Chapter 6

The Waves: "Shadows" of imperialism and colonialism

> *Indeed, it is power with which we shall be concerned, indirectly but persistently. Our modern "innocence" speaks of power as if it were a single thing: on one side those who have it, on the other side those who do not. We have believed that power was an exemplarily political object; we believe now that power is also an ideological object, that it creeps in where we do not recognize it at first, into institutions, into teaching, but still that it is always one thing.*[1] Roland Barthes

6. 1. "Rainbow of different colours forming a single arc": ideology of imperialism

Language is not innocent and neutral. Every language and sign might be, as Roland Barthes states, "the sites where different ideologies intersect and clash with one another," it is an "abstract circle of truths, outside of which alone the solid residue of an individual *logos* begins to settle."[2] Language for a writer is "rather a frontier," it is a "field of action, the definition of, and hope for, a possibility"[3] that expands man's horizon of expectations and provides a distant setting of familiarity. Through this function of language, the writer's political attitude and ideology are shaped by playing with language as a tool that is always under the control of power. In fact, literary texts such as travel or adventure narratives, which include "complex clusters of languages and signs," can be considered as extremely fecund sites for illustrating power and its "ideological interactions."[4]

Woolf's language, in *The Waves*, is, accordingly, a complex articulation between individuals, their social and cultural contexts, their hidden political attitudes and their quest for identification, especially self-identity, shown by the play of language based on her travels and her travelling gaze as an armchair traveller. Travel narratives play a very crucial role in fashioning and refashioning cultural authority, especially for the colonizers. My basic point is that travel narratives and their (hi)stories are, as Edward Said states, "at the heart of what explorers and novelists say about strange regions of the world."[5] These stories elucidate the methods the colonizer and colonized people use to

assert their own identity and the existence of their own history. In this regard, *The Waves* is a testimony to Woolf's concern with the colonial discourse, fantasy or imagination, which bears testimony to a varied literary heritage, the conventions of romance, as well as the imperial adventure narrative that informs and shapes its narrative structure. Its invisible and masked panoramic scene of the Indian or African landscape—produced in the form of a "Robinsonade"[6] Island—, the "Indianist" and "Africanist"[7] discourses, the cultural and social differentiation between the East and the West place it under the category of the imperial adventure narratives. The standard form of English adventure narratives portrays, in Said's words, a "miniature symbol, of the entire West, and indeed out to be taken to represent the West as a whole," since the West or the British Empire are an enemy of the "Indian and many other non-European peoples who suffered Western colonialism and prejudice."[8] Woolf reads imperialism and translates it ironically:

> True, they had money and power, but only at the cost of harbouring in their breasts an eagle, a vulture, [...]—the instinct for possessions, the rage for acquisition which drives them to desire other people's fields and goods perpetually; to make frontiers and flags; battleships and poison gas; to offer up their own lives and their children's lives. Walk through [...] any other avenue given up to trophies and canon, and reflect upon the kind of glory celebrated there. (*RO*: 58)

Implicitly, Woolf defines imperialism and its colonizing power. The "glory celebrated" by the power is colonization, because the colonized have "served all these years as looking-glasses possessing the magic and delicious power of reflecting the figure of man at twice its natural size" (*RO*: 53). She remarks that the imperial power's behaviour shows "the lack of civilisation" (*RO*: 59). She satirizes, in Said's words, a part of "the general European effort to rule distant lands and people," because the main battle of "imperialism is over land."[9]

The association of the white or English lifestyle with the coloured or non-English people's culture paves the way for a colonialist fantasy either to support or to interrogate the authority of colonial power through colonial discourse. Culture comes to be associated with "the nation or the state," which, as Said argues, "differentiates 'us' from 'them', almost always with some degree of xenophobia."[10] Culture is a "source of identity"[11]; hence, through analyzing culture as a discourse, it is possible to trace the visible and invisible, the dominant and marginalized forms and institutions of power. The

development and continuation of every culture "require[s] the existence of another different competing *alter ego*," because the constitution of identity (whether of the Orient or the Occident) includes "establishing opposites and 'others' whose actuality is always subject to the continuous interpretation and re-interpretation of their differences from 'us'."[12]

In fact, each age, society or culture needs its 'others' to define, and redefine itself, for instance in this case, its Britishness, which depends on the identities of different 'others,' whether they be colonized, marginal, immigrant or outsiders. Orientalism and colonialism are, in Said's words, the product of the "doctrines of European superiority", "various [kinds] of racism" and "imperialism" which show "the idea of European identity as a superior one in comparison with all the non-European peoples and cultures."[13] Woolf comments on the same idea in her ironical and metaphorical comparison of men and women as colonizer and colonized in *A Room of One's Own*:

> this claiming of superiority and imputing of inferiority, belong[s] to the private-school stage of human existence where there are "sides", and it is necessary for one side to beat another side, and of the utmost importance to walk up to a platform and receive from the hands of the Headmaster [the agent of imperial power] himself a highly ornamental pot. (*RO*: 159)

For Woolf, imperialist ideology is a "crude and immature" form of knowledge which "lack[s] suggestive power" (*RO*: 154). Colonialism, then, as an ideological practice of imperialism is the implanting of various settlements on distant territories. As Leonard Woolf, for instance, writes, "I have set foot in India now & found it Jaffna, but a wilderness more desolate even than Jaffna."[14]

To indicate, however, the construction of an unequal form of intercultural relations and cultural differences and discriminations, there are two ways of representing colonial discourse: one category is concerned with the Western representation of trans-cultural relations through an objective discipline, like those scholars who support their ideas with certain disciplinary ideologies, such as philology, history and anthropology. The second category is a subjective, individual or personal ground on which various claims for ideological and political studies of colonialism can be made. Woolf's travel narratives, which I believe belong to the second category, show that because of the imperial hegemony there are "adulterated forms of culture [...] the forms of brain prostitution

which are so insidiously suggested by the pimps and panders of the brain-selling trade" (*TG*: 87). More precisely, the colonial contact is a crucial aspect of Woolf's travel narrative which deals with identity and culture through ideological filters or ways of seeing. She mocks the British people's behaviour, who "talk during dinner without much difficulty about politics and people; war and peace; barbarism and civilization" (*TG*: 4).

Woolf constructs *The Waves* upon an adventure romance by using an exotic imperial setting, in this case, colonial India[15] (or Ceylon), or to some extent Africa, as a Robinsonade Island. The inspiring landscape features of irregularity, immensity and the uncontrollable natural energies of the island are at odds with England's regularity and its pastoral beauty. The sublime wildness of setting also shows and reinforces the manifestation of its dangers. Indeed, the colonial adventures pave the way for the heroic subjectivity of the English that is not available to them in England; hence, the colonial land opens a space for the heroic adventures. For this reason, by framing a fictional discourse of history and nation in her travel narrative, Woolf portrays India and women as a proper space for the imperial romance. I use the term colonization not only in its usual sense as an oppression ordered by imperialism, but also in its metaphoric sense, as a particular form of oppression formulated by the patriarchal system. In this sense, women and those who are socially, sexually and racially marginalized are considered as colonized and the male-dominated society as colonizer. For instance, *The Waves*, metaphorically, indicates Rhoda as a desirable colonial object rather than subject in the view of the colonizer whose quest for 'otherness' or identity will never finish. She is "at war with her lot. How could she help but die young, cramped and thwarted?" (*RO*: 104)

There are very close ties, Nicolas Daly states, between "the expanding empire and the expanding culture industry."[16] As mentioned in the third chapter, although Mary Louis Pratt's term transculturation[17] suggests the interaction between different cultures, it is colonization that engenders such ideologies of difference since it brings various groups of peoples into intimate contact with one another. This does not mean that the travel narratives simply reflect the dominant political ideologies and defend them, such as the Western ideologies of colonialism; rather, they might frequently "militate against them."[18] For instance, *The Waves* criticizes the contemporary ideas about the brutality, bestiality, even incivility of the colonized, as well as the gentleness, kindness and civility

of the male colonizers who hide themselves and their "sterile mind[s]" (*RO*:130) behind the mask of civilization. It is a critique of the victory of white man's knowledge over the non-Europeans' or Orientals' savagery such as the Indians' and Africans'.

