Imperialist Discourse in Travel Writing

A Contextualization of *Heart of Darkness* and *How I Found Livingstone* and Their Portrayal of Imperialist Practices

Christoffer Lund Lukasen
Studienummer: 20134619

Isabella Jensen Steinicke
Studienummer: 20145559

Aalborg Universitet
Christoffer Lund Lukasen
Isabella Jensen Steinicke

Thesis, English Major 2019
10th Semester
June 3rd 2019

Abstract

The following paper includes an analysis of Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* and Henry Morton Stanley's *How I Found Livingstone* using theories regarding narratology, and postcolonialism, along with the approaches of Foucault and New Historicism. The focus of the analysis will be on the two texts' representations of imperialism, and the aforementioned theories and approaches will be applied to examine whether or not the narratives of the two texts adhere to the imperialist discourse and its altruistic legitimization of colonial undertakings, their historical context, as well as the power associated with the knowledge each author circulates. The postcolonial theories are based on the works of Edward Said and the terminology of Albert Memmi, and their function is to inform on the roles associated with colonial undertakings and their results on both colonizer and colonized. As for narratology, our terminology is based on the work of Mieke Bal.

The analysis is carried out with a focus on narratology as a means of analyzing the different aspects of the two narratives, as well as how these portray the discourses and counter-discourses at play within the narratives. The postcolonial aspects are presented through the terms of colonizer and colonized, each covering one of the groups involved in colonial undertakings, as well as the nature of the relationship between these two groups.

Through our analysis we determine that Stanley's plot, and his use of narratological tools, adheres to the mindset of the colonizer and reinforces the imperialist discourse, whereas Conrad's produces a counter-discourse disputing the actions taken in the name of imperialism through a subversion of the traditional quest plot structure. As such, each author approaches the topic of imperialism differently, although comments in Conrad's text indicate that he does not oppose imperialism as a concept, only the discrepancy between the concept and the practice.

Aalborg Universitet
Christoffer Lund Lukasen
Isabella Jensen Steinicke

Thesis, English Major 2019
10th Semester
June 3rd 2019

Table of Contents

Aalborg Universitet
Christoffer Lund Lukasen
Isabella Jensen Steinicke

Thesis English Major 2019
10th Semester
June 3rd 2019

Introduction

In the years following the death of Livingstone in 1873 the European countries all vied for dominance over parts of the African continent as part of what would become known as 'The Scramble for Africa'. According to the imperialist discourse, they did so in an attempt to open up Africa and educate its inhabitants in the ways of civilization and Christianity, yet the results were at times a far cry from their declared philanthropy. The most notorious example was King Leopold II of Belgium and his colonies at the Congo, which was used as a private supplier of rubber and ivory for the king and his coffers.

Yet, the European nations believed themselves to be in the right, partly due to an anxiety regarding the Arab influence on the African population. Their beliefs were then, that by exerting an influence stressing Western civilization, they could steer the Africans unto the right path, as compared to the Arabs. The Victorian notions of a racial hierarchy being linked with cultural dominance resulted in an attitude that the Europeans were well within their right to colonize the African continent, as they were the ones with the highest probability to successfully civilize the continent. At the same time, on a more local level, the existence of a colonial system allowed the population of the colonizing country to seek their fortunes in a different location, where they would be in an elevated position compared to the native population.

The possibilities these colonial undertakings presented to the public was made known through the exploits of explorers, travelers and colonists and how they were presented through texts. One of the most popular of the genres was travel writing, which allowed the public to familiarize themselves with the colonies, either for the sake of curiosity in the new dominions of the empire, or in order to prepare for their own journey there. As such, literature played an immense role in circulating knowledge about the colonial endeavors, as well as reinforcing the culturally accepted imperialist discourse.

Yet, not all agreed with the way that the imperialist discourse was practiced, especially as more reports of violent actions by the colonists came to light. The goal for this project is to answer the question of how two different authors, each with their own set of beliefs and motivations, appeal to readers in an attempt to promote their own ideologies. In order to analyze Victorian texts for their portrayal of the relationship between the colonizing country and the African colonized, we will apply the approaches of Foucault and New Historicism as methods

to regard texts as simultaneously products of, and producers of, discourse, as they each classify text and context as too deeply rooted in one another to separate. Furthermore, in order to relay the necessary background knowledge relevant for our understanding of the texts and their contemporary period, we have included a separate chapter detailing relevant historical context. While including a chapter, where historical context has been separated from our primary texts, may go against one of the primary beliefs of the New Historicist approach, we believe that our choice will allow a more understandable structure in regard to our analysis. With this in mind, the theoretical segment of our project will be introduced with the relevant historical context, followed by a description of Foucault and the New Historicist approach.

The reason for using the New Historicist approach is that it allows us to approach texts as products of, and producers of, their contexts. This approach is not entirely new in regard to analyzing *Heart of Darkness*, as has, for instance, been done by Gregory Castle, who argues that Conrad's text was a fictional version of anti-imperialist discourse used to criticize imperialism (Castle, p. 269). Where our opinion differs is that we do not regard Conrad as entirely against imperialism, but only as a critic of the way imperialist discourse has been used as legitimization for undertakings that were inherently selfish and detrimental to the population of the colonies. As for our reason for using Foucault and the New Historicist approach to analyze travel writing, we find, like Patrick Brantlinger, that with the topic of exploration and its influence on British culture, "it would be difficult to find a clearer example of the Foucauldian concept of discourse as power, as 'a violence that we do to things'" (Brantlinger, 1988, p. 180).

After a chapter relaying the relevant historical context, we have included a chapter on Edward Said's approach of Postcolonialism, in order to explore some important factors relevant when discussing the relationship between the two major parties involved in colonial undertakings, along with the terminology of Albert Memmi. Finally, our chapter regarding theories and methods will include Mieke Bal's notion of narratology in order to discern the narrative tools in the primary texts, along with a discussion of the pastoral aspects of the location of each text.

With our theoretical and methodological outset in Foucault and the New Historicist approach, along with the relevant knowledge regarding the historical context surrounding imperialist undertakings in Africa, we will be analyzing two examples of travel writing; *Heart of Darkness* by Joseph Conrad and *How I Found Livingstone; Travels, Adventures, and Discoveries in Central Africa; Including Four Months' Residence with Dr. Livingstone* by

Henry Morton Stanley. Our main focus will be on perceiving them as indications of their historical context, as well as how they each portray the imperialist discourse and their attitude towards both the Westerner and the African through their use of narratological tools. It should here be noted that our definition of Westerner is meant as a term signifying someone of European or American descent. While we could have simply referred to them as Europeans, it would be remiss to not acknowledge the influence of the Americans on the colonization of Africa. After all, some of the technology used by the colonizers was of American origin, such as the Winchester rifles.

Theory and Methodology

Foucault: Texts as Nodes within a Network

In this chapter on Foucault and his theory on the relationship between literature and society, we will be taking an outset in his work *The Archaeology of Knowledge,* as well as the article 'Foucault and the study of literature' by Dieter Freundlieb, wherein he argues, that Foucault's theory manifests in four phases. As we will only be dealing with the second of these, we shall only be elaborating on that one. Finally, we will briefly outline Foucault's notions of power and knowledge, as these concepts constructs the basis for what the following chapter on New Historicism is structured around.

Our understanding of Foucault's theory, or at least the part we will be applying in this project, is based on his writings in his book *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. The first point which we will include regards the concept of *discourse*, which Foucault is using by avoiding other concepts "such as 'science', 'ideology', 'theory', or 'domain of objectivity'" (Foucault, 1972, p. 38). Foucault further argues that the rules of these discursive concepts are what defines their existence "in a given discursive division" (ibid.). This means that the rules of the discourse are what ensures its existence. The reason, according to Foucault, for creating a distinction between former ideologies, theories, sciences and so forth, is to detach science, for example, from the "the past as ideological" (ibid., p. 5). By using discourse, Foucault is removing underlying structures, such as ideology, and instead defines an ideology as its own discourse, science as a different discourse, and that, in the case of science and ideology, science should not be examined within an ideology. Doing otherwise would entail the ideology affecting the scientific results, or at the very least, how such results would be perceived or used, hence why Foucault argues that science should be its own discourse.

To emphasize on Foucault's notion of discourse, we move to his definition of a *statement*. Foucault claims that while a statement might appear to be able to function independently and stand alone without context, it cannot. All statements are bound to discourses and cannot stand alone as the statements are "introduced into a set of relations with other similar elements" and only through these relations can the statement be understood. Foucault describes a statement as "a seed that appears on the surface of a tissue of which it is the constituent element" (Foucault, 1972, p. 80). This metaphor defines how a statement can seemingly stand alone, yet still be part of a discourse which will restrict and limit the utterance

of the statement. As such, the statement makes sense in the discourse within which it is uttered. Grammatically speaking, while a statement can take any form, it is limited in a scope derived from the discourse within which it is uttered (Freundlieb, pp. 26-27). In short, a statement is the atom of a discourse, and the discourse is the rules or limits within which the statement is uttered (Foucault, 1972, p. 80).

To further elaborate on discourse, discourses are derived from their contemporary period, a discourse can mark multiple contemporary facets, such as politics, literature, or science. The discourse is the limits which determines what is true and what can be thought of as the truth. That is to say, the truth is variable. A certain discourse is defined by time, as Foucault argues that although politics and literature were present in the Medieval times and the Classical period, the definition of discourse has changed. This is due to how discourses change over time, in accordance with changes in politics and literature, which results in the argument, that the discourse of a given period may not necessarily be the same for a different period, as well as a different culture (Foucault, 1972, p. 22). The way we interpret discourses of the past, based on texts of the period in question, is limited by our understanding of discourses with an outset in our own era. This means that if we are to apply our contemporary discourse of politics to politics in the Medieval times or during the Classical period, the definitions of said discourse will only fit by "retrospective hypothesis", that is, the definition of discourse will only apply to the discourse at a different time or culture through analogies or semantic resemblances. If we do not apply these tools, our definition of discourse will not be applicable to the discourse in a different time or culture (ibid.).

While being rooted in time, a discourse is also defined by the culture from which it originates. A discourse is defined by rules, and these rules are created within society and culture, which leads to them being reflexive, principles of categorization, institutionalized types and normative rules (Foucault, 1972, p. 22). This is a necessity for discourses, as they must adapt and develop over time in accordance to the social institutions around which they are built. This reflection, of what a discourse is, leads to the logical conclusion that discourses requires analyzing in relation to other discourses, as all discourses are part of a complex relationship with each other. Like statements, discourses are "not intrinsic, autochthonous, [or] universally recognizable" in their characteristics, as discourses change from culture to culture and from time to time, and are created in relation to one another, meaning that they therefore cannot be seen in isolation (ibid.).

Foucault then claims that the book and the œuvre must be suspended above all discourses. In this section we will only focus on the book, as the œuvre of an author or artist is not relevant to our project. Despite how clearly defined the book appears, defining a book in reality is more complex, as books are rarely as clearly defined as they seem. In order for a book to be defined as a book, there are certain physical limitations such as a first page, a front page and so on, although Foucault argues that this is not a clear definition. For example, if the book contains a collection of poems, then the format changes and the book will no longer fit into the previously established requirements. Unlike, for example, a mathematical treatise or a historical account, which both have sets of rules or norms on how to display the findings of their author, all books cannot be said to be identical in the same manner, as books are structured in different manners depending on what type of book it is (Foucault, 1972, p. 23).

Rather than defining the book as above, to Foucault, the book is more than just the physical form it takes; it is a unity which is "variable and relative", and which relates to how questioning the unity of the book, results in the book losing its self-evidence. This leads to the conclusion, that the book only can indicate and construct itself on the basis of, and within, the complex field of discourse (Foucault, 1972, p. 30). As Foucault states, a book is "caught up in a system of references to other books, other texts, other sentences: it is a node within a network" (ibid., p. 23). To briefly summarize, the book can only be read in relation to the network within which it was written, as the book in itself is neither a unity nor a complete discourse; the book is created as part of a connection to other discourses and cannot be seen in isolation.

This relationship of a book as "a node within a network" (Foucault, 1972, p. 23), can be linked with the chapter following Foucault on New Historicism. Before introducing New Historicism, a set of relevant terms from Foucault will be introduced; those of *power* and *knowledge*. "What makes power […], what makes it accepted, is […] that it doesn't only weigh on us as a force that says no, but that it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse" (Foucault, 1980, p. 119). As this statement suggests, not only is power a producer and creator of knowledge, but likewise, knowledge is what creates power. As is stated in the afterword to *Power/Knowledge: selected interviews & other writings*, "[t]hese forms of knowledge and these apparatuses of power are linked in a constitutive interdependence" (ibid., p. 239). That is to say, "power in terms of knowledge and […] knowledge in terms of power" is possible because of its insistence that the two are the same (ibid., p. 237).

New Historicism: The Circulation of Power and Knowledge

New Historicism builds on Foucault's theory of power and knowledge as well as what influence the notion of power being equivalent to knowledge. This "gave intellectuals the confidence that their knowledge had power" (Veeser, 1994, p. 2). According to H. Aram Veeser, the relationship between knowledge and power resulted in intellectuals wishing to change the culture, although they were unable to do so, due to them being part of it and thereby caught up in its "oppressive institutions" (ibid., p. 3). By circulating and negotiating power and knowledge, one provides legitimacy for both processes, and, at the same time, create the foundations for the accumulation of yet more power and knowledge. This relation between knowledge and power leads back to Foucault and his idea that every text is part of a context, or, as referred to in the chapter above, every book "is a node within a network" (Foucault, 1972, p. 23).

Stephen Greenblatt is the first to have defined the term *New Historicism* in his essay 'Poetics of Culture'; the name chosen as the phrase "challenges the norm of disembodied objectivity to which humanists have increasingly aspired" (Veeser, 1989, p. ix). This relates to how, to refer back to Foucault, everything is a "node within a network" (Foucault, 1972, p. 23), and the circulation, or negotiation, of knowledge can be seen in the necessity to approach culture as a text or discourse too, as Greenblatt proposes (Greenblatt, p. 3). As it is with texts and how one cannot examine them outside of their context, neither can culture be approached without an understanding of its context.

Greenblatt's outset to New Historicism was derived from Renaissance studies, as it was here the "shadowy opposition is assumed between the 'individual' (bad) and the 'individual subject' (good); indeed the maiming of the latter creates the former" (Greenblatt, p. 3). In short, when the individual subject, which is good, is destroyed, the individual is created. The good, individual subject, was a subject who was an individual but who had no distinct psychology outside of the shared society, and most importantly, poetics and politics were one. This is then shattered by capitalism, as capitalism destroys this ideal of the individual subject and instead creates the individual (ibid.).

Greenblatt proposes that there is no distinction between the fields of aesthetics and the real, as aesthetics and the real are "a way of intensifying the single realm we all inhabit" (Greenblatt., pp. 6-7). This then leads back to the notion in the paragraph above, where capitalism shattered the connectedness between the individual and the surrounding society.

Greenblatt then states that “the work of art is the product of a negotiation between a creator or class of creators, equipped with a complex, communally shared repertoire of conventions, and the institutions and practices of society” (ibid., p. 12). Through this statement, Greenblatt links the creator to the economy, or society, in a way that makes them inseparable, as they are in a constant process of continued negotiation(ibid.).

The term New Historicism is, according to Veeser in *The New Historicism: Reader*, difficult to pin down, as there are no strong common practice or theoretical foundation. Even so, through his reading of many of these New Historicist texts, Veeser has pinned down five key assumptions which all New Historicist texts contain, although it should be noted, that the list of these cannot be said to encompass all the notions of New Historicism. Regarding the first point, this point concerns that of expressions, as Veeser states that whenever someone expresses itself through an act, the expression of said act is part of a larger network. That is to say, nothing stands in isolation, as everything is always part of something bigger. The second point concerns critique and how any attempt to criticize an expression also entails the use or acknowledgement of said expression, thereby falling prey to what was criticized. With this in mind, the difficulty of giving critique then becomes, that whoever tries to criticize the act will also use the tools used to express the act, thereby failing to criticize the action (Veeser, 1994, p. 2). The third point Veeser defines is that literary and non-literary ‘texts’ are linked, which entails that the two types of ‘texts’ circulate around and within each other and cannot be divided. Veeser’s fourth point concerns the truth, and how no text can give access to the truth or give access to unchangeable human nature. Finally, Veeser’s fifth point reads, that any language or method that is fit to describe a certain culture under capitalism participates in the economy, they try to describe (ibid.).

Some New Historicists claim that "art must attack the dominant social, political, and economic order" (Veeser, 1994, p. 3). However, Greenblatt opposes this notion, stating that we are deeply implicated in our culture, and that despite some claiming that art "exercises a destabilizing function in our culture" (ibid.), the current understanding is that art does not function as destabilizing in our culture. This highlights how we are all part of the social order of our society and even though we might claim to go against or attack the order of the society, the fact remains that we are too bound within the culture to fully separate us from it (ibid.).

In regard to the applicability of New Historicism for this project, New Historicism lets us study “centuries-worth of literature within capitalism” (Veeser, 1994, p. 3). This is the effect the capitalist society we live in have on literature, as our society affects our literature, and that

the capitalist background for our literature within the past century cannot be separated from this economic order of our society (ibid.). This relates to how the most important currencies of our society are money and prestige, and how we create art in order to receive either of the two. Art is therefore created in a way that maximizes the chance that society will acknowledge it, meaning that art is part of the culture and built around, and by, the culture in which it is created, which leads to art being a result of the negotiation between art and the culture, or rather a representation thereof (ibid.). Later on, New Historicists claim that capitalism means something more specific, and that "contemporary life at its best embodies mobility and impersonality" (ibid., p. 4), and that all people must represent the economy in which they thrive, and since the economy is capitalism, all people are empty as they represent money, which is empty (ibid.).

To briefly sum up the notions of New Historicism, art and politics were inseparable before capitalism created a distinction between the two. The point of using New Historicism in this project is to diminish the difference between art and culture by reading the piece of art as being part of the culture and thereby not creating a distinction between the two.

Narratological Tools and the Blueprint of the Quest Plot

In order to highlight our consideration of how one must analyze the structure of literature in accordance with its content, as well as the context from which the literature originates, as the relationship between the two is integral to reading the text thoroughly, we will be using the theoretical approach of Mieke Bal on narratology. The following chapter will be regarding this topic, as well as which of Bal's definitions we will be using. The primary motivation for us using Bal stems from her stressing "the need for systematic deduction of narratology and for instructions on the 'tools' or 'instruments' which form the pragmatic interface of the theory" (Bal, pp. 18-19). The inclusion of Mieke Bal's approach to narratology, is further due to Bal relying on the notion that "the often-alleged opposition between historical and systematic analysis is a false one" (Bal, p. 13). With this in mind, it follows that we cannot look only at either the narratological tools or the content in relation to context, we have to look at both of these in relation to one another to get a full understanding of a given text.

We will be applying the terms of Mieke Bal with the exception of her separation of *text*, *fabula* and *story*, where, instead, we will apply the terminology of *story* and *plot*. These two terms are defined by Boris Tomashevskii who states that "the story consists of a series of narrative motifs in their chronological sequence, moving from individual cause to effect, whereas the plot represents the same motifs, but in the specific order of occurrence to which they are assigned in the text" (Kolesnikoff, p. 632). Story, then, is how the entire series of events would be structured chronologically, whereas the plot is how the story is structured within the narrative and the effect this has on the reader. A way to make the plot differ from the actual story can happen through the use of *anticipation* as well as *retrospection* (Bal, p. 84).

Following this notion, we will include Bal's notions about the *speaker* and relevance of the presentation of the story as well as notions on embedded texts which will become relevant during our analysis. According to Bal, a narrative can have one of two types of speakers; a speaker who is part of the narrative or a speaker who is not part of the narrative. In relation to this speaker, a choice is made in order to define who the speaker should be. This relates to the *point of view* of the text, to which Bal uses the term *focalizor*. While we will not focus too much time or attention to the topics of focalizors and focalizing, it is nonetheless an important term to mention, as the term entails a way for the story to be marked by the subjectivity of the focalizor (Bal, pp. 8-9). Another such point of similar importance is that of the *narrator* and the use of *direct speech*. When there is direct speech in a story, it is not the narrator who is

narrating, the narrator has given the narration to someone else for the period of time in which the direct speech is being spoken (ibid., p. 8).

The ordering of the sequences in a story is not "just a literary convention", as Bal states that

> it is also a means of drawing attention to certain things, to emphasize, to bring about aesthetic or psychological effects, to show various interpretations of an event, to indicate the subtle difference between expectation and realization, and much else besides. (Bal, p. 82)

The importance of this quote lies in the fact that the structure of the plot, has an impact on the underlying elements of the story as well as different effects the ordering can have when a reader reads the plot (Bal, p. 82).

To further this point, the elements of the story are presented in a certain way in the plot in order to get the effect wished for (Bal, p. 7). These elements include *place*, *events* and *actors* (ibid.). It should be noted that with actors, we refer to agents who perform actions, and these agents are not necessarily human but can be (ibid.). Bal includes a differentiation between actor and character, as the character for the "anthropomorphic figures the narrator tells us about" (ibid., p. 114). The term event here refers to "the transition from one state to another state, caused or experienced by actors" (ibid., p. 182). And finally, place, or location, is where the fabula happens (ibid., p. 214). The reason for mentioning these is to highlight how the different elements of the story can be used in order to create a certain effect within the plot.

An additional point which will comment upon regarding narratology, is that of *embedded texts*. The term embedded text refers to when the *primary fabula* contains a *secondary fabula*, where the secondary fabula is embedded in the primary. The fabula represents the story in the terminology we use, though regarding primary and secondary fabulae, these terms will be applied in the analysis. In other words, primary and secondary fabulae only occur when the narrator's text and a text of an actor "are so closely related that a distinction into narrative levels can no longer be made" (Bal, p. 52). When a text in a narrative takes up too much space for it to be part of the primary fabula, it can be read as a secondary fabula (ibid., p. 52).

There are different ways in which embedded texts can be read, and we will present a few. There are *frame-narratives*, which is texts in which the narrative is told through second or third level, here the secondary or tertiary fabula in comparison to the primary (Bal, p. 52). The relationship between the primary and secondary fabula is that the primary fabula may be

forgotten. Bal uses the example of *Arabian Nights*, where she succeeds in telling the Scheherazade stories, in order for him to forget the time, and consequently, we as readers also forget the primary fabula. The effect that having two fabulae has on the reader is determined by the relationship between the two (ibid., pp. 52-53). The secondary fabula can be an explanation of or can resemble the primary fabula (ibid., p. 53), whereas the secondary fabula can determine the primary (ibid., p. 54), or the two fabulae, or stories, as we will refer to them, can resemble one another completely. When two fabulae, or stories, resemble one another, they are called *mirror-texts,* and while two fabulae cannot be completely identical, they can resemble each other to such a degree that they are practically indistinguishable, albeit they retain differences, as they cannot be the same by definition (ibid., pp. 57-58).

The final point we will include in this section on narratology, is that of the *actant model*. In the actant model, the entities, called actants, within a narrative can be categorized into different categories in accordance to the role they serve. The first two of these are the *subject* and the *object*, which Mieke Bal classifies as "the actor who follows an aim and that aim itself" (Bal, p. 197), of which the subject is the actor and the object is the aim for which the actor aims. The object does not always have to be a person, but the subject is usually a person or personified animal (ibid.). In order to understand the object and its relation to the other entities in the narrative, we can classify the object as part of a communication; from the *sender* to the *receiver*. For the subject to obtain or reach the object, it requires a sender who has the power to make the object available. In that sense, the sender serves as the power that determines whether the subject can reach the goal, one example of this would be found in the classic fairy tale-structure, where it is often the King sending his daughter, the object, to be married to the young man, the subject of the fairytale. However, the sender, or the power, can also be of a non-physical nature, such as social status, which can complicate or simplify the subject's journey towards obtaining of its goal. As such, the sender, can be positive or negative, as it can either help the subject in achieving his/her object, or it can impede it (ibid., p. 199). Just as there must be a sender to pass the object along, so must there be a receiver of the object, which is often the same person as the subject, given that the subject covets the object, and often ends up receiving it, though this can differ depending on the plot (ibid.).

