its impact on the histories of the third world.

2. For instance, Patrick Brantlinger argues in a recent essay that Forster in Passage actually goes beyond a critique of "the failure of the imperialist enterprise in India" to suggest "the triumph of Indian nationalism." See his "The Bloomsbury Fraction' Versus War and Empire" in Seeing Double: Revisioning Edwardian and Modernist Literature, eds. Carola M. Kaplan and Anne B. Simpson (New York: St. Martin's P, 1996) 156.

3. Fielding's wonder why would Indian nationalists want to break away from British domination, it is worth adding, implies a reductive assessment of an Eastern imperial metropolis: Japan. Imperial cultures, in his opinion, are not equal. Edward Said has commented on what he calls the "Eurocentrism" of colonialist imperialism in a manner that
clarifies the colonial attitude Fielding expresses:

All the subjugated peoples had it in common that they were considered to be naturally subservient to a superior, advanced, developed and morally mature Europe, whose role in the non-European world was to rule, instruct, legislate, develop, and at the proper times, to discipline, war against, and occasionally exterminate non-Europeans. (Eagleton, Jameson, and Said 72)

This explains the consistent representation in colonial fiction of native characters as worthy of secondary roles only. It might be interesting to compare Forster's and Conrad's natives with their counterparts in Romantic poetry, and in Byron's poetry in specific. Byron's Orientals, though embody a lot of the cliches of the day-- violence, cruelty, sensuality, moral deprivation, and the like-- are not denied narrativity and normativeness. Their world is not placed on "a temporal slope" (to use Fabian's expression), alongside the world of Christianity. In other words, they emerge, unlike the Indian or African natives, as equals to the Europeans, and their coevalness with the Europeans is not denied.

"Menace," and "mimicry" are the terms Homi Bhabha uses to explain colonialism's impact on the formation of colonial subjects. He identifies two types of natives: those who passively mimic the colonizers, and those who radically dissent from them and hence pose a menace to it. See his "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial discourse" in The Location of Culture.
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الأيديولوجيا وتشوير الشخصيات

ابناء البلاد الاصليون في روايات الطريق الى الهند

وقلب الظلمة

شاكر مصطفى , جامعة انديانا , الولايات المتحدة

ملخص

تظهر هذه الدراسة أن أدب الحقبة الاستعمارية يدعم بشكل عام العقلية الاستعمارية وسياساتها. تصوير هذا الأدب للشعوب المستعمَرة من خلال شخصيات ثانوية، يشكل جزءًا لا يتجزأ من نظرة المستعمرين إلى هذه الشعوب وإيديولوجيتهم تجاهها. وإيضاح العلاقة بين الايديولوجيا وتصوير الشخصيات، مركز المقالة على رواية جوزيف كوزارد "قلب الظلمة" ورواية إي. م. فورستر "الطريق إلى الهند" وتُبرز الطريقة التي يدعم التصور الخيالي للشخصيات بها النظرة الاستعمارية رلي المستعمرين بتضييق مساحة السرد لهم في الرواية. تم اختيار هاتين الروايتين بشكل رئيسي لأن كاتبيها ينجحان في تجنب التصور لنمط المعاد للمستعمر من أهل البلاد الاصليين في أدب الاستعمار، ولأنهما كليهما يتمتعان بخبرة مباشرة في شؤون المستعمرات.
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