The Waves has the potential of white adventure (hi)stories to unmap as well as to map, to challenge as well as to assert the presence of British imperialism. It is an adventure with a critical analysis of imperiality and its ideology, without disturbing the adventure motifs. In other words, it is an adventure in its imaginative geography, as a medium by which to negotiate the colonial practice of imperialism, especially in the history of England during the twentieth century. *The Waves* maps British superiority and Europeanization and motivates the readers to participate in a condensed imperial adventure during at least three decades—the 1910s, 1920s and 1930s. The book represents the consequences of the Great War and their impact upon the colonies, such as India and Africa, as the particular scenes of the presence of the 'imperialist adventures' on which the British imperial power and will was (and is) built. It maps on the one hand the British colonies, on the other hand the metaphorical and literal map of the British Empire after the Great War.

My objective in this chapter is threefold, first, to illustrate how Woolf's travelling eyes move from England to the colonized India (or Jaffna), and to some extent Africa (Egypt and Morocco), which is the result of her journeys into the travel narratives and records of contemporary writers, especially Leonard Woolf and Vita Sackville-West. One of the destructive objectives of colonialism is to victimize and marginalize the colonized people. Metaphorically speaking, the white males Neville, Bernard and to a certain degree Louis, as the British colonizer and the white female Susan and Jinny as the British women who are colonized by patriarchal society, and Rhoda as (a representative of) an in-between female or subaltern,[19] doubly colonized, are "thwarted and hindered" (*RO*:75) by the male-dominated imperialism. This hierarchy or opposition of male/female, white/black, master/slave, colonizer/colonized and central/peripheral suggests the binary worlds of characters in an unrealistic imaginary setting (the Robinsonade Island). *The Waves* is a critique of Western politics by mixing a Western and an Eastern untold narrative to signify how the West ignores the Eastern history and race through marginalizing it. As Woolf states, "you [the oppressed people] are being shut out, you are

being shut up, because you are Jews, because you are democrats, because of race, because of religion" (*TG*: 94). *The Waves* challenges the superiority of the West and the inferiority of the East. It criticizes the Western ideology that the East is in need of the West, in a way, and that the West gives it order, civilization, culture and identity. Although colonial travel is a *leitmotif* used in *The Voyage Out, Mrs Dalloway* and *Orlando*, *The Waves* is the clearest point of Woolf's departure from the previous forms of imperialist adventure.

Second, I am interested to show how Woolf's travelling eyes are focused on analyzing the influence of imperialism and the representation of colonialism by portraying the growth of six characters from childhood into adulthood. Their educational system confirms how imperialism plans an unremitting program to train a docile individual as "an instrument"[20] both inside and outside the lands under its control. The process is similar to what Michel Foucault argues about a docile person who can be made "out of a formless clay, an inapt body [...] turning silently into automatism of habit."[21] Regarding this point, I would like to show how Woolf challenges the inculcation of "docility," which joins "the analyzable body to the manipulable body."[22] In fact, imperialism makes the "pawns and puppets dancing on a string held by invisible hands" (*TG*: 6). More precisely, power penetrates all institutions and educational system invisibly. For instance, Jinny's reference to "the portrait of Queen Alexandra" (*W*: 427, 434)—the wife of Edward VII, hanging in her school—is not a sign without signification; rather, it indicates the passing of their childhood in the Edwardian period, which is an allusion to the Great War on the one hand, and the imperial panopticon system on the other.

Woolf, metaphorically, figures the body of imperialism whose head might be Bernard; eyes, Neville; feet, Louis; heart, Susan; beauty, Jinny; and the productive and consuming hands, Rhoda as the symbol of colonies.[23] This reflects a special form of Europeanization, especially the cultural hegemony and dominance of Britain, as a belief in her right to exploit both the colonizer and the colonized subjects' identity. In the last episode, when Bernard reviews his life for a stranger in a restaurant, he recognizes that in some strange and complicated ways the story of his life is interwoven with the lives of other characters. He sees that even though they are separated from each other they are in

a way related to each other. This paradoxical relationship signifies the reciprocal interaction between the imperial authority and the colonies.

Bernard—the male intellectual, the biographer, the historian, the representation of a patriarchal system which might be analogous to imperialism—feels himself a part of them all. He sees all their desires, their social and cultural normalities or abnormalities, and realizes that his life is not his own alone. This is Bernard's metonymic/synecdochic image as an extraordinary mixture of the lives of all characters who wear different social masks of imperiality: "I am not one person; I am many people; I do not altogether know who I am—Jinny, Susan, Neville, Rhoda, or Louis; or how to distinguish my life from theirs" (*W*: 564). This, in turn, suggests that the imperial power controls all movements, gestures and attitudes of the individuals; indeed, it has a microscopic power over the active bodies. In Foucault's terms, the human body enters a "machinery of power that explores it, breaks it down, and rearranges it" in order to make a "political anatomy," which defines how imperialism "may have a hold over others' bodies" with "the techniques, the speed, and the efficiency"[24] that power determines.

Third, I focus my argument on the final pages of *The Waves* which underscore the ambiguous and ambivalent presence of imperialism in the colonies. Colonialism and Orientalism, as Said argues, bring to mind "the question of whether modern imperialism ever ended, or whether it has continued in the Orient [or in the world] since Napoleon's entry into Egypt two centuries ago."[25] However, Woolf foresees such a form of imperialism, when she writes, "[t]hat is why Napoleon and Mussolini both insist so emphatically upon the inferiority of [women as the colonized subjects], for if they were not inferior, they would cease to enlarge" (*RO*: 54). Thus, when Bernard walks "in some unidentified city on some unspecified night,"[26] he says:

> I could go like a spy without leaving this place, without stirring from my chair. I can visit the remote verges of the desert lands where the savage sits by the camp-fire. [...] Light floods the room and drives shadow beyond shadow to where they hang in folds inscrutable. What does the central shadow hold? (*W*: 572-3)

The significance of this "central shadow," emphasized by Susan Gorsky as "an 'inscrutable' shadow"[27] at night, might be the ambiguous and unknown shadowy image of the British sovereignty in the colonies, leaving man neither at night nor at dawn, the

instability of meaning in the modern world, or the multifaceted nature of human being and his complex identity. Woolf fictionalizes "the rise of," or "the fall of," and the "rise again" of various forms of imperialism. For instance, the phrase "the eternal renewal, the incessant rise and fall and fall and rise again," (*W*: 575) underlines the impact of imperialism on shaping, reshaping, creating and recreating its realm of power.

The Waves portrays the power of "imperial discourse rather than military or economic might"[28] that confirms the hegemony of imperialism, especially in the colonies. Nigel Nicolson writes *The Waves* is a "rainbow of different colours forming a single arc."[29] I believe that this rainbow with its different colours might metaphorically be the rainbow of imperial power showing itself in various indistinguishable colours yet forming a single arc. The various colours (forms) of imperialism that are briefly reviewed by Woolf in her travel narratives—such as Portuguese, French and British imperialism—are gathered in *The Waves* as the rainbow of different colours forming a single arc.

The events of the travel narrative figure the significance of imperialism by military conquest in the Great War in 1914, as the formal emergence or existence of imperialism in the colonies and its influences on the British life. In spite of the fact that by 1914, "the age of 'classical imperialism' had come to an end," by this time, in Ashcroft's words, the British imperiality demonstrates "its protean nature, its ability to change centres, to adapt to the changing dynamic of world power,"[30] shown at the end of the travel narrative. For example, Percival's farewell dinner party celebrates the significance of a heroic symbol. Percival is the representation of the Great War or imperialism in the form of military conquests. Therefore, his failure or "Quixotic death"[31] might signify the destruction of the military presence of British Empire, its ideal or god-like presence, or its defeat and incapability both in the colonies and in Europe. Unlike the Arthurian knight Percival, he fails, yet his attempts, even if shortly, pave the way for the future generation and Bernard to replace his failure with a new kind of success.