What has been discussed so far are the categories of subject, object, the sender and receiver of the object, as well as how the narrative revolves around the subject and its quest for the object. During this quest, difficulties may arise that the subject has to overcome in order to succeed and claim the object. This conflict involves more entities that influence the subject

through two different roles, either as a *helper* or an *opponent*. The helper "can give only incidental aid [and] is mostly concrete[,] often comes to the fore[, and are] usually multiple" (Bal, p. 201). Opponents are the things/persons who obstructs the subject from receiving the object. To distinguish between the helper and opponent, the helper presents a positive power influencing the subject, whereas the opponent presents the opposite; a negative power, that wishes to prevent the subject from receiving the object. As such, the opponent is often abstract "has power over the whole enterprise […,] often remains in the background [, and is] usually only one" (ibid., p. 201). This definition of the opponent is consequently the same definition to the helper, only the opponent is supposed to prevent the subject from receiving his/her object, and the helper is supposed to help the subject receive his/her object (ibid.).

The Scramble for Africa: A Case of Altruism or a Profitable Excuse?

This chapter will focus on presenting historical context relevant for the project, specifically pertaining to the European colonization of Africa, the Europeans' motives and attempts to legitimize doing so, and the results of their undertakings both on their own population as well as that of the African population. While European colonization by no means was limited to only the African continent, we have chosen to limit the scope of the historical context segment to English colonization in Africa, as this is the area highlighted in our two primary texts.

Having kept their undertakings on the continent of Africa to only coastal outposts up until the 19th century, Britain and other European powers had settled for a lesser degree of economic and military influence over the African natives. Yet they had managed to make huge profits from this confined state nonetheless, as they exported slaves numbering in the millions, until, at least for Britain, slave trade was abolished in 1807, although slavery itself was not outlawed until 1834 (Pakenham, p. 18). Even so, the abolition of slavery did little to impede European control over Africa, as it was decided during the Berlin Conference of 1884-85 to once again stamp out slavery from the continent, particularly that imposed by the Africans and Arabs (Pakenham, p. 20). Thus was the legitimization behind what is known as 'The Scramble for Africa', which resulted in virtually the entire continent being under European control, consisting of "thirty new colonies and protectorates, 10 million square miles of territory and 110 million dazed new subjects, acquired by one method or another" (ibid., p. xv).

However, it became apparent to the world, that some of the European powers behind the Berlin Act of 1885 were far more interested in preserving and furthering their own agendas in Africa, rather than putting slavery to an end. Those who spoke for a continued presence and expansion of domains in Africa would often speak of the philanthropic and charitable nature of the undertakings. After all, according to much of the pseudo-scientific theories of their time, the Europeans were at the top of the hierarchy in just about every field, meaning that they had a moral obligation to civilize the savages and end slavery. Yet, their actions proved to be quite different from their promises. One of the more prominent examples of this was Belgium, more specifically its monarch King Leopold II, who was denounced as late as 1897 for his forces not having "suppressed slavery, but established a monopoly by driving out the Arab and Wangwana competitors", causing the deaths of as many as ten million Africans (Brantlinger, 2009, p. 145). Whether or not the colonized peoples within African areas controlled by

European colonizers were slaves in name, acts of forced labor continued well after the decision to abolish slave trading.

From an economic point of view, there can be no doubt that expanding one's nation through a colonial system proved a great asset to those at home. Not only did the existence of a colony allow the population of the colonizing nation to seek out wealth in an area where there was little competition in regards to jobs, but it also proved to be an opportunity for those who chose to participate in colonial undertakings for a change in scenery or a longing for seeing other parts of the world. However, Albert Memmi retorts the latter of the two, by reducing any yearning for the new domains to nothing more than an excuse for one's own wish for greater profit:

> Why then, does he usually seek [adventure and a change in scenery] where his own language is spoken, where he does not find a large group of his fellow countrymen, an administration to serve him, an army to protect him? The adventure would have been less predictable; but that sort of change, while more definite and of better quality, would have been of doubtful profit [...] You go to a colony because jobs are guaranteed, wages high, careers more rapid and business more profitable. (Memmi, pp. 47-48)

To Memmi then, the entire colonial system is one created for the benefit of the colonists, and any reason the colonists may claim to have for their colonial undertakings can be reduced to the economic advantages that the colonies provide. While he argues that validation of the portrait of the colonizer being a noble adventurer and a righteous pioneer may, or may not, initially have been a reality, Memmi does state that "the cultural and moral mission of a colonizer, even in the beginning, is no longer tenable" (Memmi, p. 47).

Even if assuming the existence an individual who did not come to the colonies for profit, an example of which could be a person yearning for adventure or exploration, the system of the colonies is designed in such a way, that they will inevitably see the economic advantages of their position and the disadvantages of returning to their home country. Meanwhile, the colonists will come to realize that the reason for their profit stems from the exploitation and misery of the native population of the colonies and that their privilege over the colonized can only be maintained through a continued usurpation. Whether they choose to accept or reject their role in this system, it has no bearing on the system as a whole, as they retain their privilege, and therefore their place within the system (Memmi, p. 61).

However, emigrating to Africa was not the only benefit brought about by imperialism, as John Hobson argued that another boon was that of a new market. He believed that underconsumption at home "led inexorably to a search for new markets abroad" (Brantlinger, 2009, p. 58). While this factor may not have produced any significant profit to the nation as a whole, it would certainly have made a considerable increase for the governing class and others with vested interest, as was evident in cases like that of Leopold II of Belgium and his use of Congo as his private colony to export enormous amounts of rubber (ibid. p. 144). Exotic commodities like ivory and 'red rubber', so named due to the blood of the slave laborers who died to produce it (ibid. p. 145), also proved to be a new way for the Europeans in the colonies to increase their own wealth, due to the symbolic value these luxuries represented for the wealthiest individuals outside of the colonies. As such, demand for these did not slow down, as they became useful to prove one's exuberant wealth for those who could afford them.

However, some argued that the influence of colonialism on the European colonizers was not entirely beneficial. As the end of the nineteenth century came about, many French academics were hit by a general pessimism caused by recent bleak scientific discoveries and national catastrophes, leading to the spirit of Fin de Siècle; the opinion of pessimism towards the progress of the human race. This ideology spread beyond the borders of France, as can be seen by the appearance of the Fin de Siècle-mentality on scientific theories of this era, as Navarette argues, through the suggestion that "a tendency toward a state of decay and final dissolution was inherent in all things" (Navarette, p. 3). One such example was Darwin's theory of evolution, which Fin de Siècle scientists argued could be applied to humans, resulting in the theory that while the human species was in a constant state of evolution and change, such a phenomenon would not necessarily result in progress. This, combined with the predominant race-oriented sciences of the time, created the notion, that the Western, or European, race could eventually degenerate to a similar state as that they perceived the colonized population to be. With that came a sense of xenophobia, a fear in all that was foreign to them, and an othering of any who were different than themselves, due to the perception that the foreign would somehow diminish or lead to the loss of the pure essence of cultures and races such as that of the English (Tromp et al. p. 3).

This notion bled into the topic of the Westerner's interactions with the colonies and their native population, as they experienced an emulation between the two groups. Where the colonists travelling to the colonies had to adapt to their new surroundings and the population there, the people they subjugated likewise had their culture changed to encompass that of the

subjugators. This mutual adaptation was a necessity for the colonial power to govern their new territories, as well as for the foreigners attempting to adapt to the system and earn the respect of the dominant group (Memmi, p. 60). Yet, because of the previously mentioned fear of a loss of purity of essence, as well as their wish to preserve their place as the dominant race, the colonists would perceive the assimilation as a threat, as each of the two groups would essentially become more alike in their coexistence. However, rather than classifying it as the loss of English essence, it would be more accurate to see the phenomenon as a dispersal of its locations of identity, as Ian Baucom argues:

> But as England dispersed its Gothic cathedrals, cricket fields, imperial maps, costumed bodies, and country houses across the surface of the globe, it found that these spaces, and the narratives of identity they physically embodied, were altered by the colonial subjects who came into contact with them. (Baucom, p. 220)

In order to explore this relationship between these two groups, that of the colonizing power and the colonized subject, we turn to the field of postcolonial studies.

Postcolonialism: Approaching Colonization and its Legitimization

As we will be examining representations of the colonial system in our analysis, as well as the nature of the roles of those participating in it, the following chapter contains a brief outline on the studies of postcolonialism. When discussing postcolonialism, it should be noted that the term covers multiple different ideas and theories, many of which share their ideological outset, but with different focus points. While they all are constituted around the idea of colonialism, they can infer different approaches and explore the term in different ways. For instance, in the works of Robert J. C. Young, the term is used to delineate a period in time of colonial deconstruction and the nationalist- and independence movements of the nineteenth century and forward (Brantlinger 2009, p. 52). As this era dealt with the consequences of, and attempts to dismantle, the colonial system, it was given the title of postcolonialism, as in 'appearing after colonialism'. However, in this project, we will be focusing primarily on a different definition of postcolonialism; that of postcolonial studies formed as part of the academic field based on the works of Edward Said, which he first presented in his book *Orientalism*.

Where the other definition of postcolonialism focused on deconstructing the colonial identities for the colonies, Said's variant studies the relationship between the actors of colonial and neocolonial systems, through a focus on the disparities between the two groups and the binary oppositions of the systems to which they attributed. These disparities were usually approached through their manifestations in social or political power relationships between the imperial power and the area they turned into a colony, including but not limited to the relationship between master and slave, male and female, metropole and periphery (Brantlinger, 2009; p. 106). Through this focus on oppositions, Said listed two major overarching groups from which the lesser oppositions could be traced; those of the Orient and the Occident, respectively those from the Eastern countries and those from the Western countries.

These two groups of Orient and Occident would later see broader and more universally applicable terminology made by French-Tunisian essayist Albert Memmi; those of the colonizer and the colonized (Memmi, p. 54). These two roles were presented in Memmi's work of the same name, wherein he describes the history of the two roles, as well as their part in the colonial system. The colonizer, he argues, is the group subjugating the natives and the area that has been made into a colony. This group can be further divided into two sub-groups, with the individual, or small, colonizer being the colonists setting out for personal gain in the colonies, and the masters of colonization, sometimes referring to the country of the colonizers, its

government, or large organizations, whose societal structure and rules are to be followed by the individual colonizers (ibid., pp. 54-55).

On the opposite side of the colonial hierarchy, we find the colonized; the country and its native people, upon whom a new identity as loyal subjects of the colonizer is being enforced. This imposed identity is upheld not only in the minds of the people of the colonies, but for others as well, as the colonizers impose a grand narrative in which they themselves are superior, yet normal, and anything foreign is assumed unusual, unnatural and uncivilized. According to Edward Said, the construction of the colonial system with a Western superiority resulted in a distorted worldview, as the Western based power would normalize itself, whereas it would deem all non-European cultures and people as illogical, primal, mysterious and prone to follow their desires. In short, this would result in an instinctive othering of the colonized and only enforce the notion of the west being the norm (Said, 1978, p. 40). As such, one of Said's major arguments for the study of postcolonialism, or Orientalism, as he originally dubbed it, regards how the colonizer construct the identity of the colonized. Rather than acknowledging the colonized's culture and its perception of itself, the colonizer enforces a worldview unto the colonized in which they only exist in comparison to the colonizers.

While Memmi argued for economics being the prime reasoning behind the colonial system, Said commented that the colonizers usually legitimized their undertakings with a consistently recurring perception of their moral duty. "Every single empire in its official discourse has said that it is not like all the others, that its circumstances are special, that it has a mission to enlighten, civilize, bring order and democracy, and that it only uses force as a last resort" (Said, 2003, p. xvi).

While their moral mission was commendable, their methods were less so, as Said commented on in his later work *Culture and Imperialism*, as he describes some of the arguments that empires would use to legitimize their rule over the colonized, as well as methods used to do so. Examples of these methods include "the notions about bringing civilization to primitive or barbaric peoples", the necessity for brutal punishment in the shape of flogging or death "because 'they' mainly understood force or violence best" and that, in short, "'they' were not like 'us,' and for that reason deserved to be ruled" (Said, 1993, p. xi). This shows that the idea of a moral duty in itself can infer a superiority, which in itself can be hurtful to the very undertaking they attempt to legitimize. This is perhaps best shown through a statement quoted by Said from the French advocate of colonialism Jules Harland, where he makes the connection between a Western racial superiority and their obligation to colonize:

> The basic legitimation of conquest over native peoples is the conviction of our superiority, not merely our mechanical, economic, and military superiority, but our moral superiority. Our dignity rests on that quality, and it underlies our right to direct the rest of humanity. Material power is nothing but a means to that end. (Said, 1993, p. 17)

Through his statement, Harland displays a belief that the superiority of the Western world, not only societally but also in context of a racial hierarchy, also infers an obligation and right to control others. As such, despite what at first appears to be a commendable moral obligation for the civilized to assist the less civilized, we can see how it enforces the notion of a hierarchy based on racial and cultural superiority. This, in turn, sets a dangerous precedent for any interaction between the colonizer and the colonized, as it infers the right for the former to exert control over the latter, due to the presupposition that the colonized do not know any better and are a potential risk towards themselves as well as the colonizers.

Analysis

As mentioned in the introduction, our analysis will focus on examining the two primary texts with a focus on how they function as indications of their author's ideologies whether or not these adhere to imperialism. However, in order to do so, we have decided to first describe some of the details regarding the relationship between the two texts, as well as some of their key differences that will become relevant for the rest of the analysis. Following this will be a chapter regarding the topic of narratives and some of the consequences of Joseph Conrad's use of an embedded narrative has on the plot of *Heart of Darkness* and, in turn, how this affects the reader. After this, we have included two chapters regarding how each text relates to the quest plot, as described by Mieke Bal and the actant model, as well as how each text approaches the notion of quest heroes. Then follows a chapter on the topic of readability, where the two texts will be analyzed in accordance with the approach of Peter Brooks and his text 'An Unreadable Report: Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*', followed by a chapter that focuses on how the aforementioned readability affects the reliability of each narrative. We will then examine the attitude of each narrator to the African continent and its inhabitants through the concept of the pastoral, which will be followed by an analysis of the most prominent characters and entities in each text, as well as the narrators' reaction and approach to the scenery and locations they encounter along their journeys.

Throughout our analysis, we will be including previous scientific research based on our primary texts. The reason for this inclusion is to give a better indication of what has previously been written about the topic, as well as underlining how our project differs from previous works. Rather than making a separate chapter for this, we will be including the research where it appears relevant during our analysis.

Stanley vs. Conrad: Pioneering and lamenting the age of exploration

In order to produce a comprehensive comparative analysis of the two primary texts, it should first be noted how the two differ from one another, as well as the connections they share. At a cursory glance, the two texts may appear strikingly similar, as both texts are examples of travel writing from the Victorian Age, that revolves expeditions of British (or in Stanley's case American British) men on a mission to find a scholar deep inside the heart of the African continent. However, a closer inspection of the similarities between the two texts prove that they are in fact quite diverse. While both of the texts do indeed originate in the Victorian Age, that

means very little in terms of an overarching relationship between the two, as the Victorian Age was a period of constant development. In the 28 years between the publication of the two texts, global events, such as The Scramble for Africa and the subsequent atrocities of Leopold of Belgium's treatment towards the colonies, had muddied the waters of imperialism, thus paving the way for Conrad's text to be critical of the system.

At the same time, it should be noted that each narrative is based on a journey to, and through, regions of Africa, that are in quite different conditions, at different periods in time. In the case of Stanley, he was traversing the country today known as Tanzania, which was not under colonial rule at the time of his expedition. Nevertheless, he still displayed an attitude with qualities comparable to that of a colonizer, such as his focus on dominance being justifiable due to racial superiority and his focus on the Western imperialism being the natural state of the world. Conrad, on the other hand, based his narrative on a journey into the Belgian colony of Congo, which creates a setting where the area is actively being colonized by a nation.

On the individual level of the explorers themselves, one of the key differences between the two texts is that of motivation behind the two explorers' separate missions. For Stanley, the sole reason for his expedition is to find Livingstone, while also writing his experiences down along the way, as these objectives were what he had been hired to do. As for Marlow, his mission is one he undertakes entirely of his own volition, as he was only hired to be a captain for a ship to go inland. As such, it is only for Marlow himself, that his assignment becomes to find and listen to Kurtz, due to the praise and high standing he has with the individuals that Marlow comes across on his way. Despite this difference, both stories appear similar, although a major disparity between the two is how they approach the topics of exploration, imperialism and international interaction.

Being based on an actual expedition, Stanley's text has the advantage of concerning itself with a set of characters that we know more about from other sources. One of these is the character that functions as the goal for the New York Herald expedition; the physician and missionary, Doctor David Livingstone. Being an accomplished author and missionary himself, Livingstone is referred to in an almost saintly manner, as he would go into the dark continent, bringing knowledge and enlightenment with him. This depiction resulted in Livingstone, and his relationship with Africa, being regarded as Promethean (Brantlinger, 1988, p. 180), likening Livingstone to the Greek titan Prometheus enlightening the world of man by sharing with them the flame of Olympus; a symbol of wisdom and enlightenment. This philanthropic perception of Livingstone was likely caused by his humanitarian goals in Africa, as well as his relatively

high regard for its native population. It should be noted, that when we argue for his high regard, we mean in comparison to his contemporaries, rather than from a modern perspective. After all, he did still regard Africans as "children" and "savages" in contrast to the comparatively enlightened Europeans, but where some explorers, such as Richard Burton, who saw the Africans as "unimprovable", Livingstone at least believed that they could be elevated through exposure to other peoples through commerce and to Western culture through Christianity (ibid. pp. 181-182).

As could be expected, the two texts differ in their presentation of ideas, notions and individuals, not least due to the different formats of the two. In the case of Stanley, we have a biographical text that he wrote as a summary of his experiences on the New York Herald expedition across Africa. While his primary goal is to find Livingstone, throughout the text, Stanley seems just as interested in creating a cohesive guide to future would-be explorers, as he reviews the texts available to himself and contributes to their information when he deems it necessary. The reason for this is derived from Stanley's benefactor, James Gordon Bennett, as his wish was not only for Stanley to find Livingstone, but also that along the way he should be informative about his journey. "[A]s you go up describe as well as possible whatever is interesting for tourists; and then write up a guide- a practical one - for Lower Egypt, tell us about whatever is worth seeing and how to see it" (Stanley, pp. xviii-xix). Rather than to give detailed information about his trip up until he sets out for Livingstone, Stanley's description only really starts when he reaches Zanzibar. His journey up to that point is very briefly touched upon in the introductory, all of which Stanley uses to promote himself as an enlightened individual, a seasoned explorer and a skilled mediator in conflicts involving the non-English (ibid. p. xx). As such, we can assume that Stanley means to create a guidebook for explorers, tourists and those interested in Africa, while also promoting himself, Western culture, and imperialism.

In comparison, Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* is a fictional novella, based on Conrad's experiences on a journey he undertook up along the Congo River in 1890, much akin to the one Marlow participates in in the novella, while also being comparable to Stanley's. That being said, *Heart of Darkness* remains a piece of fiction that Conrad has constructed himself, albeit one based on the conditions he witnessed while in Africa. Unlike Stanley, Conrad's text creates a sense of distrust in Western culture and imperialism, as the secondary focalizor, Marlow, remarks early on that "[t]he conquest of the earth, which mostly means the taking it away from those who have a different complexion or slightly flatter noses than ourselves, is

not a pretty thing when you look into it too much" (Conrad, p. 7). Granted, when Marlow mentions this, it is in a passage where he regards the conquering mentality of the Romans who came to England, but, throughout his narrative, we see hints that his opinion of the Roman conquerors is not that different from his attitude towards the imperialists of his own period in time. Where Stanley attempts to inform the people at home about the conditions and sights of Africa, as well as help those wishing to travel to the continent by listing precautions and necessities, Conrad's text appears to function more as a moral lesson to those at home about the cause, conditions and consequences of their imperialist undertaking in Africa.

As such, while both of the texts are examples of travelers' writings, they are quite disparate in the way, they present the topic of exploration. To Stanley, exploration is a positive undertaking, as he not only adheres to the practice himself, but also encourages it in others. On the other hand, to Conrad, exploration appears as a source of great lamentation, as is hinted at in *Heart of Darkness*. When Marlow starts pondering about the world, he reflects on his childhood fondness of maps, as all the blank spaces, to him, meant "delightful mystery - a white patch for a boy to dream gloriously over" (Conrad, p. 8). However, as the explorers of the world slowly filled out the map, it erased any hope for Marlow ever seeing one of these blank spaces for himself, as, by his adulthood, "[i]t had become a place of darkness" (ibid.). This statement can be interpreted in multiple ways; the simplest of which is to approach it as Conrad conveying a sense of longing for a time where the world was still unexplored, or at least that some of its mysteries had yet to be unveiled by explorers and the imperialists.

Another way to interpret the passage is by looking at the darkness as a symbol of imperialist practices. Rather than seeing Conrad's comment as a sadness on the mysteries of the world being decoded, it is possible that he is lamenting the fact that the world has now been colonized. This idea is supported by the continued negative way in which the colonizers are being presented throughout the novella, some examples being the Pilgrims and the Eldorado Exploring Expedition. In the case of the Pilgrims, throughout their trip on The Congo River, Marlow portrays them as a barbaric bunch that constantly long for the opportunity to shoot at natives (Conrad. p. 40). Similarly, when Marlow realizes that the Africans can be scared off by the ship's whistle, and subsequently uses it to do so, the pilgrims cry out "'Don't! Don't you frighten them away!'" (ibid. p. 67). In that regard, Marlow portrays the pilgrims rather like children, as they see their blood sport as a game, and when Marlow attempts to discourage them, telling them that all their shooting amasses to no more than filling the air with smoke, as

they fail to hit their targets, they "began to howl at [him] with indignant protests" (ibid. pp. 51-52).

Similarly to the Pilgrims, Stanley perceives the act of shooting as sport: "[h]ippopotami and crocodiles being numerous; we amused ourselves by shooting at them, having also a hope of attracting the attention of our shore party, the sound of whose guns we had not heard since leaving the Rugufu" (Stanley, p. 574). The main difference between the two phenomena is, that while Stanley is shooting at animals, the Pilgrims shoot at the natives as if they were animals. Both groups shoot at their targets, despite there being no necessity to do so, the key difference between the two different scenes being that in the case of Conrad's text, Marlow scares the natives away, either illustrating his rejection of treating the natives as animal prey, or of their way to needlessly shoot Africans when they are just as easily scared off. Yet, the fact remains, that the comparison between the two texts highlight a certain tendency in the colonizers; that of a willingness to perform violent acts against those they deem to be beneath them. While Stanley, in this case, only shoots at animals, the Pilgrims' perception of the natives as primal and bestial has led them to the conclusion, that shooting at Africans is a sport. This metaphorical reading of the instance in Conrad's narrative fits well into Conrad's negative view on imperialism, while it also highlights Marlow's opinion about how the natives should be treated.

This negative mentality towards the colonizers can also be seen in Marlow's description of the difference in goals between himself and the two previously mentioned groups. In the case of the Eldorado Exploring Expedition, Marlow likens them to "buccaneers" and "burglars breaking into a safe" (Conrad, pp. 30-31); the safe being the continent of Africa. Through both of these descriptions, the group is portrayed as ruffians who steal that which does not belong to them. In comparison, when he later compares his own goal with that of the pilgrims, he ponders that unlike his own search for Kurtz, their goal is most likely "[t]o some place where they expected to get something" (ibid, p. 35), focusing on their personal avarice. Again, Conrad seemingly criticizes the colonizers for only being interested as long as it results in a profit for themselves. Contrary to them, Marlow's cannibal crew members refrain from any attempts to give in to their urges on their trip on the steamer, even after the pilgrims deprive them of their food and reimburse them with copper wire, which does have value to the colonizers, but does nothing to feed the crew during their journey (ibid., p. 41). However, an interesting point is that Marlow's own goal, that being the search for Kurtz, can likewise be argued to stem from his own selfish desire. From this perspective, despite his apparent misgivings about their

operation, Marlow still participates in the imperialist system alongside his fellow colonizers. The key difference between his goal and that of the pilgrims is then that where they seek profit and bloodshed from Africa and its natives, Marlow seeks enlightenment from Kurtz, as he is talked of in an elevated manner by those whom his path has crossed.