Woolf's interest in dealing with imperial and colonial discourse might be the result of Leonard's anti-imperialist activities and writings,[32] especially his explanation of the complex motives, that lay behind the imperial politics formulated by him in 1919 in his *Empire and Commerce in Africa*.[33] Leonard's argument concerning Africa crystallizes his policy that the British Empire is wrong in itself and the product of its colonization is, as

Duncan Wilson states, "pragmatically unjustifiable."[34] The outcomes of his personal experiences in Ceylon give an idea to Virginia Woolf not only to dislike many aspects of imperialism but also to hate taking part any longer in the British Empire's show.[35]

6. 2. "*White shadows*" of imperialism in India and Africa

One of the reasons for creating colonial authority is constructing the dichotomy of a European or Western self and a non-European or Eastern other. One part of these oppositions is whiteness, which, as Gail Ching-Liang Low states, "operates as an invisible norm in racist cultures and exnominates itself as a colour by positioning itself outside the self/Other dialectic."[36] In the European scenario, white resembles the "ideal universal man" who moves "from 'absolute specificity' to 'the pure formality of representative man'."[37] Skin and its colour, its whiteness or "visibility represent[s] it as a signifier of discrimination which is one visible form of the exercise of power."[38] Considering colour as a "cultural/political *sign* of inferiority or degeneracy," and skin as "its natural 'identity'," one can trace them as the main points of difference, discrimination and the visible forms of power relations in the social strata of the colonized countries.

Colonial discourse, as Virginia Woolf states, helps to assert "some innate superiority" (*RO*: 52) that implies hostility. Leonard claims: "I do not think that the British Government has fought steadily aganst [sic] the colour bar in Southern Rhodesia, in Northern Rhodesia, or in Kenya"; based on this claim, he calls Africa, the "British Africa."[39] Indeed, the racial concept results in the act of "disavowal and fixation" in the colonizer that leads him to "the narcissism of the Imaginary and its identification of an ideal ego that is white and whole."[40] This process creates circulating chains of ideals such as superior, complete, civilized, rational, and so forth.

Woolf criticizes the "whiteness" of the British body and soul. *The Waves*, as Jane Marcus states, represents a "literature of color, and that color is white, a literature written under the protection of the 'white arm' of imperialism and defining itself by the brown and black of colonized peoples."[41] In fact, for Bernard, the white empire and its orderly civilization make the self of England, it is neither a fragmented self nor one self; it might be the mixture of the selves of a group of white male intellectual elites who are able to

control the politics of British imperialism. As Marcus has pointed out, this "Occidental tribe of alienated characters"[42] are the representatives of Bloomsbury intellectuals; Rhoda, Virginia; Neville, Lytton Strachey; Louis, Leonard; Percival, Thoby; Susan, Vanessa. They inscribe, in Marcus's words, "their class and race superiority only by imagining a world of the Savage Other [Oriental men] in India and Africa," where their hero representative, Percival "secures their privilege by violent exertions of brute force."[43] Indeed, *The Waves* shows that both the first and the last desire of the male British is an imperialist quest for power through the discourse of whiteness.

Lauren Rusk quotes Adrienne Rich's statement that "Woolf's 'feminism led her by the end of her life to anti-imperialism'"; in this regard, "the delusion of destiny [is] that white is at the centre, that white is endowed with some right or mission to judge and ransack and assimilate and destroy the values of other peoples."[44] Woolf's remarkable and broader critique of imperialism and its system of oppression and exclusion are stated in her *Three Guineas*: "[y]ou shall swear that you will do all in your power to insist that any woman who enters any profession shall in no way hinder any other human being, whether man or woman, white or black" (*TG*: 63). This statement confirms her anti-racist and anti-imperialist ideology. *The Waves* presents Rhoda as a metaphor for a desirable colonized object (doubly colonized)—in the view of the male colonizer—whose inferiority prevents her even from the fleeting moments of superiority like the colonized subjects, because the colonizer denigrates the colonized woman as being an object.

Woolf's *A Room of One's Own* and *Three Guineas* are great testimonies to express a sense of implication in the machinery of empire as well as a fellowship with the British Empire's victims, essentially women. The brief passage about the death of Judith Shakespeare (Shakespeare's sister), in *A Room of One's Own* ("she found herself with child [...] killed herself one winter's night" [*RO*: 73]) very implicitly "allies women and colonized peoples, both subject to the patriarchal will."[45] Judith's death metaphorically foreshadows the colonized's and women's fate, regarding them as inferior or as benefactors. Such women, considered as the wealth and properties of men's life, are synecdochic/metonymic signs of the colonial lands, such as India and Africa, which are "the jewel in England's crown."[46] Rusk states, "Judith's tragic story identifies Englishwomen with Indians and Africans as those collectively walled off by the

fortresses, overrun by the omnibuses, the patriarchal machinery, of empire."[47] The British men, especially at that time, are accustomed to superiority which motivates them to be in quest of colonies, to create the hierarchy of colonizer and colonized and to solidify colonization to stabilize the British Empire or the servant/master hierarchy. In contrast, as Woolf argues, "[i]t is one of the great advantages of being a woman that one can pass even a very fine negress without wishing to make an Englishwoman of her" (*RO*: 76).

The same discourse is encoded in Bernard's soliloquy:

> Rome is the limit of my travelling. As I drop asleep at night it strikes me sometimes with a pang that I shall never see savages in Tahiti spearing fish by the light of a blazing cresset, or a lion spring in the jungle, or a naked man eating raw flesh. [...] But as I think, truth has come nearer. For many years I crooned complacently, "My children ... my wife ... my house ... my dog." [...] Tahiti becomes possible. Leaning over this parapet I see far out a waste of water. (*W*: 516-17)

Rome, the former capital of Roman Empire, is the symbol of a *strong* imperial power. He desires to see the "savages in Tahiti,"[48] or "a lion spring in the jungle, or a naked man eating raw flesh," which reminds us of Bernard's fear of the colonized or their barbaric behaviour and his quest for India. Yet the striking point are the analogies between children, wife, house and dog; he places all on the same rank as objects for his pleasure or as his possessions. Woolf refers to such analogies when she quotes: "a woman acting put him [Nick Greene] in mind of a dog dancing" or "a woman's composing is like a dog's walking on his hind legs" (*RO*: 82-3). Elsewhere, she states that the men's "prosperity—wife, children, house—has been deserved" or all that men "most value [are]—wife, children, home" (*TG*: 4, 15). These analogies suggest that both Africa or the colonial land and women are puppets under the control of the patriarchal system of power. In this system, women "are split subjects who watch themselves being watched by men"; for this reason, they "turn themselves into objects because femininity itself is defined by being gazed upon by men."[49] Bernard objectifies the blacks and women in the same way.

Rhoda's hallucinatory dream world guides her to a suicidal sati-like death ("she has killed herself," [*W*: 567]) at the end of the travel narrative. This means that there is no way, as Ashcroft writes, in which the "oppressed or politically marginalized groups can voice their resistance" in the real world or that, "the subaltern only has a dominant

language or a dominant voice in which to be heard."[50] Rhoda's activity in the world of dreams and her passivity in the world of reality show that she is usually silent and faceless in contrast to Bernard who is active, talkative and multi-faced.

Jinny calls herself "a native of this world" (*W*: 472) with an emphasis on her Britishness or Englishness and when she adds, "[l]et the silent army of the dead descend. I march forward," (*W*: 521) she refers to the superiority of British identity that yields itself up to no peripheral or subaltern identity. However, her sexual behaviour or her metaphoric internal journey into the body might be analogous to the colonial relationship portrayed in *The Waves*: "[o]ur bodies communicate. [...] The black-and-white figures of unknown men look at me as I lean forward [...]. Our bodies, his hard, mine flowing are pressed together within its body; it holds us together" (*W*: 470-1). In the colonial situation, women are considered as the "crucial markers" or victims of cultural difference or as "indicative of a degenerate culture," and their labour feeds the colonial desire of "the colonial machine."[51] By portraying such women, Woolf wants to challenge colonialism on an emotional plane. Therefore, Jinny and Susan are representative subjects, "as literal 'wombs of empire' whose function was limited to the population of the new colonies with white settlers"[52] which shows in itself the "*white shadows*" (*W*: 544) of power. Hence, as Marcus argues, such women "in their roles as victims, silenced subjects [...] still participate in imperialist practice."[53]

Moreover, *The Waves* might imply the disguised face of white men under the black mask of heredity. As Martin Green writes, "the thing a man must do is the thing he was born to."[54] This system of thought not only values "certain *styles* of being" but also judges them by "their graces as much as by their virtues."[55] This supports the idea that race thinking and colonialism go hand in hand to indicate the superiority of white people, especially men, and draw a binary distinction between the white/black, beautiful/ugly, colonizer/colonized, civilized/primitive and so forth. The use of these oppositions in the colonial discourse illustrates the necessity for the hierarchization of human types. All these attempts are for the sake of reconstructing the colonial identity. Woolf's dialectic, however, is muffled and disguised in the modern metaphoric system of adventure narratives which is focused on finding the authority of identification.

What prevents the completion of self-identity or creates an identity crisis is the contradiction between the white subject's narcisstic desire for wholeness and its avowal of difference. The dichotomy between the self and the 'Other' might be the product of colonizer's and colonized's never-ending confrontation, because the 'Other' in the colonial mirror plays two roles: both as a point of identity and as a product of a discriminatory gaze. The game of gaze/gazer/gazee in the colonial discourse is the game of image and image-maker that results in an irreversible splitting of subjectivity which accordingly prevents the completion of self-identity. Both the colonial other and the colonized might be in an in-between space, encapsulated in an ideological dichotomy between civilized/uncivilized and white/non-white. For instance, the (metaphoric) colonized 'Other,' such as Rhoda (being a woman) and Louis (being a Jew), might be stereotyped marginal personalities who experience apparent mutations. For this reason, they can never completely be like the other characters; however, the others are also in an unstable position. Woolf's ironical image of the civilizing mission, represented in Rhoda's and Louis's behaviour, mocks the European and, especially the British model of civility.

The stereotyped Robinsonade Island shows not only the savagery and violence of the place itself but also the presence of a civilized individual (Robinson Crusoe), who is ready to tame and control wild nature. In contrast, Woolf's Robinsonade Island might be a paradoxically civilized island that becomes uncivilized or 'orientalized' by the white shadows of a patriarchal system which destroys on the one hand the innocence of the Occidentals and their civility, and on the other hand the purity of the Orientals in order to change them into cannibals for the Europeans. The presence of cannibals in the island and the roughness of the setting in the italicized interlude-like pieces underline a threatening atmosphere in which the savages can devour the Europeans. These uncivilized non-Europeans might in turn be the signs of danger for the colonizer and colonized society of Europeans; as Said states: "Asia suffers, yet in its suffering it threatens Europe."[56] The two concepts have one point in common, which is the uncivilized's or colonized's need for an order or an ideology that brings wild nature into harmony and discipline.

The "italicized interludes,"[57] showing the progress of a single day in the Robinsonade Island, ironically, portray the civilized history of the West and the barbaric history of the East that needs to be civilized by Western culture or the white shadows. This Robinsonade Island might be an anticipation of a postcolonial island inhabited by the colonized barbarians and the subaltern women being doubly colonized in the patriarchal society of England. It indicates an unknown, silent, geographically unmapped and undiscovered island occupied, unlike the typical Robinsonade Island, by the unreal women and uncivilized colonial subjects. To quote Homi K. Bhabha, this shows a critique of a "mythic, masterful silence in the narratives of empire, what Sir Alfred Lyall called 'doing our Imperialism quietly'."[58] This silence turns the "imperial triumphalism into the testimony of colonial confusion and those who hear its echo lose their historic memories."[59]

The unknown island on which the sun rises, in fact, might be a tableau or an image, which conveys three levels of meaning in this context. First, at the informational level, it represents the presence of the sun and sea or nature in the East. It signifies the idea of the East or its dreamy world as a whole. Second, at the symbolic level, as the world of signifiers, of correlations that cannot be imprisoned in a full signification or even in a final signification, it refers to the richness of Eastern nature, the energetic and warm aspect of life, its romantic feeling when man's body experiences a sensation in a beautiful Eastern island. Third, the semiological meaning never creates a definitive signified, but infinite chain of metaphors whose signified becomes a signifier. It means that the rising of the sun might be the rising of civilization, especially the ever-growing British civilization, in the uncivilized Robinsonade Island, the rising of whiteness or white Westerners that in turn reflects the ideology of racism or imperialism as well as colonialism. This third meaning opens the field of meaning completely and infinitely. Woolf's description might suggest, in Gerald Sykes's words, "the symbolic journey of the sun, between the chapters, from the east to the west."[60] The sea, mirroringly inscribed, might signify, as Judith Lee claims, "a primal maternal figure"[61] or the parental image of the imperial power. The waves which are likened to the "*turbaned warriors, like turbaned men with poisoned assegais who, whirling their arms on high, advance upon the feeding flocks, the white sheep*" (*W*: 456) do not distract from the meaning, rather

they accentuate it. These waves may be considered as Eastern colonized men who are similar to the cannibals in Robinson Crusoe's island. The "*white sheep*" have a close relationship with the metaphoric figure of a woman with a lamp which suggests a god-like figure or a goddess as a full signifier to show Britain, as an enigmatic leader whose body gives the signals of whiteness, power and beauty. Moreover, the waves might refer to the continuous and sometimes monotonous fall of the waves of time and their implied sense of dissolution and flux. The falling and rising of the waves might also epitomize the characters' mental or identity crisis in the modernized world.

The image of the trees in the garden, and even the birds, gives a familiar view of that scenery to imagine the first images of the island as a paradise that remained untouched by industrialization, modernization and the contaminated hands of imperial power. Indeed, the presence of nature and innocent creatures such as the "*trees*", "*sea*", "*sun*" and the "*birds*", "*girls*", "*white-haired women*" (*W*: 495) confirm the same idea. As the sun rises and the light increases, we see the island less clearly and in fragments, and, as Lee claims, "our perspective shifts from the sea to the [white] shadows cast by the waves"[62] which might also be considered as an emphasis on the presence of European civilization, whiteness, or even imperialism. This image recurred predominantly in the middle interludes (third, fourth and fifth ones) framing the episodes related to Percival and his (semi-)heroic death.[63]

In the fifth interlude, Woolf's symbolization might reflect the Eastern countries and their natural beauties. She compares and contrasts the Eastern nature with the Western. The metonymic image of the "*sun* [*which*] *had risen to its full height*" (*W*: 495) is not a closed sign without any signification; instead, it shows that the British Empire and its civilization stands on its pinnacle. Truly, in the East the sun

> *swept into desolate cairns, here sprinkled with stunted dark-green jungle trees. It lit up the smooth gilt mosque, the frail pink-and-white card houses of the southern village, and the long-breasted, white-haired women who knelt in the river bed beating wrinkled cloths upon stones.* [...] [*W*]*hile, further north, in cloudier and rainier countries hills smoothed into slabs as with the back of a spade had light in them* [...]. *Through atoms of grey-blue air the sun struck at English fields and lit up marshes and pools, a white gull on a stake, the slow sail of shadows over blunt-headed woods and young corn and flowing hayfields.* (*W*: 495)

She demonstrates on the one hand the natural beauties of the Orient and on the other hand its wildness and irregularity, whereas in the "*cloudier and rainier*" Western countries

through "*atoms of grey-blue air the sun struck at English fields and lit up marches and pools.*" The Western sun, metaphorically, might be the sun of "colonialism [as Marcus writes, that] would free Indian women from [...] 'barbaric' practices,"[64] or the sun of economic imperialism through which England exported her extra products to the Eastern countries by the "*steamers.*" The sun of English Empire, the light of its civilization

> *struck straight upon the house, making the white walls glare between the dark windows.* [...] *Sharp-edged wedges of light lay upon the window-sill and showed inside the room plates with blue rings* [...]
>
> *The waves broke and spread their waters swiftly over the shore.* [...] *The Waves were steeped deep-blue save for a pattern of diamond-pointed light on their backs which rippled as the backs of great horses ripple with muscles as they move.* (*W*: 496)

The passage represents the light of the sun as the sharp-edged light of modernization. In addition, the waves are likened to the great horses: the "*backs of great horses ripple with muscles as they move*" which carry a "*pattern of diamond-pointed light on their backs.*" The horse-like waves, which are controlled by the British imperial power, might suggest the image of the same horse controlled by Bernard when he strikes spurs into his horse at the end of the travel narrative.