In that sense, it would indicate that Marlow distances himself from the behaviors of his fellow colonizers, as well as his own part in the imperialist order, which in turn results in distrust and antipathy from his peers. Rather than choosing between either side of the colonizers; the company and the pilgrims on one side and Kurtz on the other, he opts to go against both, yet is considered by the pilgrims to be on the side of Kurtz, due to his wish to meet and connect with the so-called "emissary of pity, and science, and progress, and devil knows what else" (Conrad, p. 25). This mentality of distancing himself from the side of the colonizers is not surprising for Conrad's focalizor, as he during his own trip in 1890 witnessed the cruelty performed by colonizers, albeit under the direction of King Leopold of Belgium (Brantlinger, 2011, p. 68). Furthermore, during the years between his visit to the Congo and the publication of *Heart of Darkness* several noteworthy events involving the colonies had transpired, as the violent consequences of the colonization of Africa resulted in conflicts such as the Congo Arab War. In light of these events, it is likely that Conrad's memories of the event and his attitude toward the topic had been influenced, which, in turn, left its marks upon his presentation of the situation in the Congo through his text (Brantlinger, 1988, p. 263). All of this resulted in Conrad's text being critical of imperialism and, in particular, the hypocritical nature of the colonizers claiming to be there for philanthropic reasons alone (ibid., p. 274)

As is fitting with their two different approaches to imperialism, each of the texts similarly differ in their method of conveying interactions between the protagonists and other nations, particularly those of the colonized. In Stanley's case, we see how he makes notes of different nationalities and ethnicities, to make a point of how they all differ from one another, but more importantly, how they are inferior to the Western population. On the other hand, Conrad seems to regard colonizers as a group, as they are all presented acting similarly to one another, no matter the nationality. Perhaps this uniting factor is seen most prominently in Kurtz, who is part English part French, and yet seems to embody the united contributions of Europe, as they have sent him to discern a way to suppress savage customs (Conrad, p. 49). However, this difference in focus and presentation could simply stem from the divergence in what each author seemingly attempts to highlight in their separate texts.

As Stanley mentions early on in *How I Found Livingstone*, one of his goals with writing the book is to record anything interesting to would-be tourists as well as create a practical guide to traversing parts of Africa (Stanley, pp. xviii-xix), which is why so much of his focus lies in his contemplations and preparations for the trip. An example of this is in chapter two, where he lists the most pressing of his considerations, in the hopes "that other travelers coming after [him] may have the benefit of [his] experience" (ibid., p. 21). As such, Stanley knowingly writes his texts with a focus on a primarily Western audience, which makes some of his positions more understandable. For instance, throughout the text, Stanley makes indications that he adheres to the contemporary mindset of Western superiority, and a very racially-oriented bias, as can be seen in his interactions with both the indigenous population of Africa, as well as those who have moved there and makes a living off trading with explorers. Furthermore, he also presents the idea of a transgression between the different races very negatively, as he states that he holds great contempt for "the half-castes"(ibid. p. 6); a category of people composed of individuals of mixed racial ancestry, and to them, Stanley attributes all manner of negative qualities of man.

In comparison, Stanley presents the Western population in a position far elevated compared to the indigenous population of Africa, as the latter seems not only willing but honored to serve them on their expeditions. An example of this can be seen when Stanley is recruiting natives for his undertaking in Zanzibar, where he is informed by veterans from an earlier expedition that they are "willing to join any brother of 'Speke's'" and declared "their readiness to go anywhere with [Stanley], or do anything [he] wished" (Stanley, pp. 27-28). In this way, not only does Stanley reinforce the already-existing notion of Western superiority and African subservience, but he also manages to promote himself as an equal to the well-known and respected explorer John Hanning Speke.

This notion that Stanley had a tendency of self-promotion in his writing is apparent throughout several instances of his text and has been a topic for discussion for scholars such as Patrick Brantlinger. Brantlinger is of the opinion that Stanley would often self-aggrandize his actions and accomplishments, that his text *How I Found Livingstone* is riddled with passages of Stanley bragging, self-puffer and self-pity; and that his promotion of Livingstone as a saintly martyr only, ironically, undermined his own claim as 'Africa's greatest explorer' (2009, pp. 140-141). There is even precedence for the notion that Joseph Conrad himself likewise regarded Stanley as a blatant self-promoter, as he, upon reflecting on his visit to the African continent, is said to have referred to Stanley's expedition as "a prosaic newspaper 'stunt'"

(Brantlinger, 1988, p. 239). With the previously mentioned examples in mind, there is a strong case for the argument, that Stanley used the mission as a means for self-promotion, by placing himself alongside the great explorers of his age, while also attempting to leave his mark on future generations of adventure-hungry travelers and tourists through the medium of pro-imperialist discourse.

This leads to another important distinction between the two primary texts; that of their roles as producers of discourse and counter-discourse respectively. In the case of Stanley, he attempts to reinforce the discursive elements of imperialism in his text; some of these include notions of cultural superiority, racial hierarchy, and geographical dominance. One situation where Stanley's adherence to a racial hierarchy becomes evident is when he expresses his precautions when doing business with non-Europeans in Zanzibar, for instance during his description of the Banyan, a distinct group of Indian merchants: "The Banyan is a born trader [...] No pang of conscience will prevent him from cheating his fellow man. He excels a Jew, and his only rival in a market is a Parsee; an Arab is a babe to him" (Stanley, pp. 6-7). In this instance, Stanley describes the Banyans as a group, while also comparing them to other nationalities and religious beliefs in order to generalize their actions and make it easier to understand from a somewhat shallow, or generalizing, imperialist perspective. Likewise, when Stanley later notes his ordeals with negotiating a price with some of the merchants, he presents himself as superior to them, as he manages to reduce the total cost to a lower point than they initially demanded, "involving, of course, a loss of much time and patience" (ibid., p. 26), whereby he also furthers his point about their shrewdness. At the same time, he also demonstrates the superiority of the Western population, as if stating that while the merchants may be ingenious in tricking you financially, Europeans would still be able to best them in the end as a result of their supremacy.

The reason for Stanley to focus on reinforcing the imperialist discourse is, most likely, due to his attempts to support his expedition, the colonial system and to reinforce his claim of being one of the great explorers of his age. To do this, Stanley had to appeal to an audience fascinated with travel writing, who were also members of an imperialist domain, meaning that he had to reinforce the imperialist discourse in order to remain relevant, especially since he had to be perceived as reliable in order for his text to remain relevant as a piece of factual traveler's writing. Thus, his depiction of the colonies became marked by the very binary point of view so often seen in imperialists; that the non-Europeans (the colonized) were uncivilized, and therefore bad, whereas the Europeans (the colonizers) were civilized, and therefore good.

Conrad, on the other hand, seems to highlight the counter-discourse surrounding the topic of imperialism, as his text regards the relationship between the appearance and essence of imperialism. Throughout his text, Conrad puts a substantial emphasis on the controversies and inconsistencies of the situation in the colonies, as well as how agents of the imperialist agenda present themselves as opposed to how they act in practice. The effect of this counter-discursive element can be seen throughout his text through the components of Western culture imported to Africa in order to advance the civilizing of the savages. As if to mirror Conrad's own reservations about the effectiveness of imperialism, as performed by the colonizers in *Heart of Darkness*, the technological and cultural advantages of the colonizers are depicted by Marlow as ineffective at best and liabilities at worst. One example of this is the systems created by Western society in order to make it function, such as bureaucracy and currencies. The attempts to instill bureaucracy at the company's stations in Africa all result in either ineffectiveness or disaster, although the colonizers in charge of keeping their stations going seem unperturbed by this.

An example of this can be seen when Marlow first arrives at the outer station and is greeted by the company's chief accountant, who, in response to the appearance of a sick man on a stretcher, simply bemoans the individual for distracting him, potentially making it "extremely difficult to guard against clerical errors in this climate" (Conrad, p. 19). Similarly, the concept of currencies proves to be ineffectual when introduced to the natives of Africa, as can be seen with Marlow's cannibals aboard the steamer. As the cannibals' food had become rotten, the pilgrims threw it overboard, after which they reimbursed them in brass wire, with which they were to "buy their provisions [...] in river-side villages (ibid., p. 41). However, as there were no villages to come across on their voyage down the Congo, the value that the colonizers have imbedded into the wire as a currency is meaningless, as it does nothing to fill the stomachs of the cannibals.

Just as the implementation of Western systems proves futile, so does the colonizers' dependency on the products of their technological advancement turn out to be impotent sometimes, and counterproductive at others. Examples of these include decaying machinery left to rust at the outer station (Conrad, p. 15), the sunken steamer, which delays Marlow for a substantial amount of time while awaiting rivets for repairs (ibid., p. 28), and the pilgrims' inability to hit their targets, despite wielding Winchester rifles (ibid., p. 51). The last two of these prove particularly ironic, as the steamer was the tool that allowed explorers travel deep into the heart of Africa, and the Winchester rifle was, due to its technical superiority and

destructive capabilities, the "gun that won the West". Yet, in *Heart of Darkness*, the lack of reliability in technology turns the steamer into a time-sink for Marlow, and the Winchester becomes a glorified smoke-machine, as the pilgrims manage to hit nothing with it, resulting only in impairing Marlow's vision. Thus Conrad manages to depict the superiority of the hierarchical structure, upon which imperialism was built and justified, as irrelevant in the continent of Africa.

However, what is perhaps Conrad's most metaphorical way of presenting the counter-discourse, is through his focus on the disparity between light and dark. This concept is first presented to us through Marlow's anecdote to his childhood fascination of the blank spaces of maps, and how disheartening he found the concept of darkening out the maps by filling them, as they got explored (Conrad, pp. 7-8). Ironically, with that sentiment, Conrad sets up the assumption, that the dark continent only became as such due to the influence of outsiders. In other words, while Conrad does not dispute the myth of Africa being 'a dark continent', his narrative does imply that the situation was created, or at the very least worsened, by the imperialist subjugation of the continent at the hands of Western civilization. As Brantlinger also argued, the titular "heart of darkness" is thus represented through Kurtz, "the embodiment of Europe's highest and noblest values, radiating darkness" (Brantlinger, 2009, p. 144).

Embedded Narrative: The Impact of Experiencing the Plot through Others

In the following chapter, we will analyze and discuss the use of the embedded narrative, as this narratological tool is present in *Heart of Darkness* and heavily influences how the text affects the reader. As this tool is not present in *How I Found Livingstone*, we will not be approaching Stanley's narrative in this chapter.

The primary focalizor in *Heart of Darkness* is the anonymous sailor, although Marlow functions as the narrator through his long periods of monologuing, through which he narrates the story of his time in Africa. This structure results in the creation of both a primary and a secondary fabula in, what Mieke Bal defines as, an embedded narrative. The primary fabula, which is the way Bal defines the primary story, is narrated from the perspective of an anonymous sailor and takes place entirely on "[t]he *Nellie*, a cruising yawl" (Conrad, p. 3), located on the Thames (ibid.). From here, Marlow functions as the narrator of the secondary fabula, or the secondary story, and his plot is such a prominent part of *Heart of Darkness*, that most of the time the existence of the primary fabula is forgotten. The exceptions to this are the few times where Marlow's monologues are paused and the primary focalizor's thoughts and observations are made apparent, thus reminding us, the readers, of the existence of the primary fabula. One of these instances is when Marlow takes a break and the narrator states that "[Marlow] was silent for a while" (ibid., p. 27).

Later on, when Marlow's narrative has reached him listening to a conversation between the manager of the central station and his uncle, the pacing of the secondary fabula is broken, as one of the other listeners interrupts him with a "'Try to be civil, Marlow,' growled a voice, and I knew there was at least one listener awake besides myself" (Conrad, p. 34). Breaks, such as this one, remind the reader that we are indeed listening to two stories within one narrative, and that the primary fabula occurs at a time where Marlow's plot has taken place and that he merely is recounting it now after his return to England. The benefit of framing a narrative in such a way, is that it allows the reader to connect with someone, who, like them, has no prior knowledge of Marlow's plot. Instead we are put into a position where Marlow is able to impart his plot with the benefit of hindsight, at a pace where he can explain the importance of certain events and present the narrative in a more coherent manner.

One of the reasons for choosing to write through a frame narrative, is that we, as readers, are distanced from what Marlow is relaying. We can see it a bit more objectively, given we are

not in the head of the narrator of the secondary fabula who tells the plot of the narrative. The separation of the two fabulae is also a way to distance the critical view on colonialism, though we still have the listeners all being related to the colonies in some way. The primary and secondary fabulae can be a way for Marlow to direct his thoughts on imperialism towards those the thoughts are aimed at; that is, a lawyer, an accountant and a director (Conrad, p. 3). Though the thoughts on imperialism are also aimed at the general public, it is specifically aimed at those related to the companies, as they are the ones to create the discourse and to urge men to become colonizers. The people present on the *Nellie* are those with power and who creates a certain discourse, or knowledge, that produces more men who wishes to carry out the ideas they have, ideas which creates more power and more money.

Another aspect to regard when discussing the implementation of a frame narrative is that of readability, or lack thereof, of the narrative, which will be discussed further in "The Dark Enlightenment: Conrad's Disillusionment of the Colonizing Hero". In short, due to his fixation on Kurtz, as well as the incommunicable nature of the savagery found in Africa, Marlow's plot is unreadable. The use of an embedded narrative can then emphasize the distance between reader and narrator, as the reader will be unable to fully understand the narrative, as neither we, nor the narratee, have been in the heart of darkness and witnessed the events of Marlow's plot. As Marlow's experiences cannot be communicated, the use of the embedded narrative emphasizes that we will never be able to understand what Marlow experienced, while, at the same time, the embedded narrative also enhances our understanding of the plot as counter-discursive, as the listeners are all part of practice in Africa.

The point of Marlow having become more knowledgeable following his experiences in Congo comes to show during the primary fabula, as we hear the anonymous sailor's opinion on him. At the beginning of *Heart of Darkness*, Marlow is described as resembling an idol (Conrad, p. 3), and a short while later, the narrator states that Marlow "had the pose of a Buddha preaching" (ibid., p. 6). The anonymous sailor is relating how Marlow is perceived, and when Marlow later discusses Kurtz, he is told that Kurtz is "a prodigy […] He is an emissary of pity and science, and progress and devil knows what else" (ibid., p. 35). Towards the end of Marlow's narrative, the anonymous sailor once again describes Marlow, and makes a comparison to how "Marlow ceased and sat apart, indistinct and silent, in the pose of a meditating Buddha" (ibid., p. 77). This description shows how Marlow's existence has been changed into one seeking wisdom throughout his search for Kurtz, but as we shall discuss in

"The Dark Enlightenment: Conrad's Disillusionment of the Colonizing Hero" said wisdom eludes him.

Marlow has not only followed Kurtz's story, as will be discussed in "The Dark Enlightenment: Conrad's Disillusionment of the Colonizing Hero", he has become enlightened and become more like Kurtz, who is described as an "emissary of pity and science, and progress and devil knows what else" (Conrad., p. 35). The relationship between the primary and secondary fabula is here, that we get to hear about Marlow. In Marlow's plot, the secondary fabula, we do not hear about Marlow, only what Marlow thinks or perceives. The anonymous sailor describes this in the primary fabula, and while Marlow may sit like a preaching Buddha, it becomes evident that Marlow, as a result of his experience, now focuses on enlightenment. The use of two fabulae, in regard to this change in Marlow, is that we learn what happened to Marlow and how Marlow changed due to his trip up the Congo river. He becomes an idol himself, preaching about a bigger picture and informing about the wrongdoings of imperialism through the plot of his own story.

By applying the frame narrative to *Heart of Darkness,* the reader is left with a sense of not being able to truly understand Marlow's narrative, yet, at the same time, the use of the embedded narrative still allows for an understanding of Marlow's plot serving as a counter-discourse on the approach to imperialism. This counter-discourse is delivered to the reader, presented through the perspective of the listeners on the *Nellie,* the crew of which consists of individuals who may have disregarded their participation, actively or passively, in the colonizing undertakings of their nation and the companies with their vested interests. As such, both the narratees and the readers of *Heart of Darkness,* are informed of the reality of the situation in the colonies through Marlow, who once was uninformed like we about the harsh truth of imperialism and the heart of darkness.

Quest plots: Medieval Narrative Structure and its Application to Imperialist Discourse

Building on Paul Fussell's ideas of travel books and its relation to the quest narrative, the following chapter will revolve an application of the actant model to the two primary texts, to the extent it is possible, first to *Heart of Darkness* and afterwards to *How I Found Livingstone*. The reason we have placed Conrad's text before Stanley's in this chapter, as well as the following ones, is due to the alphabetical order, both in regard to the title as well as the author.

For the purpose of discussing the genre of travel writing, we will base our approach on Fussell's as presented in his 1980 book *Abroad: British Literary Traveling Between the Wars*, which specifically concerns itself with travel writing between the First and the Second World War. While neither of the narratives included in this project were written between the two world wars, Fussell's text does include some important points which are relevant even when discussing travel writing from before the turn of the century. As Paul Fussell argues, travel books serve a purpose for those who do not wish to travel, in that travel books can fulfill their wish for the "exotic or comic anomalies, wonders, and scandals of the literary from *romance* which their own place or time cannot entirely supply" (Fussell, p. 203), arguing that travel books are like romances in which the reader can escape from their everyday life.

To clarify this argument, Fussell argues that travel books are like "romances in the old sense, with the difference that the adventures are located within an actual, often famous, topography to satisfy an audience which demands it" (Fussell, p. 207). To further his argument, Fussell compares the travel book to romances, as he states that "[t]he modern traveler leaves the familiar and predictable to wander […] into the unfamiliar or unknown, encountering strange adventures, and […] after travail and ordeal, returns home safely" (Fussell, p. 208). Based on Fussell's statement, it follows that the travel book will not be complete unless the traveler returns, as Fussell writes that "the action, as in a quest romance, must be completed" (ibid.). In *How I Found Livingstone*, the satisfaction gained from Stanley's narrative is based on him traveling to Africa, finding Livingstone, and returning home. Had the text not followed this structure, it would have resulted in a less satisfying narrative. The same can be said for *Heart of Darkness*, as the narrative would not be satisfactory, at least as compared to the requirements of travel writing, to the readers if Marlow did not meet Kurtz or return back to England. This is because the quest that each narrator sets out on is based on the home-out-home

model, which both of the narratives make use of, and which creates the idea that the journey into Africa is a quest that must be overcome.

The Doomed Quest: Marlow's Unconventional Narrative and the Quest's Expiration Date

In *Heart of Darkness*, the subject is Charles Marlow, who serves as the protagonist of the embedded narrative, which becomes the plot of the text. The object of his desires is twofold: the first being his yearning for exploring the now darkened places on the maps, and the other being Kurtz, due to the knowledge he holds, and which Marlow wishes to share in, which later is manifested in Kurtz's report. As such, the object is two different entities, one being a person, along with what said person represents, while the other is an internal desire for Marlow. Before his departure from England, Marlow's sole desire is to visit the dark continents of the Earth, despite it currently being different from the white state it used to be in during his boyhood. Since then "[i]t has ceased to be a blank space of delightful mystery [...] It had become a place of darkness" (Conrad, p. 8).

Later, this desire is exchanged for an aspiration to meet Kurtz, and to converse with him, as Marlow learns of the man and the knowledge he holds; in particular when he is told by the brickmaker that Kurtz was sent there to provide "the guidance of the cause entrusted to us by Europe, so to speak, higher intelligence wide sympathies, a single purpose" (Conrad, p. 25). The subject and the object become the axis of desire between power and knowledge, the subject being the power, and the object being or holding the knowledge. This distinction between power and knowledge turns into a circulation of knowledge as Marlow meets Kurtz and discovers the darkness within the African jungle, which then becomes circulated to the listeners on the *Nellie*, as Marlow retells the plot there.

In terms of support to achieve the object, the subject has a helper, and in the case of *Heart of Darkness* multiple entities play this role. One of these helpers is Marlow's aunt, who, despite not knowing what she is sending Marlow into, thanks to her acquaintance with "the wife of a very high personage in the Administration, and also a man who has lots of influence," (Conrad, p. 8) provides Marlow with a means to achieve his preliminary goal. That being said, while the aunt becomes a helper by the preceding logic, likewise does The Company serve as a helper for Marlow to reach his objective, as it is the entity who helps Marlow into Africa. As such, the aunt merely serves as a mediatory helper, to secure The Company's help for Marlow thanks to her connections.

As with the helper, the opponent can again be argued to consist of more than one person or entity, since darkness of the continent, and its potential for deteriorating civilized colonizers to uncivilized pseudo-colonized, seems to function as a constant moral opponent, at least from the point of view of the the colonizers. However, once Marlow has arrived in Africa, and sets his eyes on a new goal, the search for Kurtz, The Company takes up the mantle of a physical opponent, as they begin to question Marlow's loyalty to the mission and whether or not he sympathizes with Kurtz's predicament. An interesting aspect of the quest plot-structure in *Heart of Darkness* is how both the aunt, and The Company, help in sending Marlow to Africa, albeit neither adequately prepare him for what he will discover in Africa. In the case of the aunt, it is due to her ignorance of the continent she is sending Marlow to, which is hinted at in Marlow's description of her, and her fellow women, as "liv[ing] in a world of their own" (Conrad, p. 13). In the sense of the symbolic opponent that the darkness presents, The Company could have prepared Marlow better for what awaited him if it had been more truthful regarding its actions and attitudes involving the colonies, thereby furthering a more genuine discourse, in lieu of the misleading one spread by the colonizers.

Interestingly, The Company serves both as helper and opponent to Marlow, in the sense that it originally grants Marlow the job to go to Africa, noting how "[he] got [the appointment] very quick" (Conrad, p. 8), albeit without the proper information and preparation required for Marlow to adjust to the situation in the colonies. This is because he is unaware of the facts regarding the treatment of the natives, as well as the nature of the conditions he will be expected to cope with during his stay. If Marlow's attitude towards the colonies are included here as well, The Company is sending Marlow to participate in, and to accept the way in which the colonies are run. Through this course of action, The Company serves as an opponent to Marlow, as he becomes disillusioned with the discourse he has been taught of the colonies, leading him to regard The Company as misleading and uncivilized, partly due to its actions, but also due to its deception.

As for the metaphorical opponent in the form of the titular 'darkness' in Africa, it can be interpreted in multiple ways, depending on the point of view of the characters. The first of these is described when Marlow listens in on a conversation between the Manager of the Central station and his uncle, as they gesture toward the jungle: "a treacherous appeal to the lurking death, to the hidden evil, to the profound darkness of its heart" (Conrad, p. 33). This quote emphasizes both how the jungle itself is perceived as a part of the darkness, and how the interior and its secrets serve as the heart of darkness; a foreign threat that brings an end to the

civilized superiority of the colonizers due to its corrupting influence. However, this is only the case from the point of view of The Company, as Marlow experiences the darkness in a different manner. To him, the darkness is not defined so much as a solely foreign threat, but equally as one that can have an origin in the colonizing Europeans, who themselves have the ability to spread it across the continent, as seen through the once-civilized Kurtz, who ends up exacerbating the situation with his presence.

The penultimate category in the actant model regards the roles of the sender of the object; that is, someone the subject must receive the object from, or from which it must be won, and the receiver of the object; the one who benefits from the subject claiming the object, or receives it. In the case of Marlow's preliminary object of desire, one could argue that the sender is either The Company, or more generally speaking, the systems that allows Marlow to live out his childhood dream of exploring the African continent, albeit at a time where its blank spaces have been explored. In the case of his desire of meeting Kurtz, the sender could be argued to be the jungle, as it is within the jungle that Kurtz, the object, is hidden. If one then considers The Company to also serve as the sender, it creates a situation where The Company simultaneously functions as that role, as well as the sender of the subject, and the opponent of the subject as it reinforces the imperialist discourse, whereas Marlow presents a threat to their system of colonization, as he refuses to adhere to their mindset. However, it is difficult to define a sender of the object in *Heart of Darkness*, because Marlow never receives the object he is looking for. So while Kurtz may be sent by either The Company or the jungle, the structure is made unclear by the fact, that we never get to meet the Kurtz, that Marlow wishes to meet, nor is he presented with the knowledge which he had hoped to receive from Kurtz. The sender can therefore be regarded as multiple entities, despite none of them really functioning as the prime sender of Kurtz, or the knowledge, he had acquired.

In regard to the desire of meeting Kurtz, one could argue, that the receiver of the object is Marlow, as he is the recipient of the knowledge Kurtz has, but, looking at it more broadly, the recipient could also be Western civilization as a whole or the listeners on the *Nellie*, who serve as narratees to the primary narrative. Marlow is the recipient of the knowledge he finds in the jungle, though, and as will be discussed in "The Dark Enlightenment: Conrad's Disillusionment of the Colonizing Hero", Marlow needs to find Kurtz in order to understand his own narrative.

Marlow uses this to create his own narrative, which, in turn, he circulates as a discourse that criticizes imperialism, to the benefit of enlightening Western civilization. The receiver can

also be the narratees; whoever reads or listens to the narrative. Whether it is the reader of the physical book or the listeners on the *Nellie*, the narratee is the recipient of the tale, or as otherwise defined, the narratee, here especially being the listeners on the *Nellie*, are people to whom Marlow wishes to impart the knowledge acquired from Kurtz. Marlow does so despite not being able to make sense of the knowledge, as they are all as ignorant of the truth behind the imperialist undertakings, as Marlow used to be, and he would have them understand their part in it.