In the eighth interlude, as the sun was sinking, blackness deepened on the Robinsonade Island. This Eastern Island of subaltern women is ruined by the

> *darts shot through laurel groves by shameless, laughing boys. But the waves, as they neared the shore, were robbed of light, and fell in one long concussion, like a wall falling, a wall of grey stone, unpierced by any chink of light.* [...] *The hawk poised on the topmost branch flicked its eyelids and rose and sailed and soared far away, the wild plover cried in the marshes, evading, circling, and crying further off in loneliness.* [...]
>
> *Now the corn was cut.* [...] *On the hills the slow shadows now broadened, now shrank, as they passed over.*[...] *There was no sound of cropping, and no sound of wheels, but only the sudden roar of the wind letting its sails fill and brushing the tops of the grasses.*(*W*: 528)

The "*darts*" and the "*shameless, laughing boys*" convey an obvious meaning, the irregularity and wildness of the Eastern Island and its inhabitants. The "*hawk*" and the "*wild plover*" accentuate the wildness of setting and reflect the aesthetic and symbolic signs of barbarity and its loneliness. Nevertheless, its supplementary or third meaning, which has vanished or is disguised in this description, shows a signifier without a signified that makes it difficult to name, it comes and goes, appears and disappears. "*Now the corn was cut*" may signify the cutting of the Oriental's barbarity or the appearing of

barbarity or cruelty of white English imperiality,[65] and its presence in the colonies, but its "*slow shadows now broadened, now shrank, as they passed over.*" These shadows are the presence/absence of the white shadows that cover the colonies, and create a tremendous situation in the island. Therefore, everywhere is covered simply with the "*liquid shadow of the cloud, the buffeting of the rain, a single darting spear of sunshine*" as well as "*the sudden bruise of the rainstorm*" (*W*: 528). The foam-like, pearl-white gleam is an emphasis on the whiteness of the white shadows, the whiteness of their culture, civilization, society or the form of patriarchy, chauvinism and imperialism, which is appeared-disappeared recurrently.

The first and last interludes are, to some extent, similar to each other. This similarity represents the cycle of growth of imperialism in history. Yet, the main point is that in the last interlude the shadows become white, and the waves send the "*white shadows into the recesses of sonorous caves and then rolled back shining over the shingle*" (*W*: 544). The image suggests the rising and falling of the white shadows in the Robinsonade Island. When the "*dark shadows*" blacken the island, it is completely covered with the darkness of the "*white shadows*" of imperialism or perhaps with the darkness of ignorance, barbarity, or lack of civilization (*W*: 544). In fact, darkness covers "*houses, hills,* [and] *trees*" here, there, everywhere. The darkness is so thick that it "*wash*[es] *down streets,*" engulfs them, blots out the "*couples clasped under the showery darkness of elm trees,*" even in "*full summer foliage,*" which might refer to the sterile and gratuitous multiplicity of modern social life:

> *Darkness rolled its waves along grassy rides and over the wrinkled skin of the turf, enveloping the solitary thorn tree and the empty snail shells at its foot. Mounting higher, darkness blew along the bare upland slopes, and met the fretted and abraded pinnacles of the mountain where the snow lodges for ever on the hard rock even when the valleys are full of running streams and yellow vine leaves, and girls, sitting on verandahs, look up at the snow, shading their faces with their fans. Them, too, darkness covered.* (*W*: 544)

This civilized Robinsonade Island has lost all its beauties and light, and the deceiving sunlight of empire, modernization and civilization, as Woolf states, inflict "wounds upon the human spirit which no surgery can heal" (*TG*: 61). Metaphorically, Woolf likens Western civilization and modernization to darkness or the dark shadow that covers the Eastern countries and whiteness or the "*white shadow*" that surrounds the Western

Empire. The dark shadow of ignorance, barbarity, or even colonization, that covers the Eastern Island or India, or even Egypt, lasts for a long time. Actually, there is no end for the never-ending cycle or presence of imperialism and colonialism in India, beginning with the establishment of the East India Company, which aimed at domesticating the Orient and turning it into a field of European learning. These colonial powers have, definitely, an external change; their form is changed whereas their content remains the same.

In *Orlando*, the East gives all its natural beauties to the Western traveller-ethnographer, yet in *The Waves*, the West destroys all the natural beauties of the East to prove that the "Englishmen, those fathers and grandfathers whom [one] sees marching in the picture of history, are 'superior' to the men of other countries [...] the Indians or the Irish" (*TG*: 90). By focusing on the dark shadows and "darkness," Woolf shows that the imperialist "was concerned not with [the colonized's] inferiority, but with [its] own superiority" (*RO*: 52).

The paradoxical frequent light imagery might suggest not only Western civilization and order but also the colonization and, in Said's words, "an unstoppable [...] expansion in search of markets, resources, and colonies."[66] The light of the sun is associated with the sharpness of a knife: "[*t*]*he sun laid broader blades upon the house*," the "*sharp-edged wedges of light lay upon the window-sill*", "*within the room daggers of light fell upon chairs and tables racks across their lacquer and polish*" (*W*: 431, 496, 505). This knife-like, dagger-like light, which is the light of British civilization or colonization shining in the Robinsonade Island, might be military imagery. This imagery creates a gap between the West and the East and reinforces the military presence of the West, especially during the Great War; it is like Peter Walsh's knife that annoys Clarissa.

The recurrent image of the "*poisoned assegais*" (*W*: 456) puts emphasis on the cannibalistic nature of the colonized. This shows a fictional map of an unexplored (especially by Woolf) and ignored (by others) land as India or Africa while, as Said claims, "[i]ts foreignness can be translated, its meanings decoded, its hostility tamed; yet the *generality* assigned to the Orient."[67] The uninhabited Oriental island, which is opened as the sun rises and light prevails and is closed as the sun sets and darkness covers everywhere and everything, reflects the presence of colonialism as a product of the

"*white shadows*" in the colonial islands. By contrast, the inhabited Occidental island, journeyed to incessantly both by the whites and the others in the real setting of the travel narrative, is the symbol of civilization and transculturation that acts as a utopia designed to entice all groups of Europeans and non-Europeans, men and women, civilized and uncivilized.

6. 3. "Mimic man": docile bodies

Power is, according to Barthes, "hidden in any discourse, even when uttered in a place outside the bounds of power."[68] It is both "an exemplarily political object" and "an ideological object" that "creeps in where we do not recognize it at first,"[69] into different institutions, even discourses, that govern the society and the world. Colonial mimicry, as an example of such discourses, Bhabha writes, shows "the desire for a reformed, recognizable Other, *as a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite*," which means that the discourse of mimicry is formulated and constructed by power around an "*ambivalence*" whose authority is stricken by "an indeterminacy."[70] I wish to argue that the mimic man might not necessarily be a real colonized subject in a colonial region, but a victimized or marginalized individual who assimilates himself with the metaphor of colonization in his psyche. In this particular sense, the colonizer might be that power in a modernized society controlling the psyche in its social and cultural relations.

One of the contradictions in colonial discourse is that both the colonized and the colonizer need "to 'civilise' [their] 'others', and to fix them into perpetual 'otherness'."[71] For instance, Louis imitates whatever Bernard and Neville really do. The travel narrative reveals the mystery of his origin as an "Arab Prince," (*W*: 484) yet it is not clear whether he is really of an Arab family or whether it is his ancestral desire for superiority that signifies "the shadow" of the other which "falls upon the Self."[72] He desires to attain Bernard's and Neville's superiority as two sons of upper-middle class Englishmen. This kind of social inferiority is a palpable form of cultural difference and discrimination, hence he says,

> I was an Arab Prince; behold my free gestures. [...] But while I admire Susan and Percival, I hate the others, because it is for them that I do these antics, smoothing my hair,

> concealing my accent. I am the little ape who chatters over a nut, [...] I am also the caged tiger, and you are the keepers with red-hot bars. (*W*: 484)

The oscillation of love-hate is the reflection of an identity crisis in the modernized England. The society frustrates him so much so that he becomes a "caged tiger" like the non-Europeans and the others—the Europeans—as "the keepers with red-hot bars." His situation is identical to the life of the colonized subject; accordingly, he accepts his marginality and is ashamed of being in an in-between space.