Stanley's Successful Quest: Imperialist Narrative through a Binary World View

Despite the narrative of Stanley's text being part guidebook and part travel writing, Paul Fussell's notions about travel books and quest plots can also be applied to *How I Found Livingstone*. This is due to how Stanley wrote about his travels partly as a guide for any would-be travelers, and partly as a more complete narrative of what he experienced, compared to the dispatches he wrote to The New York Herald during his travels. As such, the narrative functions both as a guidebook and a travel book, and seeing as the travel writing aspect is included in his narrative, the quest plot is applicable to Stanley's work, meaning that the actant model can be applied as well. In comparison to *Heart of Darkness*, Stanley's narrative adheres more to the traditional quest plot, making it more easily analyzed through the actant model. Stanley functions as the subject, and the object of his desires becomes Livingstone, although, as previously mentioned, one could argue that Stanley wants to write his own guide as much as to find Livingstone, not to mention this also being one of his duties on behalf of James Gordon Bennett. "Find out what you can about [Baker's] expedition, and as you go up describe as well as possible whatever is interesting for tourists; and then write up a guide − a practical one" (Stanley, pp. xviii-xix). At the same time, while the guide serves as a potential object of Stanley's desire, it should be noted that an overarching, and more personal, object could be the fame Stanley would receive for finding Livingstone in the African jungle. Either way, the object that allows Stanley to receive said fame, and to give himself the backing needed to support his novel, remains Livingstone, making him the primary object, although this does not exclude the existence of other objects serving as motivation for his expedition and his narrative.

To Stanley, the helper of the subject is primarily James Gordon Bennett, who is sponsoring Stanley's trip to Africa in order to find Livingstone. This is made clear, not only by Stanley, who argues that the expedition is not his own, but that of the New York Herald (Stanley, p. xxiii), but the nature of Bennett as a benefactor is made clear during their discussion

at beginning of the narrative, where he tells Stanley: "[d]raw a thousand pounds now; and when you have gone through that, draw another thousand, and when that is spent, draw another thousand, and when you have finished that, draw another thousand, and so on; but, FIND LIVINGSTONE" (ibid., p. xviii). While Bennett is, without a doubt, the primary helper, as Stanley would not have gone on the expedition without his aid, one could also define his fellow explorers Burton and Speke as helpers, as their works, based on their previous trips to Africa, formed a basis for Stanley to arrange his own expedition. Likewise, one could argue that the guides he hires, including Bombay, serve as helpers for him to achieve his goal.

As for opponents to Stanley's journey, and obstacles that keep him from achieving his goals, they are plentiful, as the jungle itself serves as his opponent, with its impassable terrain, its animals, bugs, parasites and diseases. These prove fatal for Stanley's horses as Stanley states that: "no horses could live in the interior of Africa because of the tsetse," (Stanley, p. 96) as well as some of his men, thus impeding his expedition and qualifying as opponents. Similarly, some individuals also disrupt Stanley's plans and caravans, these being non-Europeans. Namely, the opponents are the native African population, shrewd Arabs and Indian tradesmen, and even members of his own expedition when they become obstinate in refusing him, as they in one way or another get in the way of Stanley's quest to find Livingstone. While none of these opponents ultimately manage to completely stop Stanley from achieving his goal of finding Livingstone, they do slow him down. As for how the individual groups are presented as opponents, it will be examined in the chapter "Stanley's Characters: Tools to Promote Imperialist Discourse".

As for the sender of the object, it could be argued that the jungle serves this role. The problem with defining the sender, is that Livingstone sent himself to Africa in order to search for the source of the Nile, meaning that, technically, the jungle becomes a necessity for Livingstone's situation, which prompts Stanley's expedition to find him, as, without the jungle, Livingstone would have no motivation for being there. However, if we assume that the object is Stanley's guide, one could likewise argue for the jungle being at least partly the sender, as the jungle provides Stanley with locations and experiences from which he can gather information and, on which, he can base his guide. One example of this is the aesthetic impressions of the locations he comes across, which Stanley defines as beautiful. "Those distant mountains formed a not unfit background to this magnificent picture of open plain, forest patches, and sloping lawns − there was enough of picturesqueness and sublimity in the blue mountains to render it one complete whole" (Stanley, p. 110).

Ultimately, the receiver of the object, whether the object is Livingstone or the guide, is The New York Herald, and indirectly its readers. The proprietor of the New York Herald, James Gordon Bennett, states that: "I mean that [The New York Herald] shall publish whatever news will be interesting to the world at no matter what cost" (Stanley, p. xviii). Furthermore, through the Herald, its readers can also be seen as the receiver, as any readers of the New York Herald with an interest in the conditions of Africa or in Livingstone can have their curiosity satiated. On the other hand, as was mentioned in "Stanley vs. Conrad: Pioneering and Lamenting the Age of Exploration", the discovery of Livingstone presents a symbolic victory to Western civilization as a whole, not only due to how highly he is regarded, but they may also benefit from the knowledge that Livingstone has accumulated during his stay. These informations were rather significant, as he was looking for the source of the Nile, but also could have made new discoveries about the African continent and means for Europeans to inhabit it, such as had been the case with his studies in the medical uses of quinine as a treatment for malaria (Pakenham, p. 18). Finally, the guidebook, that Stanley has compiled, would also qualify as knowledge useful for the Western population, particularly those who wished to travel to Africa.

While this chapter has concerned itself with whether or not our primary texts adhere to the quest plot, by examining how well they can be analyzed using the actant model, the conclusion is that Stanley's text adheres more clearly to the traditional quest plot, whereas Conrad's text subverts the expectations and presuppositions of the quest in the Victorian Age. However, each narrative still fit Paul Fussell's criteria for romance quests, as, in both cases, the reader is brought along on a journey to an unknown destination. Both narratives concern themselves with Africa, and the quest plot serves as a platform to represent the foreign territory to readers. However, as will be examined in "The Dark Enlightenment: Conrad's Disillusionment of the Colonizing Hero", Conrad's text does not approach Marlow as a quest hero, or at least not a successful one, as his quest ultimately fails to grant him the object of his desires. Stanley's adherence to the quest plot, on the other hand, is used to portray his journey as a successful one, in adherence with imperialist discourse and its principle of the Westerners in a prominent position. At the same time, by depicting the plot as a quest, Stanley makes his expedition more relatable to his readers, as it uses an easily-understandable structure.

To sum up on our use of the actant model and that of the quest plot, although the quest plot is primarily used in relation to classical stories, like those of the Middle Ages, they share similarities when included into later historical contexts, such as that of the Scramble for Africa. Through this structure, the authors of the texts can present their plot in a simple and relatable

manner, in which certain roles are designated; the subject, once referred to as the hero, as an adventurer or explorer, thus circulating the knowledge of a pro-exploration imperialist discourse. However, the quest structure is inherently Eurocentric, as it depicts the Africans as in need of European aid, while also posing the subject to be one the Western readers can relate to. Similarly, when comparing a narrative such as the one in *Heart of Darkness* to the quest plot, it reveals that the quest plot and its narrative structure requires expectations and reality to line up, which, according to Conrad's text, is not always the case. This ideology constitutes the frame of the quest, as the imperialist ideology is a necessity in order to make meaning of the quest, meaning that in order for the quest to make sense, the reader must adhere to the ideology promoting the need for exploration and civilizing that which has yet to be civilized. When this ideology is questioned, the purpose of the quest is left unfulfilled, leading to a sense of unreadability, as will be discussed further in the next chapter.

Readability: The Consequences of a Plot Left Unfinished

In order to further examine the narratological aspects of story and plot, the following chapter will regard the topic of readability, as described by Peter Brooks in his critical essay 'An Unreadable Report: Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*', which concerns the ramifications of Marlow's plot following Kurtz's story. We will first examine Brooks' arguments as to why he regards Conrad's text as unreadable, after which we will approach how this plot structure affects the relationship between power and knowledge, and we shall then examine, following Brooks' aforementioned arguments, why Stanley's *How I Found Livingstone* differs from Conrad's text.

The Dark Enlightenment: Conrad's Disillusionment of the Colonizing Hero

As mentioned in "The Doomed Quest: Marlow's Unconventional Narrative and the Quest's Expiration Date", Marlow's initial goal, when he leaves England to travel to Africa, is not to meet Kurtz. Rather, he wishes to explore the world, and while Africa may be a dark place on the map and not white, meaning that it has already been explored, it is the closest he can get (Conrad, p. 8). It is not until he arrives at the Central Station that Marlow first hears of Kurtz, where the Chief Accountant refers to Kurtz as "a very remarkable person" (ibid., p. 19). It is from this point, as Brooks argues in his essay, that Marlow starts a repetition of Kurtz's story, as he states that "Marlow is in a state of belatedness or secondariness in relation to his forerunner; his journey is a repetition, which gains its meaning from its attachment to the prior journey" (Brooks, p. 345). Expanding on this thought, Brooks defines how Marlow attempts to excavate Kurtz's plot, in order to incorporate Kurtz's story into his own plot. According to Brooks, the meaning of the story, or the 'wisdom' which is imparted unto the reader through the narrative, cannot be found unless it is expressed through the act of storytelling (ibid., p. 346). By incorporating this, alongside narratology and Foucault's notions of power and knowledge, we achieve an insight into how knowledge is circulated throughout *Heart of Darkness*. The narrative structure is constructed around Marlow's plot's repetition of Kurtz's story, and through this repetition, Marlow's knowledge can be circulated through the narrative form.

Brooks further argues that Kurtz's plot involves many facets, one which regards the report, wherein Kurtz has written "Exterminate all the brutes" (Brooks, p. 343). This relates to Brooks' opinion that Kurtz's report is unreadable, as he argues that the text *Heart of Darkness*

in itself is unreadable as well, since the meaning of the narrative is impossible to grasp. In order to successfully circulate any kind of knowledge, it requires the understanding of said knowledge, and since the meaning of the narrative is impossible to grasp, it, likewise, becomes impossible to circulate the knowledge. As such, Kurtz's report can be defined as unreadable and the plot Marlow attempts to present to his audience, is also incommunicable, as it remains Kurtz's story. Kurtz's final words, "The horror! The horror!" (Conrad, p. 69), are defined by Brooks as "the fall from language" (Brooks, p. 348). As he remarks, language is created by societal structures, and, likewise, societal structures are created through the medium of language (ibid., pp. 348-349), hinting that "the heart of darkness […] is beyond the system of human social structures" (ibid., p. 348), as it interferes with Kurtz's ability to express his knowledge. If the knowledge of the narrative is to be comprehended, thereby allowing it to be circulated, the narrative, as well as the knowledge within it, must be understood, and in order to be understood, the narrative must be told. Therefore, since "the heart of darkness", or darkness itself, lies outside any system of human social structures, it cannot be mediated, only experienced in person.

Brooks' point makes the narrative difficult to understand, particularly in regard to Kurtz's final words, since Marlow himself finds it challenging to narrate his experiences. He talks of "unspeakable rites" (Conrad, p. 50), when he finds Kurtz in the jungle, and through these Marlow cautions the reader about the unspeakable nature of the knowledge that can be found within the heart of darkness. What Marlow is disclosing to the reader, is that since the narrative cannot be properly circulated, due to the unspeakable nature of the events that concerns it, the narrative can only be understood by an audience that has been within the heart of darkness. Despite not having grasped the object of his desire, Kurtz's knowledge, Marlow still wishes to circulate the knowledge to the listeners of his narrative. As Brooks states, when Marlow converses with the Intended about Kurtz's final words, Marlow finds it impossible to convey what Kurtz says and ends up lying to the Intended (Conrad, pp. 76-77). The reason as to why Marlow finds it impossible to circulate the information regarding Kurtz's dying words is, as Brooks argued, to be found in how the narrative of *Heart of Darkness* has no end: "Ends are not – are no longer? – available" (Brooks, p. 350). Despite how much the Intended begs Marlow for knowledge of Kurtz's end, Marlow is unable to comply, as he himself is deprived of the same closure that she yearns for. The fact that the novella has no clear ending enhances the unreadability of the narrative; with no end to Marlow's tale, as he lacks the knowledge

sufficient to understand the narrative, the knowledge cannot be imparted unto anyone, leaving the narrative of the novella in an unreadable state.

The lack of ending to the novella is, according to Brooks, also stressed by how "Kurtz's narrative never fully exists, never fully gets itself told" (Brooks, p. 349), and, as a result, "Marlow's narrative can never speak the end that it has sought so hard to find, and that it has postulated as the very premise and guarantee of its meaning" (ibid.). To put this into perspective with our inclusion of the circulation of knowledge, the lack of an ending impairs the narrative structure and form, which results in a lack of knowledge, and, in turn, circulation, as the narrative has to be understood, before the knowledge within the narrative can be circulated. In that way, the complex narrative structure of Conrad's text also functions as a counter-discourse to the binary perception promoted by the imperialist discourse; it is far too simplified to argue that the colonizers are always in the right, or that colonizing is a reward to the Africans, as they are being exposed to the culture and ways of the colonizers. Instead, as Marlow discovers, the simplified worldview that fits with the quest plot is no longer applicable, when more factors, such as misleading discourse, is introduced, and this realization leaves Marlow puzzled as to what he has been working toward throughout his journey.

While the (lack of an) end results in a narrative that is never fulfilled, Brooks includes how Marlow's repetition of his story functions as a tool for him to achieve an understanding of his own narrative. Brooks bases this argument on Freudian psychology, arguing that "in Freud's terms, repetition and working through come into play when orderly memory of the past, recollection of it *as* past – is blocked" (Brooks, p. 350). As such, repetition may be a way for Marlow to work through his experiences during his time in Africa, through which he may come to understand his own narrative. In other words, Marlow conveying his own narrative may help him find the end he has been denied, while also sharing the narrative to the audience, spreading his counter-discourse as a response to the things he witnessed in the colonies.

However, as Marlow's narrative attempts to convey knowledge that is unspeakable, to an audience who is not capable of understanding it, it stands to reason to call his attempt unsuccessful. In the words of Brooks, "[w]e have a feeling at the end of Marlow's act of narration that retelling of his tale will have to continue: that the ambiguous wisdom he has transmitted to his listeners will have to be retransmitted by them as narrative to future listeners. The process is potentially infinite, any closure or termination merely provisional" (Brooks, p. 350). Without Marlow succeeding in understanding his own narrative, all his repetition amounts to is to spread the narrative to others, who in turn can pass it on in an endless attempt

at circulating the knowledge that none of them can truly grasp. With this in mind, it could be argued that Marlow himself is spreading this unspeakable darkness along, implicating his narratees in his own problematic situation just as Kurtz implicated him. At the same time, a counterargument could be that the implicated audience will not be inflicted as severely as Marlow, since Marlow had experienced the darkness for himself.

A final point that should be mentioned regarding the plot structure, and thereby lack of readability, in Conrad's novella, is that of the quest hero. When Marlow travels to Africa, he is initially on a quest to explore the uncharted land. However, as Africa has already been explored at this point in time, Marlow has failed this quest before it has begun. Yet, he knew that would be the case, before he set out. As Marlow states, in his metaphor regarding the blank spaces on the map, Africa "had become a place of darkness. But there was in it one river especially,[...] resembling an immense snake uncoiled, with its head in the sea, its body at rest curving afar over a vast country, and its tail lost in the depths of the land. And as I looked at the map of it in a shop-window, it fascinated me[...]" (Conrad, p. 8). While in Africa, he sets another quest for himself; that of meeting Kurtz, as he becomes a curiosity to Marlow, as well as an object of his desire. This quest also fails, as Kurtz has become corrupted by the colonies, which leads Marlow to eventually have to accept Kurtz's report as the object he has won. While Marlow does retrieve Kurtz's report, the knowledge it contains does not live up to his expectations, as Kurtz has noted the post-scriptum on the final page saying "[e]xterminate all the brutes" (ibid., p. 50). As a result, Marlow has been disillusioned of Kurtz, as the object he expected and desired was not the object he received.

The discrepancy between what Marlow hoped to find and that which he found, refers to how the classical quest has become displaced, as the traditional quest narrative is misleading, causing any attempted quests to fail. Arguably, the displacement of the quest narrative displays Conrad's disillusionment with the ways of imperialism, as well as an attempt to counter its discourse with a counter-discourse. His search for the glory days of exploration, and the altruistic nature of imperialism, as was the case with Marlow's search for Kurtz, has been rendered impossible, as the object of their desires no longer exists, or, at the very least, has become so twisted that it is unrecognizable from what one expected.

With the aforementioned paragraph in mind, Marlow fails to qualify as a quest hero, simply because, in Conrad's mind, the traditional quest narrative has ceased to be applicable, due to his disillusionment with the state of the imperialism, and this, in turn, makes the story unreadable, as the standard, with which it was to be compared, no longer applies. Thus,

Marlow, who searched for the answer to the violent customs of the world from one of Europe's most knowledgeable men, receives a report that is in no way what he expected, as its encouragement of responding to savage practices with violence makes it unreadable and nonsensical.

The unfulfilled quest plot in Conrad's novella adds to the idea that Conrad is engaging in counter-discourse, as the travels to Africa were usually portrayed in a manner that adheres to the quest plot structure, as can be seen in "Reliability: Validating Attitudes toward Colonial Undertakings". In the end, Marlow receives Kurtz's unreadable report, but as a result of his disillusionment with the imperialist system, he rejects the actions of the colonizers, as he returns the favor by putting The Company in a situation similar to his own, by letting their expectations for Kurtz's full and un-redacted report not live up to reality. Instead, he offers it to them with the post-scriptum removed, which they find unacceptable, as "[t]his is not what [they] had the right to expect" (Conrad, p. 71). Just as Conrad is performing a counter-discourse to the actions made in the name of imperialism, so Marlow is spreading a similar mentality to the listeners aboard the *Nellie*; an experience only emphasized by the fact that we, the reader, experience his counter-discourse through the perception of someone listening to Marlow.

As can be gleaned from the title, Peter Brooks argues in his essay 'An Unreadable Report' that *Heart of Darkness* is unreadable. Being an example of early modern fiction, it involves a breakdown in communication between narrator and narratee, as the narrative becomes incomprehensible to the narratee. While the narrative may impart a sense of knowledge unto the narratees, Marlow's point becomes unclear, as we cannot decipher a clear ending to the narrative. Without any clear indication of the knowledge, as well as no means of communicating it in its incommunicable form, circulation becomes impossible. Instead, all one can hope for is clarity through repetition, albeit at the risk of spreading it to more individuals.

The Quest Hero's Appeal: Approaching Imperialist Discourse through Stanley's Success

While Conrad's *Heart of Darkness,* according to Peter Brooks (Brooks, pp. 342-353) was an unreadable report, we would argue that when applying his approach to *How I Found Livingstone,* Stanley's text would be regarded as readable. The following chapter will regard a discussion of our arguments as to why *How I Found Livingstone* is readable through an analysis of Stanley's use of narratological tools, both in regard to their application and effect on the readers of his narrative.

The first thing we wish to highlight is Stanley's use chapter names, as they serve as brief outlines for how much of his journey through Africa is covered in each respective chapter. For example, the title for his sixth chapter is as follows: "CHAPTER VI. THROUGH MARENGA, MKALI, UGOGO, AND UYANZI, TO UNYANYEMBE" (Stanley, p. 171). By naming his chapters as brief summaries of the distances covered, Stanley manages to reiterate how his book equally functions as a guidebook and a piece of travel writing in that it is meant to be a guide for any would be travelers or an account of his experiences in the foreign continent. Due to his manner of naming each chapter, he enhances the readers' ability to locate whichever chapter is needed, in order for them to learn about their specific destinations or locations of interest. However, as we noted in "Stanley's Successful Quest: Imperalist Narrative through a Binary World View", Stanley's narrative also adheres to the quest plot structure, and as such, his use of chapter names also serves the purpose of structuring the quest plot, since they allow Stanley to guide the reader along. This makes the knowledge, both of the development of his quest but also of his travels, easier to circulate to the reader, as there is a clear structure.

Another tool Stanley makes use of when telling his plot is anticipation, which allows him to impose information unto the reader ahead of time, so that he can affect the readers' opinions and expectations in advance of an event's occurrence in his narrative. An example of this occurs when Bombay is introduced, where Stanley states that he had the "audacity to stand up for a boxing-match with [Speke]" (Stanley, p. 28) and that Stanley "only found out when, months afterwards, [he] was called upon to administer punishment to [Bombay] [himself]" (ibid.). As will be expanded upon in "Stanley's Characters: Tools to Promote Imperialist Discourse", Stanley never presents any of the Westerners in this manner, and his use of anticipation in regard to Bombay seems to emphasize how Bombay, despite seeming like a trustworthy person for an African at a first glance, proves to be less than admirable later. Stanley's use of anticipation, in this case, reinforces the imperialist notion of the nature of the African population; as trustworthy they may seem, they remain uncivilized savages. As such, Stanley affects the impression of the readers, by informing them in advance that Bombay is not to be considered as honorable, rather than allowing them to experience his actions and drawing their own conclusions.

In relation to Stanley's adherence to the quest plot, Bombay, as one of Stanley's Faithfuls, should be assumed to be one of Stanley's helpers, but given that Bombay is an African, Stanley, and the readers, are conditioned not to expect too much of him. If this example

is to be any indication of how Stanley perceived the remaining Africans, the anticipation used with Bombay could be used to ensure a legitimization of the imperialist notion of the racial supremacy of the Western population, and, in turn, he would reinforce his narrative's adherence to imperialist discourse. At the same time, his adherence to the imperialist discourse could also enhance the reliability of his narrative, as a negative depiction of the natives would be more relatable for his contemporary society, and therefore, his readers.

In regard to Stanley's narrative approach, one aspect will be expanded upon in the following chapter titled "Reliability: Validating Attitudes toward Colonial Undertakings". However, since it also concerns the topic of readability, it will be discussed briefly in this chapter as well. The approach in question is that of retrospection, that is, Stanley having already fulfilled his mission and finished his journey prior to when he wrote the text, as opposed to having written it alongside the events of his journey. Stanley writing his narrative through retrospection highlights and undermines certain aspects of the story in order to change details of the plot, for example Stanley's focus on his superiority in regard to the natives. An example of this retrospection can be seen in Stanley's consideration of how the country and the people are in need of civilization as he states that "[m]issionaries almost might reap the same benefit from it for conversion-tours" (Stanley, p. 571). Here, Stanley is proposing how the country will benefit from missionary undertakings, as he is looking back upon what he experienced and through these experiences considers what can be done.

Another way that Stanley's retrospection is relevant to discuss, is how it allows Stanley to structure the plot, as it ensures Stanley's ability to make his narrative appear more similar to that of the quest plot with himself as the quest hero. For example, by highlighting certain aspects in the Arabs and the natives, as will be discussed and analyzed in "Stanley's Characters: Tools to Promote Imperialist Discourse", Stanley reinforces the idea of foreigners as obstacles for him to overcome in his quest plot structure. By structuring the narrative this way, Stanley ensures that his journey into Africa is perceived as a quest and that any noteworthy characters along the way can be portrayed in accordance with the roles he requires them to play, for them to befit the imperialist discourse as his helpers or opponents, senders or receivers.

In accordance with the previous paragraph, Stanley often quotes his diary, which he wrote during his journey, for instance, when he notes: "I am now going to extract from my Diary of the march" (Stanley, p. 379). The usage of his diary becomes a way for Stanley to ensure that the plot is structured chronologically in accordance with the story. At the same time, it functions as an instrument to authenticate his travels, despite how he made a conscious choice

not to follow the diary structure completely. While writing the narrative in the form of a quest is a conscious choice made by Stanley to ensure how the travel will not be tedious and repetitious (ibid., p. xxiii), at the same time, it can also be a way for Stanley to omit that which he does not deem fitting, which lets him emphasize certain points of his quest into Africa.

As could be imagined, Stanley puts very little focus on his journey from Africa back to England. After all, when compared to the hero's journey homewards once the quest is complete, the quest itself, where Stanley set out for the object of his desires, is far more important. Yet, the final step in the home-out-home structure is to return home and, as Stanley writes, as early as the beginning of the narrative, how he chose to write his journey as a narrative (Stanley, p. xxiii), we know already that he returns home, fulfilling the quest plot. Indeed, this fact is one of the key differences between plot and story, insofar as how the quest structure of his narrative came to be. As mentioned in the chapter regarding readability, the quest structure is also present in *Heart of Darkness*, albeit presented somewhat differently as compared to *How I Found Livingstone*, due to the fact, that following the theoretical approach of Peter Brooks, Stanley's text is readable. Stanley's plot is presented in a way that makes the outcome understandable, as there is an end to his narrative. Unlike Marlow, while Stanley is looking for Livingstone, his journey does not become a repetition of Livingstone's, as Stanley follows his own plot and story instead. Marlow, on the other hand, lets his obsession with Kurtz transform his journey into one where Marlow is repeating Kurtz's, first physically and then verbally, insofar as he knows it, to his narratees. Due to Kurtz's madness and untimely death, Marlow never concludes his plot, in that he never hears Kurtz's story from the man himself.