Louis, who is so "opulent," gazes at the place where Rhoda has "vanished," but Louis, as a marginal Jew and a representative of Leonard Woolf, works for the British people's "instruction," their "regeneration, and the reform of an unborn" power (*W*: 522). Louis presents himself like a loyal citizen:

> We have laced the world together with our ships. The globe is strung with our lines. I am immensely respectable. All the young ladies in the office acknowledge my entrance. I can dine where I like now, and without vanity may suppose that I shall soon acquire a house in Surrey, two cars, a conservatory and some rare species of melon. But I still return, I still come back to my attic, hang up my hat and resume in solitude that curious attempt which I have made since I brought down my fist on my master's grained oak door.(*W*: 523)

The marginal or colonized subject not only alters his gaze according to the local needs but also uses them to reverse the orientation of power in their relationship. This Jewish inhabitant who works hard to be considered an active member of the English society is at odds with them as he reads a poem and murmurs: "O western wind, you are at enmity with my mahogany table", "with the vulgarity of my mistress, the little actress, who has never been able to speak English correctly" (*W*: 523). His inferiority complex stems from his metaphoric Oedipus complex or from being far from his motherland, as a "boy I dreamt of the Nile", "I have sat in the eating-shop and tried to make the clerks accept me" with my "Australian accent" (*W*: 524). This refers to a dialectical power struggle between self and other or to a kind of discrimination surrounding the modern society. He is under the pressure of a double force and discovers that the marginal identities, in spite of mimicking their master's way of life, have an ambivalent position in England.

Rhoda is engaged in the same ambivalent situation, since during her adulthood she needs social interactions more than the other characters. In spite of their close connection with the English society, Louis and Rhoda feel absence, because they realize the

difference between themselves and the others. Rhoda, who has a never-ending fear, being afraid of the "tiger [which] leaps," believes that if

> I should grow old in pursuit and change, I should be rid of my fear: nothing persists. [...] The door opens and the tiger leaps. You did not see me come. I circled round the chairs to avoid the horror of the spring. I am afraid of you all. I am afraid of the shock of sensation that leaps upon me, because I cannot deal with it as you do—I cannot make one moment merge in the next.(*W*: 485-6)

The tiger and the shock of sensations are not empty signifiers; rather, they might convey the presence of a patriarchal hierarchy in the society, or the imperial domination over the colonized subjects. Furthermore, Rhoda's fear and undecidability represent her internal struggle and liminality as well as her vulnerability as an in-between character. It is difficult for Rhoda to "have a face"; as a result, she compares herself either to "the foam that races over the beach or the moonlight that falls arrowlike," to "a bone or a half-eaten boat," or to a "paper against endless corridors," (*W*: 486) while wandering without having any real destination. Despite all these distinctions, she imitates the others' behaviour and laments being marginal or colonized:

> How you chained me to one spot, one hour, one chair, and sat yourselves down opposite! How you snatched from me the white spaces that lie between hour and hour and rolled them into dirty pellets and tossed them into the waste-paper basket with your greasy paws. Yet those were my life.
>
> 'But I yielded. [...] What you did, I did. If Susan and Jinny pulled up their stockings like that, I pulled mine up like that also. So terrible was life that I held up shade after shade. Look at my life through this, look at my life through that; let there be rose leaves, let there be vine leaves—I covered the whole street, Oxford Street, Piccadilly Circus, with the blaze and ripple of my mind, with vine leaves and rose leaves.[...]' (*W*: 425-6)

As Woolf writes, "[i]maginatively [Rhoda] is of the highest importance; [but] practically she is completely insignificant" (*RO*: 66). The patriarchal society or colonizer thoroughly controls Rhoda's way of life from childhood up to adulthood and she adapts herself complacently: "[w]hat you did, I did." The situation encourages Rhoda to mimic the others' social and cultural habits, behaviours and values. She is imprisoned in a hidden imperial or colonial cell within the invisible walls that shows the overt goal of imperial power. This might reflect one of the most powerful strategies of imperial dominance or surveillance, which may not be necessarily direct and physical, but psychological. The point is that the colonized subject, such as Rhoda, may assimilate herself with the

colonizer and, as Ashcroft states, "accept the imperial view, including the array of values, assumptions and cultural expectations on which this is based, and order his or her behaviour accordingly."[73] Such a system creates the colonial subjects like Rhoda and Louis who, despite suffering from their social and racial marginality,[74] try to be "'more English than the English', those whom V. S. Naipaul called 'The Mimic Men' in the novel of that name."[75]

This mimicry shows how Rhoda like Lucrezia sinks into the mire of common sense and Londonness by becoming a double stranger to her own country, language, sex and identity, without realizing that the shadow of her national identity falls on the condition of uncertainty and the unpredictable identifications with the images of other nations, especially the Europeans. Rhoda is an imitator, who can mimic the others' social behaviour, but never reproduce the values of the upper-middle class purely and completely, whereas Louis tries to be a perfect imitator and to play the role of a colonizer. They are appropriate objects of a colonialist chain of command or authorized versions of otherness, as well as the doubling figures, the objects of a metonymy of colonial desire.

Mimicry helps to fix the colonial authority, and brings to mind the questions of authorization of the colonial representations that suggest the superiority of the authorial subjects and the inferiority of the "colonial man as an object of regularly power, as the subject of racial, cultural, [and] national representation."[76] Indeed, it poses the colonial presence in terms of otherness, or the cultural confrontation with the 'others.' The Western imperial discourse puts identity under erasure by shuttling the signifier of authority in search of a "strategy of surveillance, subjection and inscription" that, as Bhabha argues, situates the colonizer and the colonized in a process of "miscognition where each point of identification is always a partial and double repetition of the *otherness* of the self."[77]

In the concluding episode, Bernard turns over the pages of the book of empire which may signify the book of missionaries, travellers or administrators with all the concealed pictures of the colonized people. This ironic behaviour suggests an inversion, a mockery just under the surface of the whole process of colonization enacted in Bernard's cultural understanding. It shows an area of considerable political and cultural uncertainty in the

structure of imperial dominance. The discourse of imitation created in the first episode ironically recurs in the last episode through Bernard's memory. The scene in which the "[d]octor lurch[s] into chapel," while "shouting out his commands through a megaphone" (*W*: 547) can be considered as a real or imaginary battleship. In the Great War, the doctor might play the role of a military captain who teaches children the "immortality" of heroic behaviour through his "Prayer Books" in an academic system (*W*: 547). This confirms that the educational system trains children on the basis of religious and military disciplines directed by the dominant power in the schools, institutions, and even universities:

> Percival sat staring straight ahead of him [...] flicking his hand to the back of his neck. His movements were always remarkable. We all flicked our hands to the backs of our heads—unsuccessfully. [...] Through the window should come a hunting-song from some rapid unapprehended life—a sound that shouts among the hills and dies away. [...] He was thrown, riding in a race, and when I came along Shaftesbury Avenue tonight, those insignificant and scarcely *formulated faces* that bubble up out of the doors of the Tube, and many obscure Indians, and people dying of famine and disease, and women who have been cheated, and whipped dogs and crying children—all these seemed to me bereft. He would have done justice. He would have protected. About the age of forty he would have shocked the authorities. (*W*: 547-8, my emphasis)

The other children try to imitate Percival, the god-like hero and the centre of children's attention. Through imitation, the colonizer forms the docile individuals, dictates them the disciplines of imperial doctrine, and trains them, as Woolf states, to shake "an empire," to lead "an army into battle," or to introduce "a barbarous race to the blessings of civilization" (*RO*: 169). By reshaping such educated docile bodies, the colonizers "would help to create a civilized society which protects culture" (*TG*: 103). This illustrates, in Foucault's term, a "technico-political register" of the body, which is "constituted by a whole set of regulations and by empirical and calculated methods relating to the army, the school,"[78] and so forth in order to control the operations of the individuals, or in Woolf's words, "to hypnotize the human mind" (*TG*: 104). It portrays the inculcating "docility."[79]

Bernard sees all the "formulated faces that bubble up out of the doors of the Tube, and many obscure Indians, and people dying of famine and disease, and women who have been cheated, and whipped dogs and crying children—all these seemed to me bereft." The images have their own values; they belong to a history, a history of marginality and

colonization that refers both to the oppressed groups of society or to the Indians as the docile bodies who are trained by the British missionaries and merchants to fulfil their imperial desires. These "formulated faces" are the docile bodies or the small-scale models of power shaped and trained to obey, to respond, to become skilful and to increase the forces, measures and values of power. All the characters, especially Bernard, are afraid of being "formulated," but they are all "formulated faces." This reminds us of T. S. Eliot's "formulated" faces when he laments in "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock":

> And I have known the eyes already, known them all—
> The eyes that fix you in a *formulated phrase*,
> And when I am *formulated*, sprawling on a pin,
> When I am *pinned and wriggling* on the wall,
> Then how should I begin
> To spit out all the butt-ends of my days and ways?
> And how should I presume? (Lines 55-61, my emphasis)[80]

The "formulated phrase" brings to mind the doctrine of imperialism that makes the docile bodies and minds. As soon as this docility is imposed upon the individuals, their identities will be formulated according to the norms and standards of power. Indeed, power dominates all the movements and gestures of these individuals, both the colonizer and the colonized. Hence every individual enters a "machinery of power that explores [...], breaks [...] down, and rearranges [him or his body]" in order to make a "political anatomy" that defines "how one may have a hold over others' bodies" with the "techniques, the speed, and the efficiency that one determines."[81] Bernard is able to see and read the other side of life, and his childlike innocent gaze is changed to the gaze of a middle-aged man who observes with his inner eyes trained to see what they are looking for. He is like the "formulated faces," or the "pinned" faces "wriggling on the wall" of British imperialism.