As Stanley follows no one's plot, but his own, he is capable of making meaning out of his own story and plot, thereby creating an end to his narrative and making his narrative readable. Since Stanley is looking for a person, and his search eventually leads him to said person, his quest is complete, making him a successful quest hero, and, in turn, making his narrative readable, and therefore, communicable. Stanley's adherence to a quest plot also makes his narrative more easily communicable, as it follows the basic structure that entails the triumph of the good and civilized, making his narrative structure and plot more in line with the imperialist discourse and colonial legitimization. In other words, the thoughts which Stanley wishes to circulate after his travels are communicable, meaning that he can indeed pass his narrative on to any readers, who, in turn, can reproduce them. Overall, the knowledge Stanley communicates through his narrative is that of the discourse of the time, which he construes as the truth.

Reliability: Validating Attitudes toward Colonial Undertakings

In the following chapter, we will analyze and discuss the notion of reliability in relation to both our primary texts. While *Heart of Darkness* is a fictional text, our examination of the point of reliability relates more to the notion of focalization and how this can add to the unreliable nature of the narrative. However, as we have previously discussed readability in relation to our two texts, an inclusion of the topic of reliability can add depth to the argument on the question of the readability of the text's narrative. In comparison, for Stanley, the reliability has to do with whether or not the narrative can be considered factual.

Focalization in *Heart of Darkness* is complex, as the plot is split into two stories; a primary and a secondary, as has been noted on in "The Dark Enlightenment: Conrad's Disillusionment of the Colonizing Hero". The primary fabula is focalized by an autodiegetic focalizor; meaning that the focalizor is the protagonist of the plot. In this case, the focalizor is an anonymous sailor, who is present as Marlow tells his story, as can be seen in the way he sets the frame to Marlow's story: "[b]etween us there was, as I have already said somewhere, the bond of the sea" (Conrad, p. 3). However, as the anonymous sailor is only presenting the primary fabula through his own account of what is happening, the story becomes less reliable. Nevertheless, as the primary fabula consists of the anonymous sailor presenting Marlow's plot to us, we will be approaching Marlow's plot as its own distinct entity. Furthermore, it cannot be understated, that both fabulae must still be regarded as works by Joseph Conrad, meaning that his agenda of anti-imperialism without a doubt influences his writing. That being said, in Conrad's text, the matter of reliability is arguably not as important as it is in *How I found Livingstone*, given that *Heart of Darkness* is fiction merely based on real events. The reliability is nonetheless important to look into, as it can be a reflection of a certain attitude towards imperialism.

Within the secondary fabula, Marlow is the autodiegetic focalizor, as he recounts his experiences as the protagonist of the African adventure. With this being the case, the same points regarding reliability applying to the anonymous sailor goes for Marlow. The difference being that while the anonymous sailor is only relaying Marlow's plot to the reader, Marlow is the protagonist in the plot he is telling. Similarly to the anonymous sailor, the fact that Marlow does not have someone else to validate the plot, does run the risk of damaging his reliability, albeit Conrad's attitude towards imperialism makes that a strong possibility all the same. So, while both the narrative of the anonymous sailor and that of Marlow fall prey to the same

problems regarding reliability, the distinction between the two is nevertheless important to make, as Marlow arguably follows his own plot outside of what the anonymous sailor is able to pass on to us, the readers.

While the two paragraphs above relate to the validity of the plot and whether or not we, as readers, can consider the plot to be accurate, the topic of reliability can also be analyzed in respect to New Historicism and how attempts at criticizing a practice requires one to concede its existence and, to some extent, follow its process (Veeser, 1994, p. 2). Although Joseph Conrad was known to be critical of imperialism, by attempting to criticize the practice, he must first acknowledge it, and, as with Marlow, take part in it. He does this during his visit to Congo, as he comes to understand the kinship to the uncivilized natives, which terrifies him; "[t]hey howled and leaped, and spun, and made horrid faces; but what thrilled you was just the thought of their humanity—like yours—the thought of your remote kinship with this wild and passionate uproar. Ugly. Yes, it was ugly enough" (Conrad, p. 36). Here, while Conrad attempts to criticize the practice of imperialism and the treatment it has brought unto the natives, his description of the natives' behavior and actions adheres, at least somewhat, to an imperialist mindset, through which he falls prey to the imperialist conclusion that the natives must be brought into a civilized state.

To further this point, throughout the novel, Marlow displays a general negativity towards the imperialist way of treating the Africans, but still he sees them as less human compared to the white man. In this way, Conrad acknowledges and applies the very practice he condemns, if for no other reason than that he must know the practice, its terminology and its approach, in order for him to attempt to condemn it. While this does not need imply that Marlow is accepting of the imperialist practice, he does make use of it, as can be seen on his use of the natives as laborers and his description of his and their common kinship as ugly (Conrad, p. 36). In this way, while Conrad, through his character Marlow, tries to reprimand the colonizers for their way of treating the colonized, he ends up treating them at least somewhat similarly himself.

Conrad's narrative also concerns itself with the negotiation of power and knowledge in regard to the topic of colonization. Conrad may be taking on a part reminiscent to Memmi's "naive colonizer", who comes not to the colonies with a wish for financial profit, nor to make a new life for himself in the colonies, but nevertheless he remains a colonizer, and whether willingly or unwillingly accepts the notion, that the colonized are less than the colonizer (Memmi, p. 68). Indeed, as Memmi argues, "he cannot help judging those people and that

civilization. How can one deny that they are under-developed, that their customs are oddly changeable and their culture outdated?" (ibid.). And though Conrad may have written his narrative as an attempt to condemn actions taken in the name of imperialism, it still adheres to the manner in which the colonies are run, and his character Marlow does little more than accept that the natives are treated by the colonizers in the way they are, leaving them to die in the shadows. Arguably, what Marlow intends to do with his narrative is to change other people's perception, along with the discourse, regarding the colonized, and through that can change how the colonized are treated. He realizes that he cannot, himself, change the way the colonies are run. In that sense, Conrad only furthers the discourse of the colonizers, by stating that the civilized should be allowed to enforce their will upon the savages. Yet, as he shows throughout the novel, his attitude remains that even the self-proclaimed 'civilized' colonizers succumb to their savage nature, as they either relish in savage delights of violence and cruelty towards the native Africans, or through their intentional disregard for the consequences of their actions.

With this in mind, Conrad's presentation of the discourse of imperialist actions toward native Africans functions as a way to intensify the feelings of the readers toward the topic of imperialism itself. When the colonized are depicted as being dependent on the colonizers, due to a disparity in enlightenment and civil behavior, making the latter superior to the former, the idea of the colonizer's duty to civilize the African population would appear quite convincing, especially to citizens of England with little to no personal experience with the continent. But by introducing the narrative in a way that emphasizes those who use imperialism to legitimize their own personal interests, Conrad instills a sense of anti-imperialist tendencies in his readers. The fact that he seems to adhere to some of the arguments of the colonizers, such as a conviction that the colonized are less civilized than the colonizer, is not particularly surprising, as Memmi argues that this very argument was often used by the colonizers to defend their occupations (Memmi, pp. 68-69). As such, it is hardly surprising that Conrad adheres to parts of the discourse, he holds in contempt, as he is still a product of the colonialist environment and writes to people who are in a similar position.

An important point to mention, regarding reliability, is its connection to the topic of readability. While the narrative succumbs to the pitfalls of autodiegetic focalization and how this affects the reliability, the unreadable nature of the narrative can also define or question the reliability. One instance, where this unreadability occurs, is when Marlow is lying to the Intended, as he says that he "[']heard his very last words…' [He] stopped in a fright. 'Repeat them,' she murmured" (Conrad, p. 76), Marlow lies and says that Kurtz said her name, telling

the men on the *Nellie*: "I couldn't. I could not tell her. It would have been too dark— too dark altogether…." (ibid., p. 77). While this may seem like an omission caused by compassion, Marlow instead admits that he could not tell her, simply because he could not explain it to her. The truth is incommunicable, as it eludes Marlow himself. Instead, Marlow relays to the listeners aboard the *Nellie,* that since he could not tell her, he lied to her. In that way, the truth is not communicable, wherefore the plot cannot be said to be reliable. The effect of this incommunicable plot on the reader is one that emphasizes the misleading nature of the imperialist discourse regarding the situation in Africa. While the Africans need civilization, the way the colonizers are bringing it about is wrong, as is demonstrated through the entity of the darkness, which both comes from within the jungle, as well as the hearts of the colonizers

Stanley himself serves as the autodiegetic focalizor of *How I found Livingstone*, as we perceive the narrative from his perspective. This is easily determined from the narrative, as Stanley makes multiple references to himself, including ones where he refers to himself and his expedition. "I should have liked to exchange opinions with [a fellow traveler] upon the probable results of my journey, but I dared not do so" (Stanley, p. xx). As is often the case, the type of focalizor influences the way in which the plot is being conveyed. In the case of Stanley, his use of himself as the focalizor affects the reliability of the content. This is because Stanley is arguably an unreliable focalizor, seeing as how his plot mostly presents Stanley in a favorable manner. With this in mind, it is difficult to state whether or not Stanley did add or subtract anything in regard to his plot, thereby altering his narrative of what happened in Africa. That being said, Stanley's narrative has been criticized for inflating his actions, or displaying himself in an unrealistically positive manner. An example of this is Patrick Brantlinger, who refers to Stanley as "self-aggrandizing" and his discovery of Livingstone as somewhat absurd, as Livingstone by no means had been lost in the first place (Brantlinger, 2009, p. 140). The unreliability of the focalizor therefore raises the question of the factuality of the plot, rendering the content questionable regarding its reliability.

Another aspect that portrays Stanley in a more reliable light, is the fact that he is stating how his narrative is based on diary entries: "I have adopted the narrative form of relating the story of the search, on account of the greater interest it appears to possess over the diary form" (Stanley, p. xxiii). His journey to Africa was first published in the New York Herald, and later Stanley "rewrote the despatches - written during the heat of his explorations - for publication in book form" (Bennett, p. xiv). While Stanley may be considered more reliable by the fact that his experiences were published in the New York Herald, they would not have garnered

popularity, if the public had not found the knowledge, he presented, interesting and relevant. Nor would he have had the opportunity to re-publish the experiences he had made on his journey, in a new book of his own. The reliability is thereby increased, as Stanley is constantly referring back to his diary, with the addition of a different version of his dispatches, which would have received changes, since Stanley also himself stated that he "adopted the narrative form of relating the story of the search" (Stanley, p. xxiii). While the version published in the New York Herald can be deemed the most reliable of the texts, simply because Stanley did not have time to rewrite much before publication, we chose to focus on the version Stanley later wrote, as we believed this version would more clearly illustrate his opinion on the topic of the imperialist discourse. At the same time, his book publication took on the narrative structure of a quest, which we examined in "Stanley's Successful Quest: Imperialist Narrative through a Binary World View".

While it can be discussed whether Stanley's portrayal of the events of his journey are factual or not, and whether one version was more akin to reality than the other, the narrative Stanley presents was nevertheless perceived as reliable and accurate during its time of publication. One important reason for this was likely his depiction of the Foreign, in particular, the Africans, which adhered greatly to the general perception of Africans at the time, as Stanley portrayed them as primitive and uncivilized compared to the Western population and culture. By confirming this perceived knowledge of the Africans, Stanley conforms to, and reinforces, the imperialist discourse. With this in mind, the circulation of knowledge, presented through this narrative, reduces the Africans into a position, where they cannot be perceived as equals to the Western population in any manner, due to the impenetrable barrier of the racial hierarchy.

In this narrative, the power exerted through the circulation of knowledge can be seen in the discourse stating that Africans are like children, which creates a societal structure that adheres to this mindset, thus giving colonizers power over the colonized because of a perceived knowledge. One source for this narrative of Africans as being mentally like children stems from their reactions to advanced products such as guns or medicine. An example of the natives' behavior can be seen when Stanley describes that "[a]t one time on the banks there were considerably over a thousand natives going through the several tenses and moods of the verb 'to stare,' or exhibiting every phase of the substantive [...] the stare peremptory, insolent, sly, cunning, modest, and casual" (Stanley, p. 117). Through this, Stanley shows that the African's fascination not only extends to the products of the Western civilization, but to its inhabitants, as they may never have seen a white man before. Interestingly, while the colonizers perceive

the colonized as less evolved than themselves, due to their inexperienced reactions to these new curiosities, the colonizers do not question how a society that is less technologically advanced than them would have access to such a technology in the first place.

The inclusion of reliability can be seen in relation to the analysis and discussion on the unreadability of Conrad's narrative, as well as the perceived factuality in Stanley's. Conrad's narrative is unreadable, and the unreliable narrator, Marlow, who cannot explain what happened during his stay in Africa, adds to this unreadability of the narrative with his incommunicable knowledge. In the case of Stanley, the story is perceived as factual, which is emphasized by how he had his journey published in The New York Herald, and later turned the dispatches into a quest plot, as was common of travel writing at the time. Stanley's adherence to the discourse of the time regarding the natives as well as the country, supports the reliability of his narrative.

Pastoral: The Primal Desire for a Simpler Way of Life

Regardless of the nature of their narratives or the difference in their attitudes, the two texts still concern similar topics, such as imperialism and the relationship between the colonizers and the colonized, as well as the domain of the colonies. In order to explore the way each author depicts his opinion of the colonies and its native inhabitants, we will make use of Paul Fussell's definition of the pastoral, as he links this category to travel writing: "But travel books are not merely displaced quest romances. They are also displaced pastoral romances" (Fussell, p. 209). With Fussell's claim in mind, not only can the pastoral be linked to the quest, but both genres share qualities with travel writing. Fussell's claim is based on William Empson's definition of the traditional pastoral as "a beautiful relation between rich and poor" (ibid., p. 210), which Fussell expands to a description of the traveler as freer and richer than the natives, leading him to buy their work, resulting in a mutual acceptance of their respective presence (ibid.). This acceptance leads into an inclusion of the pastoral notion, whether implicit or explicit, in travel writing, with the function of a celebration of the past simplicity and a rejection of industrialism.

The pastoral stems from the ancient Greeks and Romans, and up until about 1610, the term 'pastoral' typically referred to shepherds who poetically described their work, their love or the idealized descriptions of the countryside (Gifford, p. 1). This means that the observer in pastoral narratives are often looking at the objects, here being the inhabitants of the native area, as interesting and authentical, as a result of a loss in authenticity for the sophisticated observer. In *Heart of Darkness*, Marlow does regard the simplicity of Africans in a positive manner, even though he seems to find their primal candor fascinating. Another thing Marlow notes about the positive aspects of the natives, particularly those employed on the steamboat, is a willingness to learn. Marlow states that "[t]hey were men one could work with, and I am grateful to them" (Conrad, p. 35). While this does not necessarily need to be an example of the pastoral, it could nevertheless be interpreted as such, as Marlow acknowledges the simplicity and authenticity in these men. They may be men from "the beginning of time" (ibid., p. 40), but through interactions with them, Marlow comes to learn how they see life and how their train of thought functions, leading to a relationship akin to that of the pastoral. As primitive as the natives are, and despite the fact that they do not understand the intricacies of the European machinery, Marlow sees them in a picturesque manner, all the while amused at the simplicity of their mannerisms. That being said, he does note that he finds the thought of their shared kinship ugly (ibid., p. 36), which hints at a lack of the pastoral.

In relation to Marlow noting the ugliness of their shared kinship, we will discuss Marlow's thoughts on the Africans. Despite the imperialist discourse stating that the colonizers were superior to the almost inhuman colonized, Marlow realizes through his observations of the natives that it was not quite as simple as that. Marlow states how "[w]e are accustomed to look upon the shackled form of a conquered monster, but there—there you could look at a thing monstrous and free. It was unearthly, and the men were—No, they were not inhuman" (Conrad, p. 36). This defines how Marlow perceives the Africans, as he has come to the realization that the natives are more than just simple beasts; they are human, and as such, they have a shared kinship, as ugly as the thought may be to him. The point of taking this into consideration within this chapter on the pastoral, is that Marlow defines the Africans as less evolved as compared to those like himself, and yet, as was discussed in the previous paragraph, he acknowledges the simplicity and authenticity with which they live and learn. While this observation by Marlow can be seen as a way to perceive the natives in a manner unlike the one preached by imperialist discourse, it also qualifies as a pastoral glance at the natives and their simple ways. The main difference between his perception of the Africans and the pastoral would be that although Marlow feels a kinship to them, he is not entirely pleased by the idea of living alongside them.

In comparison, *How I Found Livingstone* differs, as Stanley to some extent does display the qualities of the pastoral observer, as he seems to acknowledge the blissful ignorance of the childish way in which the natives act. While his comments on the childlike mind can be seen as pastoral, Stanley's feelings towards them are far removed from the positive yearning often ascribed to the genre, as he believes that the natives have been corrupted by the Arabs, resulting in a perception of the Africans as misbehaved children. This, Stanley expresses through his reaction to their mannerisms, such as a point where he finds them ill-mannered for staring, "for they stare! stare! - my God, there is no end to their staring. I'm almost tempted to slap 'em in the face!" (Stanley, p. 186). In that sense, rather than yearning to take part in the childlike state to achieve a sense of fullness of life, Stanley reacts towards the Africans as if they are children affected by the, to Stanley, bad mannerisms of the Arabs, resulting in him attempting to correct their behavior through beatings and harsh discipline. The Arabic corruption is emphasized by Stanley, through his negative characterizations of the Arabs as being incapable, or unwilling to change (Stanley, p. 5), while insinuating that their culture is unable to even convert a city, let alone a continent (ibid. pp. 5-6). However, we shall delve more into his portrayal of the Arabs in "Stanley's Characters: Tools to Promote Imperialist Discourse". In short, the pastoral notion of yearning for an authentic lifestyle has, to Stanley, been replaced with a mixture of loathing

and pity towards the Africans for having been corrupted by the Arabs, as well as a tendency towards harshness in order to civilize them and rid them of the taint.

That being said, the fact remains that *How I Found Livingstone* does feature some aspects characteristic to the pastoral romance, the key difference being that Stanley's fascination of the natives does not stem from a sensation of longing for something he, and by extension civilized society, lacks. In that way, Stanley further encourages the circulation of knowledge regarding the imperialist discourse, or at least the notion of the cultural hierarchy where the colonizers are placed at the top, meaning that they have nothing to adopt from the ways of the colonized. While he does find the foreign continent beautiful, the aesthetic value comes second to Stanley, as his focus lies primarily in how it could be appropriated and optimized by the colonizers. For example, in a passage, Stanley describes the beauty of the jungle and the land, after which he states that he will "look back upon the scene with pleasure, for the wealth and prosperity it promises to some civilized nation, which in some future time will come and take possession of it" (Stanley, pp. 122-123). Here, rather than accepting the values characteristic to the pastoral, Stanley is enjoying the view while pondering ways of how the landscape could be changed into something more sophisticated and profitable for a civilized nation. However, we will leave this point to be resumed and explored in "Stanley on Nature: An Unrefined Gem Waiting for Western Civilization".

Though both of the narratives may seem to have hints of the pastoral, in that both of the protagonists' objects are the less-developed African natives, the protagonists do not perceive them as bearers of a quality that would grant the civilized with a more authentic experience of life. Marlow does to some extent see their simplicity as something to admire, yet he does not perceive that this simplicity is something which the civilized lack. Rather, the inclusion of the pastoral perspective reveals the colonizers' perception of the natives as inferior, due to their lack of culture, meaning that any yearning for the simplicity of their lifestyle is portrayed as ludicrous. Instead, this lends more credibility to the imperialist discourse and its binary view of the civilized as preferable to the uncivilized, resulting in a legitimization of the imperialist endeavors to circulate their knowledge and to spread their culture, rather than to appreciate the colonized for their picturesque and simple nature.

However, the biggest discrepancy when comparing the two texts to the pastoral, is that to Stanley and Conrad, the Africans would likely not be objects of envy, nor to be something worth yearning for. Unlike the pastoral, where the one gazing in is often someone of a higher social class, yearning for a return to a simpler lifestyle and a fulness of life, to the Victorians,

the relationship between the Western and African population were far more disparate than could be compared to social classes, due to the racial hierarchy (Pakenham, p. 184). Thus, where the pastoral often infers a yearning to throw away their social class and take up a simpler lifestyle, the racial barrier would have been too massive for Stanley and Conrad to disregard, although, to his credit, Conrad admits their shared kinship.

Character Analyses: The Casts as Representations of the Authors' Attitudes

Characters used in literature, particularly in fiction, serves as mediums for the narrator/author to express their opinions and motivations. With this in mind, the following chapter will revolve around the characters, or actors, in respectively *Heart of Darkness* and *How I Found Livingstone*. The chapter will be divided into two separate sub-chapters, one for each of the texts, for the benefit of coherence for each of the two narratives and their respective character interactions.

Conrad's Characters: A Critique of Imperialism Through Marlow's Recollection

The thing that potentially holds the most importance when regarding character portrayals in texts is the attitude of the author or the narrator. Due to its previously mentioned narrative structure, *Heart of Darkness* centers around the protagonist of the secondary fabula, Marlow, as the primary narrator is reduced to an observer. As such, it is important to keep in mind Marlow's character and how his opinion and depictions of the other characters may be affected by it. This makes Marlow, as the character who narrates the plot, the character of the biggest importance to the narrative. However, in order to explore how his point of view is expressed through the characters of his narrative, as well as how his experiences and encounters impact him, we have chosen to place his character analysis at the end of the chapter. Consequently, the first character we will be examining is one from the start of his narrative and who facilitates his journey; Marlow's aunt.

It is through his aunt that Marlow is presented with the offer to go to Africa. Little is known about her, as she does not feature very prominently in the narrative, although some things can be observed through a conversation between her and Marlow from before he sets off. In that conversation, she mentions "weaning those ignorant millions from their horrid ways" (Conrad, p. 12), to which Marlow hints that he believes the company is run for profit (ibid.). The conversation highlights what Marlow states shortly after; that: "[i]t's queer how out of touch with truth women are. They live in a world of their own, and there has never been anything like it" (ibid., p. 13). Thus, Marlow displays a general distrust in aunt and her knowledge, due to her gender. Marlow further states that men are contently living with women despite this, as the opposite would only introduce more problems.

In terms of knowledge, the aunt displays little more insight than that circulated by the colonizers and The Company; that of imperialist discourse. That is to say, the imperialist discourse surrounding the colonies was created from the knowledge which the colonizers, in this text represented by The Company, wished to circulate among the public, in order to gain as much support for their undertakings as possible. It is implied that the aunt is not reacting at all to Marlow telling her of the profit-minded nature of the companies, with Marlow going so far as to note that it would be for the best if no one were to shatter the beautiful world in which women live (Conrad, p. 13). Here, it could be argued that Marlow's reference to women could be a metaphor for the society of the colonizers, as the aunt's situation of only receiving discourse of one perspective and believing it to be the only knowledge needed, resulting in a distorted perception of the colonies and the vested interest of the companies. As a result, Marlow hinting at a different state than the one she is accustomed to does not register for her and his attempt to circulate new knowledge to her fails.

The next characters of importance in Marlow's narrative are two women knitting black wool in the waiting room at The Company headquarters. While they do not serve an important role in terms of their actions in the narrative, their presence serves a symbolic value and a foreboding premonition as to the fate of Marlow's journey into Africa. The two women could be seen as a reference to the Moirai - the Greek mythological personification of fate through three sisters spinning the thread of life for all mortals, deciding and judging their fate from life to death. Indeed, much like their portrayals in Greek mythology, the two women are represented as different stages of the human life with each their own assignments in producing fate (Hard, pp. 27-28). This carries over into Conrad's novella, as the younger represents life and allots people with their fate, here presented as showing them to their interviews, while the old one represents death and silently judges people with a knowing gaze, causing an eerie feeling to come over Marlow, as he notes how she seemed "uncanny and fateful" (Conrad, p. 11). This would also be a reason as to why Marlow believes she gives off the air of someone who knows all about anyone who enters, himself included (ibid.).