Bernard calls his friends, Louis, Rhoda and others, the "minute objects" (*W*: 548). These minute objects or mimic men play the role of the docile bodies: Louis is unhappy, "unfriended, in exile," whose "ascendancy was resented," whereas "Percival's was adored"; he remains "aloof" and "enigmatic" (*W*: 548). Bernard's description of Neville is also very enigmatic, a man who knows "Latin classics," and searches out "every curl and twist of those Roman sentences" (*W*: 548-9):

> We grew; we changed [...] we are animals. We are not always aware by any means; we breathe, eat, sleep automatically. We exist not only separately but in undifferentiated blobs of matter. [...] An army marches across Europe. We assemble in parks and halls and sedulously oppose any renegade (Neville, Louis, Rhoda) who sets up a separate existence. (*W*: 549)

These statements confirm the practices, theories, attitudes and influences of a dominating colonial power on the psyche of the characters. For example, Bernard as one of these formulated faces, who enthusiastically advocates the policy of imperialism, is now trapped in the imperial power's spider-like web. As Woolf claims, the "whole iniquity of dictatorship, whether in Oxford or Cambridge, in Whitehall or Downing Street, against Jews or against women [...] is now apparent to [us]" (*TG*: 94).

Bernard's comparative description of Jinny, Susan and Rhoda as mimic personalities shows his imperious gaze. Jinny is physically oriented and identified with pleasure, houses, streets, city life, and what she herself calls "the body's" imagination (*W*: 535). "Rhoda was wild—Rhoda one never could catch. She was both frightened and clumsy," (*W*: 550) she speaks of nature, water, pillars, far out mountains and deserts. Rhoda's wildness might be compared to the Indians' wildness and barbarism, but her simultaneous fright and clumsiness represents her as a servant afraid of her master. Her in-between position rearticulates the whole notion of identity. However, Susan, who speaks of fields, lands and animals, and is "identified with natural forces, a kind of earth-mother figure,"[82] might be considered as a symbol of England and Englishness.

Imperialism makes a network that solidifies and reshapes the existence of power everywhere. The dichotomy between the marginal and central characters is obvious here. Bernard, Neville, Jinny and Susan are in quest of social and cultural success and happiness; hence, a prosperous life, the possibilities of gaining a good education, getting a good job, and increasing their possessions are very important for them. In contrast, the two marginal and 'colonized' characters are in quest of stability, their lost identity, and they gaze at the behaviour of the others and imitate them in order to find themselves. They feel this lack of superiority, and realize their own marginality or peripheral position.

6. 4. "Contamination": being in an in-between space

As Barthes points out, "power is present in the most delicate mechanisms of social exchange," such as "in the State, in classes, in groups, but even in fashion, public opinion, entertainment, sports, news, family and private relationships,"[83] and definitely even in constructing and reconstructing man's identification. Power is eternal and perpetual, because even the language we speak and write inscribes it. Based on this view, the empire imposes its hegemony on every aspect of the colonized countries and makes them mere consumers of imperial culture and civilization. Imperial power, in fact, controls the culture of nations, their nationalities, religion, thoughts and their identities. The construction of the colonial subject in discourse and the exercise of colonial power through discourse demand an articulation of various forms of racial, social, cultural and sexual differences. Such a discourse is, as Bhabha states, concerned with constructing "the colonized as a population of degenerate types on the basis of racial origin in order to justify conquest and to establish systems of administration and instruction."[84] The colonizer and the colonized might be like two opposite sides of a seesaw, whose up-and-down or to-and-fro movement is essential for their survival.

For instance, Bernard as a representative of the colonizer, in *The Waves*, is afraid of loneliness and solitude. He needs Mrs Moffat, his servant that shows the system of master/servant relationship as the manifestation of the colonizer/colonized relationship. Indeed, Bernard confesses that he needs the servant's or colonized's existence which helps to reconstruct his identity. It is on the site of this coexistence that, as Bhabha argues, the "strategies of hierarchization and marginalization are employed in the management of colonial societies."[85] Bernard is aware of Mrs Moffat's and Rhoda's fear, but his life, in a way, depends upon their existence, and he acknowledges it:

> I (Bernard) cannot bear the pressure of solitude. [...] When I am alone I fall into lethargy, and say to myself dismally as I poke the cinders through the bars of the grate, Mrs. Moffat will come. She will come and sweep it all up. [...] Rhoda loves to be alone. She fears us because we shatter the sense of being which is so extreme in solitude—see how she grasps her fork—her weapon against us. (*W*: 487)

Rhoda is afraid of social life and being confronted with the others. By grasping "her fork—her weapon against us" she identities herself with her friends: "follow and repeat and score still deeper the old worn ruts in which society, like a gramophone whose needle

has stuck, is grinding out with intolerable unanimity" (*TG*: 97). Woolf calls Mrs Moffat's and Rhoda's society "the Outsiders' Society," which has a different tradition and the different values. However, the main distinction between the colonizer and the colonized is that the former might use the means provided by their position such as its wealth, social and political influence, while the latter remains outside and "experiment[s] not with public means in public but with private means in private" (*TG*: 104). It means that the colonizer's life or prosperity as a form of life "inside society," (*TG*: 103) even depends upon the others or the colonized.

> 'The roar of London,' said Louis, 'is round us. Motor-cars, vans, omnibuses pass and repass continuously. All are merged in one turning wheel of single sound. [...]'
> [...]
> 'I see India,' said Bernard. 'I see the low, long shore; I see the tortuous lanes of stamped mud that lead in and out among ramshackle pagodas; I see the gilt crenellated buildings which have an air of fragility and decay as if they were temporarily run up buildings in some Oriental exhibition. I see a pair of bullocks who drag a low cart along the sun-baked road. The cart sways incompetently from side to side. Now one wheel sticks in the rut, and at once innumerable natives in loin-cloths swarm round it, chattering excitedly. [...]' (*W*: 488)

What matters is their way of gazing at the world around them as two distinct forms of observation. When Louis gazes at London, he recognizes it as a cosmopolitan society. As far as he is a marginal consumer of the English culture and society, he attempts to assimilate himself with the rules of modernization and civilization, whereas when Bernard sees "India," he realizes that "an air of fragility and decay" covers everywhere. In other words, his eyes (as the eyes/I of a traveller) search for discovering all the irregularities of an uncivilized and underdeveloped country. Bernard's gaze is the same as the gaze of an intellectual-traveller or administrator who is aware of the Indians' way of life and understands their dilemmas, like Leonard who recognizes the problems of the Ceylonese. Their various gazes at two different Occidental and Oriental settings reflect a great dichotomy between the colonizer and colonized. The colonizer's society is presented as being full of beauty, order, discipline and pleasure, whereas the colonized's is equivalent to ugliness, disorder and savagery. Thus, Bernard remembers Percival:

> Percival advances; Percival rides a flea-bitten mare, and wears a sun helmet. By applying the standards of the West, by using the violent language that is natural to him, the bullock-cart is righted in less than five minutes. The Oriental problem is solved. He rides on; the

> multitude cluster round him, regarding him as if he were—what indeed he is—a God. (*W*: 489)

Percival uses "the standards of the West" and "the violent language that is natural to him," the colonizer's language to tame the barbaric colonized. He solves the "Oriental problem" by colonizing underdeveloped and uncivilized countries like a "God," the god-like presence of imperialism, its superiority, civilization as well as its modernization. Portraying Percival as a mythical hero and Bernard as Percival's inheritor is Woolf's critique of the chauvinistic desire of those men who act as the docile bodies, the missionaries, the ambassadors, the spies, or the political puppets of the British imperiality with their "adulterated opinion," (*TG*: 89) ready at all times to provide their services.