The biggest issue with this comparison is that the number of women does not reflect that of the sisters of fate. In short, they lack the third sister, who, in Greek mythology, represented birth and who spun their thread (Hard, pp. 27-28). However, this could simply be a premonition of the fate of Marlow and the undertakings of The Company. Without the presence of birth, the two remaining women represent only the allotment of fate and the inevitable death. This could be seen either as the fate and death at the colonized, due to the

actions that the colonizers of The Company will perform upon them in the name of profit, or to the fate of those who employ themselves to The Company and the death that they will inflict on others, as well as their own sense of morality. This would also explain why the yarn the old women knit takes the form of a warm pall; a cloth made to be spread over a coffin (Conrad, p. 11). Either way, the meaning is clear: the old women represent an inevitable death, if not for all of humanity, then at least for those who, in one way or another, gets involved with The Company and the colonizers they represent. This point is only underlined with Marlow's statement of "*Ave!* Old knitter of black wool. *Morituri te salutant*" (ibid.), Latin for "Hail! We who are about to die salute you" mimicking the salute of Roman gladiators, as they were about to fight to the death as entertainment for their Emperor (ibid.), showing that, even if only through the benefit of his hindsight, Marlow is aware of the severity of his fate.

Much later in the narrative, Marlow recalls the older of the two women, when he tells how he crawled towards Kurtz in the wet grass. Marlow relays that "I had some imbecile thoughts. The knitting old woman with the cat obtruded herself upon my memory as a most improper person to be sitting at the other end of such an affair" (Conrad, p. 64). At this point in his narrative, Marlow is making his way towards the darkness, desperately trying to save Kurtz from it, by force if necessary. His sudden recollection of the old woman could symbolize Marlow attempting to cross fate, as he intends to save Kurtz from the darkness and from death. At the same time, the appearance of the Moira of death hints at the ultimate fate of Kurtz; struggle as Marlow might, Kurtz is too far gone and will die shortly no matter what. Conrad's inclusion of these two women provides a sense of foreshadowing for Marlow's journey, while also emphasizing the inevitable outcome for all who takes part in what occurs at the colonies. For the colonized, it results in a physical death, whereas for the colonizers, it can result in either a physical death or a spiritual one, as they lose part of their own identity by relinquishing their moral and cultural superiority as they are swallowed by the darkness found in the Dark Continent.

As for the colonized, we are informed of many individuals throughout the story, but only few of them are explored in detail besides their ethnicity. As such, we shall begin with an examination of Conrad's portrayal of the natives in general, as well as their treatment at the hands of the colonizers. Marlow's first encounter with them occurs at the first of the stations, where groups of black people walk past him. In this encounter, Marlow ponders of the imperialist discourse, that describes the native Africans as "enemies", which he disputes, stating that "these men could by no stretch of imagination be called enemies" (Conrad, p. 16).

Marlow continues, stating that "[t]hey were called criminals, and the outraged law, like the bursting shells, had come to them, an insoluble mystery from the sea" (ibid.). Through this, Marlow makes a point of the farce of classifying the native inhabitants of a continent as criminals based on a law enforced by outsiders. In doing so, he also provides legitimacy to the argument, that the colonizers promote a discourse of hypocrisy, as they seem content with justifying their actions through misleading information. Despite their apparent condemnation of slavery, the colonizers simply classified natives as criminals and sentenced them to forced labor to avoid repercussions.

Shortly after Marlow notes this, the Africans pass him "within six inches, without a glance, with that complete, deathlike indifference of unhappy savages" (Conrad, p. 16). Through this portrayal, the reader is introduced to a different look at the black man, compared to the one they know from the imperialist discourse predominant at this period in history, as Conrad attempts to present a different discourse, based on his own journey to the Congo, through the experience of Marlow's narrative. In that sense, Conrad seems rather progressive, in the way that he underlines the discrepancies between the imperialist discourse's promotion of philanthropically civilizing the colonized and the sights he witnessed himself while there.

Marlow's notion of the multiplicity of classifications for the colonized is later emphasized when he reaches Kurtz's station in the heart of the continent. There he encounters a display of severed heads mounted on sticks posted outside Kurtz's hut, and is told that "these heads were the heads of rebels. I shocked [the Harlequin] excessively by laughing. Rebels! What would be the next definition I was to hear? There had been enemies, criminals, workers—and these were rebels" (Conrad, p. 58). Through this, Marlow highlights the absurdity of the discourse, in that the colonizers are constantly reclassifying the native Africans in order to justify their grotesque treatment and continued suppression of them, by labelling them as troublemakers, while promoting themselves as far superior. Through this discourse, the colonizers grant themselves not only the justification to condemn the colonized, but also manage to legitimize their own right and power to mistreat the colonized.

However, as Marlow demonstrates at the first of the stations, even the colonized who avoid the categorization are still made to suffer as a result of the colonizers and their undertakings in the colonies. Shortly after Marlow sees the "unhappy savages" (Conrad, p. 16) walking enchained as branded criminals, he walks into the forest in order to get some shade. Here he comes across, what he defines as, a "grove of death" (ibid., p. 20), where scores of Africans are sitting, reduced to barely anything but bones and barely breathing, waiting to die.

Rather than having been branded as enemies or criminals, Marlow defines these men as "nothing but black shadows of disease and starvation, lying confusedly in the greenish gloom" (ibid., p. 17). This depiction serves as the epitome of Marlow's discourse, as a response to the misleading nature of the imperial discourse. While the colonizers may boast and aggrandize their philanthropic endeavors, the result is not the creation of a civilized continent in the image of the colonizers. Rather, the nature of the colonies reduces the colonies and colonized alike to bones, taking from them everything they own and leaving them as husks once they have served their purpose. In that sense, we see how the knowledge that Marlow attempts to circulate, is a counter to the one presented by The Company, and just as Marlow is attempting to enlighten his listeners aboard the *Nellie,* Conrad could be argued to attempt the same through *Heart of Darkness*. By circulating a counter-discourse of the abusiveness of colonization, rather than the misleading discourse of The Company, Marlow hopes to change the mind of his peers, or at least broaden their perception enough to see the multi-faceted nature of their undertaking.

In relation to individual Africans, one particular African man is depicted in a predominant manner compared to the others; that of the native serving as Marlow's helmsman aboard the steamboat. Ironically, it is not until his death that Marlow realizes how much he had bonded with him, despite him having a somewhat simple-minded nature. He is initially described as "[a]n athletic black [...] [who] was the most unstable kind of fool I had ever seen" (Conrad, p. 44). He is mentioned again shortly afterwards, when Marlow realizes that they are being shot at, where he states that "[t]hat fool-helmsman, his hands on the spokes, was lifting his knees high, stamping his feet, champing his mouth, like a reined-in horse" (ibid., p. 45). Following the death of the helmsman, Marlow notes: "I missed my late helmsman awfully" (ibid., p. 50), and comments that "a subtle bond had been created" (ibid., p. 51).

While Marlow initially defined the helmsman through only physical attributes and regarded him with wariness, as he felt he had to keep an eye out for him when he steered, he nevertheless developed the beginnings of a bond with the man, at least to the point that he was comforted by his presence. This hints at one of the key differences between Marlow and his fellow colonizers, in that he may refer to the natives as savages, but he realizes that the Africans are more than that. Unlike the other colonizers, he feels the remnants of a kinship to them, albeit one he does not seem pleased by, as he refers to the thought as "ugly" (Conrad, p. 36). However, he still opts to acknowledge the existence of the kinship, as well as some primal response to the natives and their actions, as he believes acceptance of one's primitive ancestry to be of import.

> Yes, it was ugly enough; but if you were man enough you would admit to yourself that there was in you just the faintest trace of a response to the terrible frankness of that noise, a dim suspicion of there being a meaning in it which you - you so remote from the night of first ages - could comprehend. And why not? (Conrad, p. 36)

As Marlow proves willing to accept his shared ancestry with the natives, he has no issue accepting the existence of the bond he shared with the helmsman, created through their shared steering of the steamboat down the river toward Marlow's goal. With this in mind, even though Marlow may define the Africans as savages, he still attributes them more humanity than the other people at the stations, as well as most people of his time. In that sense, Marlow does still enforce the discourse of the white man being more powerful and more civilized than the black man, but Marlow nevertheless advocates the notion that the black man and the white man share a kinship, which allows them to breach the hierarchy and develop bonds with one another, despite the differences between them as colonizers and colonized.

Comparatively, Marlow presents the white men in Africa somewhat negatively. The first of these Marlow encounters once reaching The Company's stations is the Company's Chief Accountant. Although the Chief Accountant does not play a major role in the narrative, the role he does play is nevertheless interesting. Marlow describes the Chief Accountant's appearance and attire as "a high starched collar, white cuffs, a light alpaca jacket, snowy trousers, a clean necktie, and varnished boots. No hat. Hair parted, brushed, oiled, under a green-lined parasol held in a big white hand. He was amazing, and had a penholder behind his ear" (Conrad, p. 18). In short, he had kept his civilized appearance of a colonizer, despite, as we later learn (ibid., p. 18), having been in Africa for nearly three years. This comes to emphasize the apparent primary characteristic of the Chief Accountant; he maintains his appearance and composure in an attempt to keep things going and maximizing proficiency.

Another way, besides his appearance, this character trait is made clear, is through his entries. He explains to Marlow, that "'[w]hen one has got to make correct entries, one comes to hate those savages—hate them to the death'" (Conrad, p. 19). Thus, to him, the Africans are little more than a nuisance, as their nature is at odds with his endeavor to be proficient. Another thing this interaction highlights is the reappearance of the duality of The Company's undertaking in the colonies, as, shortly afterwards, Marlow describes the situation and location of the Chief Accountant's office: "[i]n the steady buzz of flies the homeward-bound agent was lying finished and insensible; the other, bent over his books, was making correct entries of perfectly correct transactions; and fifty feet below the doorstep I could see the still tree-tops of

the grove of death" (ibid., pp. 19-20). Here, the absurdity of it all is made apparent. While the Chief Accountant is perfectly dressed his clothes ironed and his skin white and clean, flies are buzzing above the body of an invalid agent of The Company, all the while he talks about making perfect entries and enforcing rules in a place where rules do not exist and hold no power. Meanwhile, in the background, the previously mentioned "grove of death" looms, serving as a chilling reminder of the situation the colonizers are enforcing upon the colonized, creating a clear contrast between the perceived reality of the imperialist discourse and that of the reality as witnessed by Marlow and Conrad.

As such, the Chief Accountant serves as a personification of the colonizers, and arguably even of the imperialist societies as a whole. In England, for example, an established law and order exist and are followed, because the country's people have accepted them as rules and are expected to follow them. In Africa, as was noted earlier, the colonizers appear with a set of laws and demands the colonized to follow them blindly, that is, the colonizers reconstruct the native population into a new, subservient working-class (Memmi, pp. 55-56). This functions as a source of motivation for Western individuals to journey to the colonies, as, regardless of their previous status in their home country, they are regarded as superior to the colonized. For the aristocrats, this presented a nostalgic return of the authority they had been losing during the Victorian Age, whereas individuals from a working-class background experienced a reversal of the status quo; in the colonies, they were no longer the subservient social class, as the race hierarchy allowed for them to be placed above the natives (Brantlinger, 1988, p. 183). The Chief Accountant, as a symbol of the colonizers, only cares for results and how they reflect on his entries, even while the workforce is left to tend to itself when it outlives its usefulness, with any pretense of philanthropy or missionary endeavors forgotten. As such, the Chief Accountant serves as a way for Marlow to highlight the difference between the mission to civilize and the quest for profit, as we see a cold disregard for life in favor of numbers, even in the face of an agent invalidated as a result of The Company's undertaking. Meanwhile, the Chief Accountant is more focused on making precise entries and keeping up appearances, as he is blinded by the avarice of The Company and the colonialist discourse, which justifies the prioritizing money and ivory over the lives of colonists and Africans alike.

This mentality is shared by other members of The Company, as can be seen in the case of the Manager of the Central Station, who presents himself as a man set out to make sure that everything proceeds according to plan. To ensure this, he travels with Marlow and the Pilgrims

to Kurtz's station. The interesting thing about the Manager is found in a conversation he had with his uncle before leaving the Central Station:

> 'We will not be free from unfair competition till one of these fellows is hanged for an example,' he said. 'Certainly,' grunted the other; 'get him hanged! Why not? Anything—anything can be done in this country. That's what I say; nobody here, you understand, *here*, can endanger your position. And why? You stand the climate—you outlast them all. [...]' (Conrad, p. 32)

This conversation not only portrays the colonizers as greedy, but it serves as an example of how that avarice manifests in the Manager, as he is shown to be fixated on preserving, and potentially improving, his position in the colonies. In England, the way to fulfill that goal would be through hard work, but in Africa, or "in this country" (Conrad, p. 32), as the Manager's uncle points out, anything was possible for those who could acclimate to the harsh conditions, including killing off competitors or executing scapegoats. As a result, the philanthropic nature of the imperialist discourse is cast aside, as the Manager does little besides fixate on his position by scheming with the Brickmaker and his uncle.

While the talk with the uncle happens later, Marlow's first description of the Manager is based primarily on his physical attributes. The Manager is "commonplace in complexion," though "[h]is eyes [...] were perhaps remarkably cold" (Conrad, p. 21). Marlow describes how the Manager was a common trader, and that he "was obeyed, yet he inspired neither love nor fear, nor even respect. He inspired uneasiness" (ibid., p. 22). Marlow notices how the Manager never becomes sick unlike the other agents and comments on this in a way that makes the Manager seem almost inhuman, as if his insides were replaced by a void of darkness (ibid.). The discussion between the Manager and his uncle, that Marlow overhears, informs us about the Manager's goal; he is a colonizer who is after money and prestige, and by being in Africa, outliving the other agents, he can achieve that goal. The conversation with the uncle also hints at the lengths the Manager is willing to go in order to achieve his goal, as he is encouraged by his uncle to kill Africans to set examples, given that the laws of Europe do not apply to the white man in Africa, especially since the Manager is invaluable, due to his resilience to the climate. The potential for creating uneasiness, as well as the apparent darkness the Manager possesses, serve as tools for the Manager's success in ensuring that the power stays with him, as he holds the capacity for survival in Africa. As such, he becomes an example of the violent practices of the colonial system, while also showing the disparity between the value of Western lives as compared to African ones.

Similarly, the Pilgrims traveling alongside Marlow towards the Inner Station are depicted as greedy and prone to selfish desires. Their numbers total "sixteen or twenty pilgrims" (Conrad, p. 24), and are first seen waiting at the Central Station while Marlow was awaiting the parts needed to get the steamboat functional again. He describes them as wandering about, "[s]everal had still their staves in their hands. I verily believe they took these sticks to bed with them" (ibid, p. 23), and notes how "[t]hey wandered here and there with their absurd long staves in their hands, like a lot of faithless pilgrims bewitched inside a rotten fence. The word 'ivory' rang in the air, was whispered, was sighed" (ibid.). Through this description, Marlow depicts them in a borderline ridiculous manner, as they seem completely devoted, in that they never leave their staves and yet are deemed as faithless, in that their devotion is entirely to the acquisition and worship of ivory, rather than a journey based on religious beliefs or a wish for self-reflection. As such, Marlow's use of the term 'Pilgrims' becomes a mockery towards the flock, as they perform a similar hypocrisy as that of the colonizers as compared to the discourse they circulate. 'The Pilgrims' may wear the appearance of pilgrims, who have traveled to Africa to either spread Christianity, or for some other soul-searching journey, but when push comes to shove, their only interest is ivory.

Later in the narrative, when they are under attack on the steamboat, Marlow takes note of two of the Pilgrims who "rush out incontinently and stand darting scared glances, with Winchesters at 'ready' in their hands" (Conrad, p. 40.). Here, Marlow is once again noting on the absurdity of it all, while depicting the Pilgrims as inept and ill-prepared. As ready as the Pilgrims believe themselves to be, and as much as they crave the ivory of Africa, Marlow's narrative depicts them as woefully unprepared and incapable of coping with the harsh conditions of the colonies, as even their abilities to use their own equipment is put into question. In that sense, the Pilgrims could be argued to represent a blind dedication to the self-enriching discourse often associated with the colonies, as they praise the ivory like a deity, all the while traveling into hostile territories completely unprepared, yet seem not to realize the danger they have put themselves in.

However, when Marlow points out their inadequacy, and when he tries to come between them in their thrill-seeking, they become enraged, as was the case when Marlow attempted to scare the natives away, rather than to let the pilgrims shoot aimlessly at them (ibid., p. 67). The absurdity of their presence then, is that they have entered the Dark Continent without any clear indication of having the means to procure their goal of their journey. They represent the mentality of those who wish to go with Africa to cut out their own share of its renowned riches,

yet have been circulated a discourse that misrepresents the risks and the situation of the colonies, meaning that they are utterly unprepared for what they will face once they arrive. In that sense, we see that while the Foucauldian notion that knowledge begets power, and vice versa, misinformation and ignorance of fact beget powerlessness and vulnerability.

One important comparison made by Marlow, directly or indirectly, is between the cannibals and the Pilgrims. While aboard the steamboat, the cannibals are employed to do the work, despite the fact that they were starving, as the Pilgrims had thrown the food supplies of the cannibals overboard, as the meat was rotten. To reimburse their loss, the Pilgrims pay the cannibals in brass wire, with which they were to buy food, the problem being that they do not pass any villages or outposts along the way, resulting in them having nothing to eat. Marlow notes this and states:

> It takes a man all his inborn strength to fight hunger properly. It's really easier to face bereavement, dishonour, and the perdition of one's soul—than this kind of prolonged hunger. Sad, but true. And these chaps, too, had no earthly reason for any kind of scruple. Restraint! I would just as soon have expected restraint from a hyena prowling amongst the corpses of a battlefield. (Conrad, p. 42)

Marlow is surprised by the restraint of the cannibals, as they simply endure their hunger, rather than lashing out or attempting to eat any of the crew on the ship. As such, they are depicted as showing significantly more restraint than the Pilgrims, who prove compelled by their own greed and show no hesitation in getting into conflicts at several instances of the narrative.

Despite all of these strenuous acquaintances, Marlow perseveres, all in the hope to meet Kurtz. Once at the Inner Station, he encounters the unnamed young Russian man, whom he refers to as a Harlequin due to his colored clothes. His physical features hint at an inner innocence, as Marlow describes his face as "[a] beardless, boyish face, very fair, no features to speak of, nose peeling, little blue eyes, smiles and frowns chasing each other over that open countenance like sunshine and shadow on a wind-swept plain" (Conrad, pp. 52-53). His appearance gives off the impression of the Harlequin as being an innocent or naive individual, which could be a reference to his attitude towards both Kurtz and the colonial practices as being correct, simply due to a blind faith in the imperialist ideals. If so, the Harlequin serves as a representative of those Europeans who could see no wrong in the way the colonies were functioning, as all they see is proof of the imperialist discourse. This mindset can be observed in the harlequin's attitude towards the Africans, as he defines them as "simple people" (ibid.,

p. 53). Yet, this could simply be an extension of his devotion to Kurtz, seeing as Kurtz's original objective was to find a manner to suppress the natives' savage customs.

However, there is also the likely possibility, that Marlow describes the Harlequin with innocent attributes, due to his general lack of interest in economic profit from the colonies. Marlow finds in the Harlequin a kindred spirit, as his journey to the colonies are based on a yearning for adventure, rather than having traveled there for riches, which is a trait that Marlow shares and admires. "If the absolutely pure, uncalculating, impractical spirit of adventure had ever ruled a human being, it ruled this bepatched youth" (Conrad, p. 55). This is the very quality that sets Marlow and the Harlequin apart from their fellow colonists, to the point where their yearning for adventure leads them into impractical situations, as they clash with those who were supposed to be their comrades. Unlike the Pilgrims, who also set out utterly unprepared, the Harlequin does not display any interest in the profitability in the ivory trade, as he "surely wanted nothing from the wilderness but space to breathe in and to push on through" (ibid.).

Yet, their shared yearning for adventure is not the only thing Marlow and the Harlequin have in common, as they both display a fascination with Kurtz. As can be gleaned through his conversation with Marlow, the Harlequin is quite dedicated to Kurtz, as a result of his conversations with the man. Despite this, his relationship to Kurtz is unstable, in that as much as he reveres Kurtz, he also fears him, but this is mostly due to Kurtz's own duality. As such, he can revere the talented and enlightened speaker he is at times, but fear him moments later, as his eloquence becomes threats.

As we learn from the Russian Harlequin, Kurtz's nature has become one of duality. As such, it seems most fitting to divide his character analysis into two aspects; Kurtz as he was, according to those Marlow encounters, and Kurtz as he is, based on how Marlow presents him through his narrative. When Marlow first hears a description of Kurtz, he is presented as "a first-class agent" (Conrad, p. 19), "a very remarkable person" (ibid.) who "[s]ends in as much ivory as all the others put together" (ibid.). Later, when Marlow broaches the topic of Kurtz with the Brickmaker at the Central Station, he is told that Kurtz is a prodigy, "an emissary of pity and science and progress, and devil knows what else" (ibid., p. 25). In short, Kurtz is presented by his fellow employees at The Company as the perfect colonizer, as well as the epitome of what Western civilization has to offer. As such, he proves himself as a great asset for them, especially through his ability to procure more ivory than anyone else. The characters who describe Kurtz all indicate that his abilities will take him to the top of the corporate ladder. What is more, the Brickmaker talks of him, as if he has a higher purpose for being there, as he

offers "the guidance of the cause entrusted to us by Europe, so to speak, higher intelligence, wide sympathies, a singleness of purpose" (ibid.). Rather than solely being a profitable individual, we see here the notion, that Kurtz's presence is invaluable, as he is the kind of man needed in this uncivilized place. This notion of him being an emissary or personification of Europe and all it has to offer is reinforced when we later learn that he is part English and part French (ibid., p. 49), both nations well-cemented and recognized in the cultural and scientific landscape.

With all of this information, the expectations are set high for both readers, as well as Marlow, expressed by the latter through his statement that Marlow "was curious to see whether this man, who had come out equipped with moral ideas of some sort, would climb to the top after all and how he would set about his work when there" (Conrad, p. 31). Not only is Marlow interested in seeing whether Kurtz lives up to his reputation, but he is also interested in how Kurtz had decided to operate and what results he could produce in the wilderness. However, the Kurtz we meet is a far cry from the one we expected, as Marlow can only describe him as an "atrocious phantom" (ibid., p. 59). It should be noted though, that Marlow had already hinted at the state of Kurtz before, during one of the times where his narrative breaks and he goes into a rant to the listeners aboard the *Nellie* before his narrative had reached his encounter with Kurtz.

> And the lofty frontal bone of Mr. Kurtz! They say the hair goes on growing sometimes, but this— ah—specimen, was impressively bald. The wilderness had patted him on the head, and, behold, it was like a ball— an ivory ball; it had caressed him, and—lo!—he had withered; it had taken him, loved him, embraced him, got into his veins, consumed his flesh, and sealed his soul to its own by the inconceivable ceremonies of some devilish initiation. (Conrad, p. 48)

Although he starts with a description of Kurtz's exterior, it develops into comments on the state of Kurtz's mind, as he comments that the wilderness had "consumed his flesh, and sealed his soul" (Conrad, p. 48). Marlow's comparison between Kurtz's head and a ball of ivory could be construed as a metaphor for having nothing but ivory in his head to the point where he has lost sight of everything else. He has, in short, been consumed by his avarice for ivory, as a result of The Company's demands and through his exposure to, and later assimilation of, the ways of the Africans. It could also be a reference to the Victorian Age's focus on phrenology, or even to the phrenologist Marlow encounters early on during his

examination, who linked cranial measurements to the changes that "take place inside" (ibid., p. 12).

As was explained in the chapter "The Dark Enlightenment: Conrad's Disillusionment of the Colonizing Hero", due to the state of Kurtz and its effect on Marlow's narrative, Kurtz never manages to circulate the knowledge necessary to determine his moral ideas. Nor does he get the chance to share the logic behind his methods, although we can assume that, to some extent, they resemble the ideas of so many other colonizers in Africa. We know that the ivory has affected his mind to the point where it is one of his, if not the, primary priority of his station. However, it is possible that the ivory only serves as a priority to Kurtz, as the steady stream he distributes to The Company allows him to remain in solitude among the Africans. Either way, there can be little doubt, that in return for his endeavors at the Inner Station, he has given up the parts of his humanity that he was associated with before. Rather than introduce the Africans to the European ideals, as the Brickmaker expected he would, he has allowed himself to become savage, either as a result of assimilation of the Africans he surrounded himself with, or as a consequence of the inner, primal nature hidden beneath the exterior of the colonizers.

The duality presented through Kurtz's character is one of the primary themes in Conrad's text, used in a way to circulate a discourse critical of imperialism and colonial undertakings, and to make readers consider the consequences of territorial expansion into other continents to impose a foreign will and culture for profits. In the center of this debate is Kurtz; a personification of the darkness found within man, both for colonizer or colonized, and a reminder that even the most promising of individuals with the best of intentions can be corrupted. Acting in hypocrisy will only end in disaster, as Kurtz demonstrates through an undertaking meant to civilize, but instead turns the colonizer feral, as the true intentions are made clear. Thus we see how Kurtz's report, meant to find a solution that will end savage acts instead determines that any attempts to do so will involve further violence, as summed up in his declaration "[e]xterminate the brutes!" (Conrad, p. 50). This mirrors Memmi's point, that the colonizer, who does not choose to depart the colonies, as a reaction to the injustice he witnesses there, will inevitably become more cruel toward the colonized, in a "self-defeating process", driven by a mix of colonizer's wish to retain his position and his attempts to "extol himself to the skies and drive the usurped below the ground" (Memmi, p. 97).

Left to ponder his own role, along with Kurtz's dying message, is Marlow. It would appear that he takes this role to heart, as per the description of him made by the anonymous sailor early on in the text. According to him, Marlow "had sunken cheeks, a yellow complexion,

a straight back, an ascetic aspect, and, with his arms dropped, the palms of hands outwards, resembled an idol" (Conrad, p. 3). With Marlow's past in mind, his resemblance to an idol hints at great wisdom, which proves correct as he ends up imparting it unto the other passengers on the *Nellie*. Interestingly, the previous description is one of the only ones in the text not stated by Marlow, meaning it is not simply Marlow's perception of himself, but that of his peers, here represented through the anonymous sailor. Marlow says about himself that "After all, I also was a part of the great cause of these high and just proceedings" (ibid., p. 16). As much, Marlow accepts his own part in regard to adhering to the imperial discourse, as he admits to having served the interests of the colonizers through his work for The Company. However, the major difference between him and other participants in the imperialist practices is that Marlow does not agree with the way in which these practices are carried out, despite him having no objections to the notion, that the Africans are in need of civilizing.

This duality in Marlow's rejection, yet participation, of colonialism is compatible to one of the core assumptions of New Historicism, as Marlow cannot condemn a practice, in this case colonialism, without understanding and acknowledging the existence of said practice, meaning that he must, on some level, participate in it as well (Veeser, 1994, p. 2). By participating, Marlow has gained insight into a different perspective to the topic of imperialism, as well as the differences between its discourse and its practices. At the end of his narrative, Marlow resumes his position as idol (Conrad, p. 77), as an indication of his enlightened state following the experiences he has encountered and recounted. Through his narrative, we have heard how he went from a state of yearning for adventure, to pessimism at the obstruction of his dream, to a somewhat superficial insight into the motivation of the colonialist companies, concluding in an extensive understanding of their methods through personal experience, which he is now able to condemn after his participation. This, in turn, allows him to circulate his knowledge through the medium of his narrative to the listeners aboard the *Nellie*, in order for them to learn from his experiences.

This leads to the conclusion, that the characters in *Heart of Darkness* all play a particular role in regard to the underlying message that Marlow, and consequently Conrad, wish to impart unto their audience. As a result, some of Conrad's characters function as representations of the parties involved in imperialist undertakings, some by consenting to the system while being uninformed about the consequences. Others actively participate in the practice while being in denial or showing indifference as to what effect they impose unto both the colonists and the colonized. At the center of the conflict sits Conrad; an individual who,

throughout his narrative, shows how he himself has gone from ignorant as to the exact scope of the colonies to a knowledgeable idol, able to circulate a discourse as a response to that of the imperialists and as a result of his participation in their system. An important note to finalize the character analysis of Marlow is, that while he does seemingly condemn the imperialists for their misleading discourse, and for their prioritization of profits over civilization, he does not seem to be an anti-imperialist per say. Rather, he does applaud imperialism when it is done in accordance with the philanthropic undertakings preached by the imperialists. For instance, as he notes a vast amount of red areas on a map at the headquarters of The Company, he remarks that those were "good to see at any time because one knows that some real work is done there" (Conrad, p. 10). This would be a reference to the typical 19th-century habit of marking British areas on maps in the color of red (ibid.). Considering his use of the phrase "some real work is done there", Marlow is either indicating that the work in Congo is not as important as other places, or more likely, he is referencing the fact, that at other colonies, they adhere to the altruistic sides of the imperialist discourse , which he finds encouraging. This indicates that Marlow, at the very least, finds imperialism good as long as it is done as it was supposed to. This also establishes why he clashes with The Company and the way they practice imperialism in the Congo, as it is not what Marlow regards as "real work".

Stanley's Characters: Tools to Promote Imperialist Discourse

Unlike *Heart of Darkness*, that, as a novella, could make a distinction between the author and the narrator, *How I Found Livingstone* is an autobiography, meaning that the author Henry Morton Stanley serves as the narrator as well. As was the case with Conrad's, Stanley's depiction of the characters included in his narrative is influenced by his own attitude towards them, as his portrayal of them would serve to validate his own beliefs, particularly on the topic of imperialism, to the reader. Therefore, as was done with Marlow in the previous chapter, we have chosen to place the analysis of Stanley himself at the end of the chapter, in order to use the other characters as being indicative of Stanley's beliefs before concluding on the man himself. The characters included in this analysis have been chosen based on how important they are to the narrative, as well as whether their interactions with Stanley serve as indications of his beliefs or validates his narrative and the imperialist discourse.

The first member to take part in Stanley's expedition, or at least, the first we are introduced to, is William Lawrence Farquhar, a man from Leith in Scotland. Despite Stanley relying heavily on Farquhar, he does not describe him in great detail, except for the color of

his skin, which Stanley notes on several occasions. These are often used for no apparent reason, besides reminding the reader that Farquhar is indeed white, as is the case at one point, where Stanley states: "I invented a saddle to be manufactured by myself and my white man Farquhar" (Stanley, p. 26). A short while later, Farquhar is finally given some more specific characteristics, as he is defined by Stanley as "a capital navigator and excellent mathematician; […] strong, energetic, and clever" (ibid., p. 27). The qualities of Farquhar would appear to be those appreciated in colonists, as he not only has the right complexion to Stanley, but also seems ideal for the work required on an expedition such as Stanley's.

Unfortunately, the last thing we hear about Farquhar is that he has died of illness, more specifically, Stanley believes it to have been elephantiasis (Stanley, p. 147). Stanley's omission of any other description of Farquhar could either be a result of Farquhar not having excelled in any way that made him stand out, or that, to Stanley, being white is sufficient introduction to an individual. This notion is supported by his tendency, as we later find, to be particularly critical to individuals based on their nationality or ethnicity. Either way, Farquhar is presented entirely with positive connotations, which sets a stark contrast to how Stanley depicts those of different ethnicities, such as the Arabs and the Africans, who are presented in his narrative shortly after his introduction of Farquhar.

The first African Stanley makes a point to mention is "Seedy Mbarak Mombay, commonly called 'Bombay'" (Stanley, p. 27), who serves as another of the men taking part in Stanley's expedition. As for Bombay's physical appearance, Stanley describes him as "a slender short man of fifty or thereabouts, with a grizzled head, an uncommonly high, narrow forehead, with a very large mouth, showing teeth very irregular, and wide apart [...] [Stanley] was favourably impressed with Bombay, though his face was rugged, his mouth large, his eyes small, and his nose flat" (Stanley, p. 27). Stanley puts a noteworthy focus on Bombay's appearance, particularly on the distinction between his features, and by extensions those of Africans, as compared to the typical European facial features. For example, Stanley focuses on Bombay's large mouth and flat nose, both common in the discourse on what the African man looked like, while also expressing the focus on phrenological features like Bombay's forehead. However, it should be noted that Stanley does not only regard Bombay based on his physical appearance, as the sole reason he approached him was because he had been named as a "Faithful" to the explorer John Hanning Speke (ibid.). With this title in mind, Bombay is presented as a man who is somewhat trustworthy, at least when compared to other Africans.

Despite elevating Bombay above most Africans by assigning him the title of "Faithful", Stanley retains reservations about Bombay, as can be seen in other descriptions of him. He defines Bombay as "honest and trusty, but slightly disposed to be dilatory" (Stanley, p. 74), which could be a reflection of Stanley believing that as faithful Bombay may be, he still has his flaws as an African. Later, when they are in the wilderness of Africa, Stanley once again makes note of Bombay's nature, stating that "Bombay was neither very honest nor very dishonest, i.e., he did not venture to steal much. He sometimes contrived cunningly, as he distributed the meat, to hide a very large share for his own use" (ibid., p. 346). With this, Stanley's attitude towards Bombay has worsened, as he now regards him as not entirely honest, but neither dishonest, as he has been reduced to distribute more meat to himself. Following this, Stanley notes how Bombay "required to be closely watched, and when aware that this was the case, he seldom ventured to appropriate more cloth than I would have freely given him, had he asked for it" (ibid., p. 347). Finally, Stanley deems him not fit for "too much brain-work" and he would forget "every order the moment it was given him" (ibid.). While Stanley never describes Bombay as being smart in the first place, there is a noticeable decline in Stanley's regard of him, as he went from faithful to inconstant.

However, there is a hint that Stanley never truly regarded Bombay as someone worthy of his trust in his earlier depiction of the man. Back when Stanley described Bombay's physical features, he noted an injury that Speke had inflicted upon him "when his master's patience was worn out, and prompt punishment became necessary" (Stanley, p. 28), which Stanley could only assume was administered justly, as it was the result of Bombay's own "audacity to stand up for a boxing-match with [Speke]" (ibid.). Stanley himself seems to applaud the use of punishment towards the Africans, as he in the same chapter noted how he at a later date had to administer a punishment on Bombay as well (ibid.). Thus, Stanley lets the reader know early on, both through his retrospective knowledge, and arguably his characterization of Bombay as being seedy, that despite the high praise one could expect from one deemed as faithful by a renowned explorer, Bombay is described similarly to a child, whom cannot be trusted if left to its own vices. As such, in order to ensure that he acts in accordance with Stanley's instructions and does not impede Stanley's expedition, Stanley not only finds it acceptable, but actively encourages physical punishment when he deems it necessary.

This plays well into the discourse of the time, where uncivilized Africans were perceived to be less than the civilized Europeans and Westerners. The Africans proved useful in performing some tasks, particularly at the colonies, as their bodies were accustomed to the

climate that threatened any Europeans who ventured there, but they needed guidance and discipline, as they were prone to ignore orders. This, in turn, led to the notion that they could not be trusted completely, even those who were deemed most faithful. Thus, they could be used for their ability to traverse the wilderness and for physical labor, but they were not entrusted any roles that required autonomy. Stanley's description of Bombay fits into his contemporary discourse regarding colonizer and colonized, although the question remains whether Stanley portrayed Bombay, and the other characters for that matter, in a manner that was more in line with his own attitudes, as well as those of his target audience. As such, when Stanley is referring back to how Speke punished Bombay, and how he similarly would have to later in the narrative (Stanley, p. 28), he is reminding the reader that even though Bombay may seem trustworthy for an African, he is not to be trusted completely, as he remains inferior to his white companions.

This leads us to the second white man accompanying Stanley on the expedition; "John William Shaw – a native of London, England" (Stanley, p. 26). As with Farquhar, Stanley notes several times that Shaw is white of color, and, before the death of Farquhar, Stanley often does so while referring to them as a unit; "the white men Farquhar and Shaw" (ibid., p. 35). As could be surmised from the two previous characters, Shaw, as a white man, is depicted as capable and trustworthy, similarly to Farquhar, but as a contrast to Bombay. Stanley states that "the men worked smartly under Shaw's supervision" (ibid., p. 78), and also makes a point of how Shaw was often sent out with a group either to retrieve men from the expedition that had gone missing or to help Bombay negotiate with the chiefs of the different villages. Later, when Shaw becomes sick, Stanley writes: "the whole duty of driving the foundering caravan devolved upon myself" (ibid., p. 135), by which he is inferring that Shaw was so capable that he had been entrusted the duty of driving parts of the caravan forwards. Again, this creates a noteworthy contrast to Bombay, as he is not trusted despite having been employed by another distinguished explorer already. However, it complies with the racially driven discourse of the Victorian Age, where being a member of the Western population lent credibility to an individual, especially in comparison to the native population of the colonies, who need guidance and civilizing from the colonists, thus lending validity to the imperialist discourse.

As mentioned previously, one of the great encouragers of bringing civilization to Africa is the very David Livingstone that Stanley is out to find. Despite being the titular character, we do not hear much about Livingstone before Stanley arrives at the village, where Livingstone is. Here, when Stanley first meets Livingstone he says: "I was not sure, at first, but this joviality,

humor, and abundant animal spirits were the result of a joyous hysteria; but as I found they continued while I was with him, I am obliged to think them natural" (Stanley, p. 433). This description of Livingstone's personality makes him appear to possess otherwise unnatural levels of joviality, humor and spirit, which could be interpreted as a negative quality if it had not been a quality of Livingstone. Had it, for example, been an African in possession of such qualities, it might indicate an inherent childishness of mind, but in the case of Livingstone, it makes him appear energized. Stanley goes as far as to say that Livingstone "is a very fine example of the perseverance, doggedness, and tenacity which characterise the Anglo-Saxon spirit" (ibid., p. 435).

Stanley not only describes Livingstone as the epitome of the Anglo-Saxon race, but also promotes him and his philanthropic endeavors to spread knowledge and civilization to the Africans, thus being the perfect individual for the native Africans to encounter as well. This Stanley does through remarks such as "[t]o men differently constituted, a long residence amongst the savages of Africa would be contemplated with horror" while pointing out that Livingstone still finds time for philosophical studies as well as being "charmed with the primitive simplicity of Ethiop's dusky children" (Stanley, p. 438). However, besides his famous search for the source of the Nile, Stanley defines Livingstone's personal mission, regarding the Africans, as his search "to elevate a people that were apparently forgotten of God and Christian man" (ibid.). With this statement, Stanley promotes Livingstone and his mission by granting him religious significance, while also appealing to Livingstone's focus on the importance of Christianity to the Africans (Brantlinger, 1988, p. 181). He also infers the imperialist idea that by spreading Christianity to the Africans, the colonizers may take it upon themselves to civilize the uncivilized Africans.

Livingstone is seen by Stanley as "the daring pioneer of [the African] civilization" (Stanley, p. 620), not only because he traveled into the continent, but because he managed to maintain his sanity and civility while there, as was evident in how he had furthered his studies. As he is portrayed in Stanley's narrative, Livingstone resembles a martyr who has taken it upon himself to traverse the danger in order to civilize those in need, thereby representing the optimal specimen as a white, Christian man. Not only does he strive for knowledge and to fill in the empty gaps of knowledge, but he expresses a will to help those in need through his philanthropic deeds and preaches ways to improve the lives of the uncivilized by enlightening them to the ways of the Western world under the guiding eyes of colonizers.

Stanley attempts early on not to depict himself as against those of black skin, as he mentions having friends among the "negroes of our Southern States", along with some he is outright "proud to call friends" (Stanley, p. 9). This statement could, however, just be an attempt by Stanley to make himself appear appealing towards his readers, as well as the winning side of the American Civil War, which had concluded in the abolition of slavery in the United States just over three years prior to Stanley setting off on his expedition. Nevertheless, he considers whether the same will be possible with the black population in Africa, as he poses the question of whether or not the native Africans will be in possession of even the most basic of emotions, which will make them "lovable among [their] fellows" (ibid., p. 10). Despite quickly finding that they do indeed possess these basic human qualities, it should be noted that he questions whether they have these at all, meaning that he questions their humanity itself. Having thought this, Stanley states that the Africans "were an exceedingly fine-looking body of men, far more intelligent in an appearance than I could ever have believed African barbarians could be" (ibid., p. 30).

The previous statement could hint at Stanley slowly experiencing for himself how the Africans measure up when compared to the Western population. Initially, he questions whether they even feel emotions, but later realizes that they were more intelligent than he at first believed. Later still, as Stanley journeys into Africa, he notes that working in the field "were men and women in the scantiest costumes, compared to which Adam and Eve, in their fig-leaf apparel" (Stanley, p. 76). All of Stanley's observations leads to the impression of the Africans as a primitive people, who are not as developed as the colonizers. His reference to Adam and Eve in scant apparel almost invokes a sense of pity, since, like the two biblical figures, the reason that they cannot help what they do is a lack of knowledge and experience. This leaves little choice but to rely on instinct, as Stanley says that "[t]hey, poor people, had only acted according to their nature" (ibid., p. 663). As such, Stanley's presentation of the Africans adheres to the imperialist discourse, in that the colonized are to be pitied and helped through civilization and colonization, so that they too may reach a state where they know how to act by learning from the colonizer.

Indeed, the civilized Western population seems to serve a central role for Stanley's narrative, as he and his technology is constantly under observation by an adoring crowd of Africans. He says that "all paid the tribute due to my color, with one grand concentrated stare" (Stanley, p. 258), and a while earlier, he describes their excitement as "a furious mob" all of the people, both men, women and children were "almost as naked as Mother Eve when the

world first dawned upon her in the garden of Eden" (ibid., p. 176). Rather than it being nothing more than a chance to promote himself by the reactions of others, Stanley notes how he finds little pleasure in it, as he would have rather preferred a "respectful silence, reserved behavior and esteem" (ibid.). When Stanley asks the Arabs why the mob will not quiet down, they reply: "'Heed them not; they are dogs who bite besides barking'" (ibid.). Judging from what Stanley would have preferred, one can assume that he finds the mob's stares and noises uncivil, which, as we just mentioned, the Africans cannot help but be, as they are ignorant in the ways of Stanley and the colonizers. Instead, they act in a manner akin to childlike awe at Stanley, much to his dismay. This childishness, in the face of Stanley and the wonders of Western technology, is somewhat of a theme in Stanley's text. One very striking example occurs when Stanley presents medicine to some chiefs:

> His chiefs roared with laughter, and clapped their hands, pinched each other, snapped their fingers, and committed many other ludicrous things. I verily believe if such a scene were presented on any stage in the world the effect of it would be visible instantaneously on the audience; that had they seen it as I saw it, they would have laughed themselves to hysteria and madness (Stanley, p. 335)

This excerpt is included, as it captures the view of the Africans rather fittingly. Whenever Stanley presents them with products of Western technology that he has brought along to ensure the success of his mission, such as guns and medicine, they respond with a childlike wonder and ecstasy. Stanley finds their reactions ludicrous and laughable, and although he knows better than to laugh in their faces, he knows that his fellow Europeans and Americans would be laughing if they could see it. This firmly establishes his attitude towards the Africans, in that he firmly believes the colonizers to be the superior race, and that they must bring civilization to the native population of the colonies, in order to raise them up from their pitiable state.

However, the Africans and their childlike ways are not the only nationality that Stanley becomes acquainted with throughout his narrative, as he also has several encounters with Arabs during his time in Africa. He defines the Arabs as being below the Westerner in the racial hierarchy, but even so, they stand above the half-caste and the African. As an example, with an outset in their status in Zanzibar, Stanley determines that the Arabs represent "the higher and the middle classes. These classes own estates, the ships, and the trade" (Stanley, p. 9). Through this, Stanley emphasizes that despite the stereotype of the rich Arab, there is nothing here that promotes the notion of them being even a little economically superior to the European

or American. In fact, on some levels, Stanley argues that they are less useful, such as his emphasis on how "you can't make them go faster by ever so much scolding and praying" (ibid., p. 18). Comparatively, Stanley seems to prefer to deal with the Africans, as he is in a favorable position, whereas the Arab seems unperturbed by Stanley's whims. This could also be a reflection of his experiences negotiating with the Arabs, as well as the fact that the Arabs were well-known slave traders, which, as we mentioned in "The Scramble for Africa: A Case of Altruism or a Profitable Excuse?", was one of the justifications for the Scramble for Africa to begin with.

While Stanley does, to some extent, define the Arabs as holding some positive qualities, and elevating them above the Africans, Stanley is determined not to let it be forgotten, that he still finds the Western colonist to be "much better […] behaved than the Arabs" (Stanley, p. 263). He also compares himself to the Arabs later, stating: "I succeeded, before long, in winning unqualified admiration, and my superiority, compared to the best of the Arabs they had seen, was but too evident" (ibid., p. 334). The reason for this apparent enmity between Stanley and the Arabs is most likely that he, as many others, perceives the Arabs as potential rival colonizers, spreading a civilization different from their own. His thoughts indicate as much, when he considered the potential Arab influence on Zanzibar.

> The Arab never changes. He brought the custom of his forefathers with him when he came to live on this island. He is as much of an Arab here, as at Muscat or Bagdad; wherever he goes to live, he carries with him his harem, his religion, his long robe, his shirt, his watta, and his dagger. If he penetrates Africa, not all the ridicule of the negroes can make him change his modes of life. Yet the land has not become Oriental; the Arab has not been able to change the atmosphere. The land is semi-African in aspect; the city is but semi-Arabic. (Stanley, pp. 5-6)

Through this description, Stanley displays two primary qualities of the Arabs, that makes them less suitable for the role of colonizers. Firstly, he notes that they are rigid and unchangeable, which may hint at the disparity between the cultural and technological levels of the Western societies, as compared to the Arabs. In the case of their culture, the aspects Stanley mentions are all different as compared to the Western one, making the Arab culture less admissible to be used to civilize the Africans, compared to the superior Western one, and he proceeds to argue that the appearance of the Arabs would garner ridicule from even the Africans themselves. Secondly, he underlines that the Arabs are not to be trusted, by stating that they will always bring their daggers. Both of these characterizations of the Arabs serve as

reminders of the underlying conflict between the Western colonizers and the Arabs, while also reinforcing the discursive notion that the Western civilization was supreme, particularly when compared to the Arabs who had not condemned slave trading, unlike many of the Western nations at this point in time.

While the Arabs were fairly clearly-defined and morally could be categorized as an enemy, due to their continued practice of slavery, a less clearly-defined group were depicted in Stanley's narrative as a consistent impediment to him and his goal. The half-castes "are neither black nor white, neither good nor bad, neither to be admired nor hated […]If I saw a miserable, half-starved negro, I was always sure to be told he belonged to a half-caste. Cringing and hypocritical, cowardly and debased, treacherous and mean, I have always found him" (Stanley, p. 6). As can be assumed from the name, the half-castes are the result of coupling between African and Arab parents, and were not regarded as belonging to either class. At one point, Stanley even defines them as "half-caste [...] instead of men" (ibid., p. 616), in an angry response, when they appear after his appeal for men from Zanzibar for his return trip following the success of his expedition. Due to their mixed ancestry, Stanley finds them difficult to place in the racial hierarchy, and rather than refer to them as if they were people, their nature seems too contemptuous to Stanley as they display some of the worst traits of their parentage. They are eager to serve the Arabs with great devotion, while being willing to perform great acts of violence upon their slaves, as if rejoicing in someone being beneath them (ibid. p. 64). Stanley gives an example of this during his time inland, when he hears of a half-caste who "poisoned the minds" of Livingstone's followers "ingratiated himself with them by selling the favours of his concubines" (ibid., p. 448). Stanley's portrayal of the half-castes seems to adhere to the Victorian Age's, and the Fin de Siècle's, focus on racial purity, as mixing the races were deemed to bring about the end of the purity of the essences of the individual nationalities. As such, to Stanley, they are something to be condemned and avoided, as they show only the worst potential from the two races from whence they originated, as they would bring about conflict and the end of civilized behavior.

As mentioned in the beginning of the chapter, Stanley's descriptions of other characters help us define him, as his narrative choices reveal things about himself as a character. As could be expected, little is mentioned about Stanley 's own physical features, except, once again, for the color of his skin, which he mentions on multiple occasions. The color of his skin is something of utmost importance to Stanley, as can be gleaned from statements of his, such as: "[w]e were white men, different people altogether from those whom they were accustomed to

see" (Stanley, p. 513). This all concurs with the Victorian ideal of a racial hierarchy, which is tied to the progress of the race's civilization, on the top of which sits the Caucasian and Western population. Rather fittingly, the way Stanley narrates his quest for Livingstone, every character that serves as his opponent is either African, Arab or half-caste, thus enforcing the discourse of the uncivilized being obstacles to the colonizers. It is interesting, that Stanley to some degree then forgets that Livingstone himself could be seen as an obstacle to Stanley's goal, as he early on in the narrative admits that if Livingstone had found out about Stanley's expedition, he would have put several miles between them, as he did not wish to be found (ibid., p. 46).

Although our character analysis has not encompassed the total sum of characters present in *How I Found Livingstone*, the ones we did cover, or the groups in some cases, are those we deem most relevant in regard to the topic of our project, as well as those who reveal the most about Stanley. The latter of those two is particularly important, since Stanley, as the protagonist, author, and narrator, has chosen which characters from his journey is mentioned, as well as how they are portrayed. These portrayals are what reinforces the imperialist discourse and its preaching of colonization and imperialism being just causes and philanthropic towards the Africans, as they result in a circulation of civilization, while also keeping them out of the hands of the misleading and slave-trading Arabs.

Overall, the narrative in *How I Found Livingstone* could be approached as somewhat binary, in that Stanley's depiction of the actors seem to follow the mindset that the Westerners are good, whereas the Africans and Arabs are either ignorant or bad. While Stanley does distinguish between good and bad colonizers, the line for him seems to be that the Western colonizers are the right ones to colonize and civilize the Africans, while the Arab colonizers are condemned for their culture and their inability to properly civilize the colonized. However, this does serve as an indication of how Stanley was influenced by, and attempted to reinforce, the discursive practices surrounding the topic of imperialism. He believes that the Western culture will be the only one suitable to be imparted unto the uncivilized Africans, and that the Arabs will never succeed in bringing civility to the continent, as he chides the Arabic culture for being backwards and lacking in comparison to that of the Western.

Each of the two texts depict the topic of colonial subjugation of the African population differently. In the case of Stanley's *How I Found Livingstone*, we see examples of what Laura E. Franey referred to as 'marked bodies' in *Victorian Travel Writing and Imperial Violence*. The marked bodies are those natives who have been beaten by their master and received marks or scars of the punishment as discernable, physical indications of their deeds and the

consequences. Bombay, from *How I Found Livingstone*, is an example of this given that his former master beat him as punishment. Raney states how these scars "will serve future travelers and colonial administrators as highly legible signs of Mubarak's imperial subjection" (Franey, p. 27). An example of this same practice is not found in *Heart of Darkness*, as the only scars mentioned in this are "ornamental scars on each of [the] cheeks" (Conrad, p. 37) on one of the cannibals described by Marlow on the steamboat. However, some of the natives are marked in a different manner, as Marlow describes how, at one of the stations, "each had an iron collar on his neck, and all were connected together with a chain whose bights swung between them" (ibid., p. 17).

This difference between bodily markings in the two narratives could serve as examples of how the two authors held different focuses concerning the presentation of the natives. In Stanley's case, the scars are a result, and reminder, of misdeeds by the natives, whereas, in *Heart of Darkness*, the scars are defined along with other bodily marks as signs of the natives' tribal traditions. Nevertheless, the natives are still marked as victims of imperial subjugation through iron collars, serving as a reminder by Conrad that the practice still occurs. At the same time, the scarring serves the purpose in both stories to define the differences between the colonizers and the colonized. In both cases, the scarring occurs solely to the natives, and serves as physical signs of uncivilized behavior; one is a punishment, while the other is simply savage custom.

Locations: The Scenery's Effect on Imperialist Discourse

As both of our primary texts are pieces of travel writing, wherein the narrators circulate the experiences they made in a foreign land, the locations featured in both texts hold a particular significance for the stories, as the way they are presented, much like with the characters from the chapter before, can reveal much about the narrator, their beliefs and their motivations. As such, the following chapter examines places and locations presented in the two narratives, as well as how these are portrayed. As with the previous chapter concerning characters, this one will be divided into two sub-chapters; one for *Heart of Darkness* and one then one for *How I Found Livingstone*.

Conrad's God-Forsaken Dark Places of the Earth

In *Heart of Darkness*, the plot begins at the setting of the primary narrative; on the *Nellie*, "a cruising yawl" (Conrad, p. 3), sailing on the Thames. The scene is described in a very colorful manner by the anonymous sailor, as the sun is setting in the West. "The water shone pacifically; the sky, without a speck, was a benign immensity of unstained light; the very mist on the Essex marsh was like a gauzy and radiant fabric, hung from the wooded rises inland, and draping the low shores in diaphanous folds" (ibid., p. 4). As the sun has passed down beyond the horizon, the description becomes more desolate, as if the place had been "stricken to death by the touch of that gloom brooding over a crowd of men" (ibid, p. 4). This change in appearance of the Thames and the surrounding lands leads to Marlow stating that "this also, [...] has been one of the dark places of the earth" (Conrad, p. 5). Not only does this change emphasize a start in transition from the narrative of the anonymous sailor to Marlow, but Marlow's comment hints at the Thames, and England as a whole, holding its share in the darkness of the world, revealing Marlow's mentality on the imperialist discourse and its binary world views very early on in the narrative.

Marlow continues his statement by discussing the Romans and how they came to England hundreds of years ago, going into a reference to the topic of light contra dark. He says: "[l]ight came out of this river […] but it is like a running blaze on a plain, like a flash of lightning in the clouds. We live in the flicker" (Conrad, p. 5). While the latter could be a hint to the Fin de Siècle movement and how the pessimistic thoughts permeated through literature and art during the Victorian Age (Navarette, p. 3), it could also be a hint at the continued change of the state known as 'civilized'. While, at his point in time, the English may be colonizers and

civilized, that has not always been the case, and the possibility remains for them to plummet from that state. The description of the land can be seen as a question as to whether any place on earth is devoid of this darkness, as Marlow's comments are backed up by the literal disappearance of the light, as is described by the anonymous sailor at the end of Marlow's narrative: "[t]he offing was barred by a black bank of clouds, and the tranquil waterway leading to the uttermost ends of the earth flowed sombre under an overcast sky—seemed to lead into the heart of an immense darkness" (Conrad, p. 77).

However, as was briefly mentioned earlier, the darkness can also symbolize how there still remains an inherent darkness in the colonizers, as is alluded to at the end of the text, once Marlow's narrative has finished, as the darkness remains. This would fit well with Conrad's portrayal of colonizers, as the character in his text that arguably spreads the most darkness is Kurtz, in the words of Brantlinger;" the would-be civilizer, the embodiment of Europe's highest and noblest values" (1988, p. 193).

The situation in Africa is slightly different to the situation on the Thames, as Marlow defines the continent as a complex place from the time he arrives. He first defines the jungle as "smiling, frowning, inviting, grand, mean, insipid, or savage, and always mute with and air of whispering, 'Come and find out'[…] The sun was fierce, the land seemed to glisten and drip with steam" (Conrad, p. 13), and the stations in Africa "looked like a God-forsaken wilderness, with a tin shed and a flag-pole lost in it" (ibid.). This change in description could, however, be due to the fact that it is now solely Marlow who is passing along the description of the scenery, rather than the anonymous sailor. The impression Marlow creates is that of the continent itself as inviting, yet with an underlying hostility," as if Nature herself had tried to ward off intruders" (ibid., p. 14).

The continent becomes an extension of the people, as Marlow states that "these chaps; […] had bone, muscle, a wild vitality, an intense energy of movement, that was as natural and true as the surf along their coast" (Conrad, p. 14) and similarly to the continent's rejection of the colonizer's, some of the natives fight the colonizer's off as well. This idea of the dark continent itself rejecting the advances of the colonizers becomes a recurring theme in Marlow's text. An example of this can be seen when Marlow and the steamboat are sailing towards the Inner Station, as they are sailing against the current, to the point where Marlow has to hope for the boat to make the journey, as the stream grows more rapid (ibid., p. 38). Similarly, after they have reached the Inner Station and have set out on the journey homewards, the river seems to eagerly propel the outsiders out from the land, as"[t]he brown current ran swiftly out of the

heart of darkness, bearing [them] down towards the sea with twice the speed of [their] upward progress" (ibid., p. 67). Though this approach does seem to bestow Africa with human intentions and abilities, Marlow's choice to depict it as such hints at his thoughts on the scenery, even if only as a result of his own state of mind, while also emphasizing the threat of the situation, as if the dark land itself is fighting against the colonizers.

Marlow's description of the landscape, as the steamboat is heading towards the Inner Station and the center of Africa, hints at the title of the novella and how the jungle is almost alive, with a heart of darkness at its center. Marlow writes how "[they] penetrated deeper into the heart of darkness. It was very quiet there" (Conrad, p. 35). At this point, the heart of darkness appears ominous and tense, due to the overwhelming silence, as even "the snapping of a twig would make you start" (ibid.). At this point, the heart of darkness represents primarily three things to Marlow; the first being that he does not feel safe, as the silence is making him dread what comes next. Secondly, to Marlow, the heart of darkness has become a representation of mankind's inner potential for incivility and violence. The final point regards what the geographical location represents, as Marlow defines how "[w]e were wanderers on a prehistoric earth, on an earth that wore the aspect of an unknown planet. We could have fancied ourselves the first of men taking possession of an accursed inheritance, to be subdued at the cost of profound anguish and of excessive toil" (ibid.). In this case, the darkness becomes a representation of the prehistoric place and state of mind, the silence and the untouched jungle reflecting the first men, which has come to define the uncivilized ways associated with Africa, despite the presence and influence of colonizers.

The title itself could very well be a reference to this location at the center of Africa. However, as mentioned previously, the title does not necessarily refer to a physical location. Considering how Kurtz is spreading the darkness from the Inner Station, the heart of darkness can arguably be located wherever there are people. Since the darkness is also present at the Thames, where the story is being narrated, the heart of darkness could refer to how darkness can be as much a matter of the internal, as the external; while the sun may set anywhere on the planet, the darkness is bound to no one place. Kurtz is no exception, despite him being both English and French. He still succumbs to his inner darkness, and spreads it further, showing that the Western culture is just as much at risk in the face of the primal tendencies inherent to all mankind.

A final point regarding the scenery in *Heart of Darkness* concerns how, particularly at the stations, the colonizers seem to be surrounded by inoperative technology and machinery

paving the ground, rusting. Marlow has only just arrived at the Central Station when he finds a boiler as well as "an undersized railway-truck" in the grass, both of which look dead "as the carcass of some animal. I came upon more pieces of decaying machinery, a stack of rusty rails" (Conrad, p. 15). This description of the machinery once again reminds the reader of the fallibility of Western advancements and technology when applied to the African culture and setting. Rather than serving as assets and benefiting the colonizers, the technology becomes a liability, due to the reliance on it, as is the case with Marlow's steamboat and the railway. The decaying machinery litters the ground like dying bodies, and thus serves either as a representation of the massive amount of colonists succumbing to the elements and diseases of the colonies, or of the Africans within the grove of death. "Black shapes crouched, lay, sat between the trees leaning against the trunks, clinging to the earth, half coming out, half effaced within the dim light, in all the attitudes of pain, abandonment, and despair [...] [t]hey were dying slowly" (ibid, p. 17). Thus, the colonizers continued attempts to implement their own advancement result in the scattered remains of both colonizers and colonized in their wake.

The scenery which Marlow describes in *Heart of Darkness* symbolizes Conrad's notion of the dark side to imperialism. It is filled with references to dying individuals, pieces of corroding machinery and a primal silence in these lands where civilization has not evolved since the beginning of time, reminding the reader of the death caused by the colonial undertakings in the Congo. At the same time, Conrad presents the African nature as a force that is attempting to repel intruders, with the example of the current impeding their journey towards the Inner Station, and the destroyed technology leaving the colonizers unable to progress. As such, this could be a reference to how Conrad deems the way imperialism is performed as detrimental to the native population of the colonies, rather than being the force for civility and progress it was meant to be to the colonized continent.

Stanley on Nature: An Unrefined Gem Waiting for Western Civilization

The following chapter examines the locations presented by Stanley in his narrative. It should be noted that, while Stanley does include two chapters concerning geographical and ethnographic notes, he has taken along the way, these will not be included in our analysis of locations, as these have little importance when regarding the narrative. This is because these chapters are exclusively made to the benefit of scholars and for his guidebook, and are therefore of little relevance to his journey, as he states in the second of the two chapters upon this topic, that he will now "relate, in a chapter specially devoted to" (Stanley, p. 516) what has been

discovered. Since he himself keeps his remarks on the geographical curiosities separate, we find that they add knowledge to the guidebook for any future traveler, but, as we deem the information Stanley presents throughout his travel to be of more value to his ideas of imperialism and the discourse thereof, the two chapters will not be included in our analysis.

Although the majority of the narrative of *How I Found Livingstone* takes place in Africa, Stanley's journey starts in Europe, although little attention is given to these surroundings, as they are not the focus of Stanley's travel writing and guide. The first place he describes is Zanzibar, as he outlines how big the island is, how many ships are at the ports, and the presence of both Africans, Arabs and Westerners. However, Stanley also notes negative aspects, such as how "[t]he climate of Zanzibar is not the most agreeable in the world" (Stanley, p. 16). Stanley then mentions how unclean the city is, noting the climate's influence on the colonists.

> [Stanley] expressed to [Capt. Webb his] wonder at the apathy and inertness of men born with the indomitable energy which characterizes the Europeans and Americans, of men imbued with the progressive and stirring instincts of the white people, who yet allow themselves to dwindle into pallid phantoms of their kind, into hypochondriacal invalids, into hopeless believers in the deadliness of the climate, with hardly a trace of that daring and invincible spirit which rules the world. (Stanley, p. 17)

Stanley infers that the climate is to blame for the Europeans' descending from their positions as progressive men to hopeless believers. For Stanley, the foreign climate of Zanzibar serves as an excuse for the changes some Westerners undergo while being in Africa. Thus, weather and harsh conditions become the culprits behind their change in behavior, as the colonizers are not accustomed to them, despite some of them, including Stanley, managing to surmount the climate and accomplish their goals.

After Stanley's stay in Zanzibar, the expedition proceeds to travel into Africa in their search for Livingstone, coming across villages and fields. As he walks past some of the fields, Stanley makes a note of the fertility of the soil, "producing grain and vegetables a hundredfold, the sowing and planting of which was done in the most unskilful manner" (Stanley, p. 76), while he also observes that the Africans working in the fields were naked. While this could be interpreted as a sign that the continent is more civilized than Stanley believes it to be, seeing as how the natives are capable of cultivating the soil, Stanley comments that the sowing and plating were "[d]one in the most unskillful manner" (ibid.), showing that, in Stanley's view,

the natives are novices in need of colonizing, as the fertile lands are being utilized in a wasteful manner.

Most of Stanley's descriptions of the continent concern the wilderness and jungle. One of Stanley's first encounters with the latter is when he wishes to pass through the jungle as it would provide the fastest route. While doing so, Stanley is wearing a flannel pajamas, as he deemed it the best clothing to travel in when traversing the jungle, although it results in his pajamas being ripped by plants and, later on, soiled, as he has to crawl through bushes in order to pass through the jungle. During his march through the jungle, Stanley is wounded by thorns and he finds the air hot and dense. Finally, he comments on the smell, stating that "there was a pungent, acrid plant, which, apart from its strong odorous emissions, stuck [him] smartly on the face, leaving a burning effect similar to cayenne" (Stanley, p. 92). As a result of this experience, Stanley vows that he will never penetrate the African jungle again, unless it is of utmost necessity. As promised, throughout the rest of the journey, Stanley avoids the jungle whenever possible, as he considers it impassable, which also highlights how impenetrable and wild Stanley depicts the land to be, and, consequently, as a statement of how much the natives need the colonizers to tame areas like the jungle.

One of the aspects of the scenery, that Stanley refers to in particular, is the richness of the land, as well as how this richness could be put to use by some civilized person or nation. He considers how useful the land is by stating that as a result of its "depth of black mud, its excessive dew, its dripping and chill grass, its density of rank jungle, and its fevers, [he] look[s] back upon the scene with pleasure, for the wealth and prosperity it promises to some civilized nation, which in some future time will come and take possession of it" (Stanley, p. 122). His description of the land is one seen through the eyes of a colonizer; one who wishes to cultivate the land and make better use of it than the natives are capable of, rather than one who can appreciate the scenery for what it is. While Stanley might not be on the look for land to colonize himself, he nonetheless portrays the land as a place in need of civilization, here both referring to the land itself, as well as its inhabitants. Stanley proceeds to explain how railroads and drainage systems will make the country more inhabitable to civilized occupants, thereby making the land itself more desirable for future colonizers (ibid., pp. 122-123). While Stanley is pitching the land as best as possible to would-be colonizers, he is also reinforcing the discourse that the land needs civilization, thereby justifying any colonization.

Another example of Stanley attempting to pitch the African countryside to potential colonizers can be found when he is looking at mountains in the distance and states: "[t]he

mountain slopes are densely wooded with trees that might supply very good timber for building purposes" (Stanley, p. 142). As was the case with the previous example, Stanley here displays little interest in the scenery as it is, but rather sees it as a potential resource waiting for the civilized to make use of it. Likewise, as the expedition is traveling back to Zanzibar, after having met Livingstone, Stanley comes across a picturesque place with a foul odor, noticing that "the foulness might be removed by civilized people, and the whole region made as healthy as it is productive" (ibid., p. 585). In this instance as well, Stanley sees the scenery as something that can be improved upon by the colonizers, thus showcasing how he adheres to the imperialist discourse and its tenets of the colonies as areas that must be civilized, not only to the benefit of the native inhabitants, but also for those willing to serve as colonists.

As is noted upon in the chapter "Conrad's God-Forsaken Dark Places of the Earth", the continent symbolizes its native inhabitants and vice versa. In *How I Found Livingstone*, this is also the case, albeit with the difference of 28 years publication and the fact that Stanley was in an African country not taken over by colonizers. Stanley defines how "[t]he wilderness in Africa proves to be, in many instances, more friendly than the populated country" (Stanley, p. 205). Despite the obstacles, such as the almost impenetrable jungle, the regions Stanley travels through on his expedition are passable, unlike in *Heart of Darkness*, where the jungle, anthropomorphically, is given human qualities and seems to actively try to repel the colonizers. If a comparison between the continent and the inhabitants were to be made, based on Stanley's perspective, it would be that they seem to complicate his journey slightly, but not to an extent that is insurmountable. Rather, he seems to see some value in both, but only from a colonialist point of view.

To summarize, Stanley puts an emphasis on the wilderness and its potential in the hands of the capable, civilized colonizer. Yet, he does pay attention to the picturesqueness of the land as well. He is looking at "greenly-tinted slopes, dark with many a densely-foliaged tree; its many rills flowing sweet and clear […] giant sycamore and parachute-topped mimosa, and permitting [his] imagination to picture sweet views behind the tall cones above" (Stanley, p. 167). While Stanley is tempted to brave his fatigue to go up and look over the summit, he does not do so, as he states that despite not enjoying the view from the summit, "his love for the picturesque [was not] disappointed" (ibid.). Despite him showing restrain in regard to taking full use of the scenery in this particular location, Stanley's general attitude displays a tendency toward seeking possible improvements on the African jungle, which, he argues, can only be achieved by the direct intervention by Western civilization.

Conclusion

In conclusion, through our examination of narratological tools, as well as our approach to readability and quest plots, *How I Found Livingstone* promotes imperialist discourse, whereas *Heart of Darkness* performs a counter-discursive response to the repercussions of colonial undertakings. In the case of Conrad's text, this is done in a manner showing his disillusionment with the binary world view of the colonizers, in regard to their attitude, that their superiority permits and justifies, what eventually turned into, violent actions against the native population of the colonies. His disillusionment is illustrated through his reconceptualization of the quest plot, as he indirectly argues that such a thing as the traditional quest is no longer a possibility, due to the misleading nature of the imperialist discourse.

Stanley, on the other hand, adheres to the traditional, quest plot and the binary imperialist discourse, putting emphasis on the Western colonizer's superiority, both in regard to the African and the Arab population, thereby reinforcing the idea that they have an obligation to elevate the uncivilized, or make use of their land in a way only the colonizer can. This could be the result of the differences in Stanley's and Conrad's settings, as their texts concern different locations, conditions, and periods in time, as well as the fact that each author had different motivations for writing their texts.

Still, despite their differences, both authors seem to be in favor of imperialism, although Conrad's attitude displays more of an outrage at the greed and selfish desires motivating some of the imperialist practices. Each of the two texts refer to the Africans with the usual stereotypes of the Victorian Age, in that they are displayed as lazy, inept, childlike and violent; in short, they are presented as in need of guidance. In that respect, the authors are in agreement. Yet, to Conrad, the colonizers are displaying just as much of a tendency toward inaptitude and violence, when fueled by uncivilized ambitions, which may well have been the result of his reaction to the dark turn the colonization of Africa would take. Likewise, if one perceives his *Heart of Darkness* as a criticism of Stanley, it may be the result of Stanley's treatment of the natives of Africa (Pakenham, p. 59), or Stanley's subsequent employment under King Leopold II (ibid., p. 60); who was, himself, one of the worst offenders in the case of using the imperialist discourse as an excuse for personal agenda.

Had we wished to highlight other approaches to imperialism, we could, alternatively, have made use of additional pieces of travel writing literature, thereby getting a more nuanced cross section of Victorian travel writing. For instance, by including texts of H. Rider Haggard,

where the setting often surrounds the conflict between an English self and a foreign otherness found in Africa, such as *She* or *King Solomon's Mines*, we may have been able to further explore the assumption of British imperialism as the natural state of the world. Each of the two examples provide substance to the argument of a negative perception of imperialism, as *She* revolves around a foreign colonizer exerting her influence over an African tribe with violent consequences, and *King Solomon's Mines* involves an African chief, who decides to reject any further influence by the foreign colonizers. However, we chose to focus on making a qualitative analysis of the two texts in this project instead, due to their deceptively similar appearances, their startlingly different portrayals of colonialism and the relationship between the two authors and their motivations.

Works Cited

Bal, Mieke. *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*. 2nd ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1999.

Baucom, Ian. *Out of Place: Englishness, Empire, and the Locations of Identity*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press. 1999.

Bennett, Norman R. "Introduction" *Stanley's Despatches to the New York herald, 1871-1872, 1874-1877* by Stanley, Henry Morton. Boston University Press. 1970, pp. xiii-xxxviii

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

Brantlinger, Patrick. *Victorian Literature and Postcolonial Studies*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 2009.

Brantlinger, Patrick. *Taming Cannibals: Race and the Victorians*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 2011.

Brooks, Peter. "An Unreadable Report: Conrad's Heart of Darkness." *Heart of Darkness*. Ed. Armstrong, Paul B., New York. W.W. Norton & Company. 2017, pp. 342-353.

Castle, Gregory. *The Blackwell Guide to Literary Theory*. Oxford. Blackwell Publishing, 2007.

Conrad, Joseph. *Heart of Darkness: Authoritative text, backgrounds and contexts, criticism*. 5th ed. Ed. Paul B. Armstrong. New York: W.W. Norton & Company. 2017.

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

Foucault, Michel. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings*. Ed. Colin Gordon. Trans. Colin Gordon et al.. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.

Franey, Laura E. *Victorian Travel Writing and Imperial Violence: British Writing on Africa, 1855-1902*. New York. Palgrave Macmillan. 2003.

Freundlieb, Dieter. "Foucault and the Study of Literature." *Poetics Today*, vol. 16, no. 2, 1995, pp. 301–344., www.jstor.org/stable/1773331.

Fussel, Paul. *Abroad: British Literary Traveling Between the Wars*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1980.

Gifford, Terry. *Pastoral*. New York: Routledge. 2001.

Greenblatt, Stephen. "Towards a Poetics of Culture." *The New Historicism*. Ed.Veeser, H. Aram, New York: Routledge. 1989, pp. 1-14.

Hard, Robin. *The Routledge Handbook of Greek Mythology*. New York. Routledge: Taylor & Francis Group. 2004.

Kolesnikoff, Nina. "Story/plot." *Encyclopedia of contemporary literary theory*. Edited by: Irena R. Makaryk. University of Toronto Press. 1993, pp. 361-362.

Memmi, Albert. *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. London: Earthscan Publications Ltd.. 2003.

Navarette, Susan Jennifer. *Shape of Fear: Horror and the Fin de Siècle Culture of Decadence*. Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky. 1998.

Pakenham, Thomas. *The Scramble for Africa: 1876-1912*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson. 1991.

Said, Edward W. "Preface". *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient*. Edward W. Said. London: Penguin Books, 2003, pp. xii-xxiii

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient*. London: Penguin Books. 1978.

Said, Edward W. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf Inc.. 1993

Stanley, Henry M. *How I Found Livingstone; Travels, Adventures, and Discoveries in Central Africa; including four months' residence with Dr. Livingstone*. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Low, And Searle. 1872.

Tromp, Marlene et al., editors. *Fear, Loathing, and Victorian Xenophobia*. The Ohio State University Press, 2013.

Veeser, H. Aram, editor. *The New Historicism: Reader*. New York: Routledge, 1994.

Veeser, H. Aram, editor. *The New Historicism*, New York: Routledge, 1989.