Metaphorically speaking, Percival, as Rhoda says, is a "stone fallen into a pond" (*W*: 489) around which the waves are created and as they take distance from the centre, they become larger and larger. The scene of dropping the stone in a pool of water that causes ripples reflects the duplicity of its signifier that is at once meaning and form and signifies Percival's centrality. Rhoda believes that they themselves are Percival's followers who "undulate and eddy contentedly" and she adds that "India for instance rise into our purview," and "we see muddy roads, twisted jungle, swarms of men and the vulture that feeds on some bloated carcass as within our scope, part of our proud and splendid province" (*W*: 489). This might suggest the gaze of a woman, or a colonized subject, who sees the destroyed East or its devastated province, as well as her scattered pride and splintered psyche.

There is a pause in the travel narrative, showing in the parentheses in which Rhoda and Louis are in a "nocturnal" festival or in a "great procession" (*W*: 491) that may reflect the encapsulated or contaminated identity of these personalities by putting their speech in the parentheses. Concurrently, it might convey the various gazes of the rather snobbish English male and female adventurers who gaze at the others as "savage", "ruthless," or "naked men with assegais" (*W*: 491). Rhoda confesses that the East is her imaginary and dreamy country and her desire for travelling is like a pilgrimage. Accordingly, this "pilgrimage" and "departure" will be possible only by the presence of the white or the Western people, since she sees a landscape "between [their] shoulders, over [their] heads," and "a shape, white, but not of stone, moving, perhaps alive" (*W*: 490):

> ('Look, Rhoda,' said Louis, 'they have become nocturnal, rapt. Their eyes are like moths' wings moving so quickly that they do not seem to move at all.'
>
> 'Horns and trumpets,' said Rhoda, 'ring out. Leaves unfold; the stags blare in the thicket. There is a dancing and a drumming, like the dancing and the drumming of naked men with assagais.'
>
> 'Like the dance of savages,' said Louis, 'round the camp-fire. They are savage; they are ruthless. They dance in a circle, flapping bladders. The flames leap over their painted faces, over the leopard skins and the bleeding limbs which they have torn from the living body.'
>
> 'The flames of the festival rise high,' said Rhoda. [...] Their horns spill blue smoke; their skins are dappled red and yellow in the torchlight. They throw violets. They deck the beloved with garlands and with laurel leaves, there on the ring of turf where the steep-backed hills come down. The procession passes. And while it passes, Louis, we are aware of downfalling, we forebode decay. The shadow slants. We who are conspirators, withdrawn together to lean over some cold urn, note how the purple flame flows downwards.'
>
> 'Death is woven in with the violets,' said Louis. 'Death and again death.') (*W*: 491)

Rhoda's hidden face, her gestures, thoughts and dreams through which she speaks reflect one dimension of her dwelling in the Western social world and her desire for travelling to the East. As a marginal personality, she defines a boundary that is at once inside and outside or the outsider's insideness, which refers to an ambivalence or hesitation, a time of cultural uncertainty, or a time of representational undecidability that surrounds her. The people's procession breaks up her dreams and through such an act of epistemic violence her world of dreams is disturbed—a metaphor for the splitting of the colonial space of consciousness. As a colonized subject, Rhoda is fixed, yet, in Bhabha's words, she might have been "split between the incongruent knowledges of body, race, ancestors,"[86] nationality, language, culture, civilization and the social behaviours. This knowledge gives her an ambivalent order of identification, which is the result of the construction of a discriminatory knowledge that depends on the presence of differences. Rhoda hears the "[h]orns and trumpets" of a group of people who dance and drum like "the dancing and drumming of naked men with assagais." Her neutrality and unfamiliarity with the familiar sounds and movements is the product of having been far from the Eastern countries for a long time and living inside the patriarchal or the colonizers' society.

Louis calls the procession "the dance of savages" round the campfire, and believes that the colonized are "savage; they are ruthless," which indicates the uncertain and menacing process of cultural transformation, as the production of discriminatory identities that

secure the original identity of authority. This signifies, in Bhabha's words, a "disposal" or "negative transparency" of power.[87] It is the silent voice of a command continually represented in the production of terror and fear. Rhoda also sees them as savages, whose "skins are dappled red and yellow in the torchlight." Louis's and Rhoda's gazes reflect their in-between gaze. All cultural systems are constructed in a space which Bhabha calls the "Third Space of enunciation" that "makes the structure of meaning and reference an ambivalent process."[88] This in-between space carries the burden of meaning of culture and creates a situation in which the colonized negates or neglects "the imbalance and inequality of the power relations."[89] The procession passes, yet they are aware of "downfalling," they are decayed and destroyed and, as Louis says, "[d]eath is woven in with the violets," death and "again death." Both Rhoda and Louis recurrently use the word "conspirators" and call themselves conspirators who are contaminated. The contamination refers to their positions in the in-between spaces.

Rhoda thinks that they are thrown "asunder," and simultaneously the dichotomy between the marginal and the central, the East and the West shows itself from top to bottom. The superiority of their friends make them "immune [...] from picking figures and searching eyes," (*W*: 492) while Louis's and Rhoda's sexual, social, racial and cultural marginality may signify the stereotypes of primitivism, degeneracy, dismemberment and dislocation. Louis suffers from "all humiliations" that are created by the boasting boys; and for this reason, he condemns them, but his heart "yearns towards" them (*W*: 535). He directs his gaze towards the colonizer and conserves the orientation of power in a reciprocal relationship.

Rhoda's gaze might be the reflection of experiences of the East during a sojourn in the East. Rhoda might be Virginia's aunt, Mary Beton (who stayed in India), Vita (who experiences Persia and India), or Virginia (who travelled to Turkey). Rhoda claims that during all her life in England, she has taught her body to do certain tricks, however "[i]nwardly I am not taught; I fear, I hate, I love, I envy, and despise you, but I never join you happily," since in such an English society she has nothing, even "no face" (*W*: 536). She differentiates the East from the West by drawing a picture of nature, the impact of industrialization on the East and the reaction of the West to trace to what extent they are far from each other:

> A wind ruffles the top-most leaves of primeval trees. (Yet here we sit at Hampton Court) Parrots shrieking break the intense stillness of the jungle. (Here the trams start) The swallow dips her wings in midnight pools. (Here we talk) That is the circumference that I try to grasp as we sit together. Thus I must undergo the penance of Hampton Court at seven thirty precisely. [...] (so I dream, falling off the edge of the earth at night when my bed floats suspended) embrace the entire world, I must go through the antics of the individual.[...] And you will not help me. More cruel than the old tortures, you will let me fall, and will tear me to pieces when I am fallen. (*W*: 537)

The first three statements refer to the East, its wildness, calmness, stillness and nature, whereas the parenthetical sentences show the West, its civility, civilization and industrialized society. What matters is the rising and falling of the waves of her mind, moving from the East to the West, from nature to society, from the wildness to civilization, from the stillness to the dynamism. The recurrent image of East/West, East/West, East/West indicates that she is wandering in a world of uncertainty and ambivalence or in a continual fluctuation between wanting one thing and its opposite simultaneously. This synchronized attraction towards and repulsion from the East and the West describes the complex mix of attraction and repulsion that characterizes the relationship between the colonized and the colonizer. She also dreams of "falling," yet she cannot find her real and final destination, because she sees as "[m]ore cruel than the old torturers" (*W*: 537) those who let her fall and tear her into pieces when she has fallen. She has the desire to "escape from here and now" (*W*: 537). These references confirm the sense of ambivalence that never allows the in-between subjects to be the exact replicas of the colonizers.

This ambivalence threatens all the characters. For instance, Bernard believes that "loneliness destroys" him. The reason that all the characters reach an uncertain destination is, in Bhabha's words, the "necessary negation of a primordial identity—cultural or psychic—that introduces the system of differentiation"[90] which enables them to accept it as a symbolic or historic reality. It takes place "when authority becomes hybridized when placed in a colonial context and finds itself against other cultures."[91] Louis "does not care what people think", "Neville's tortures are at rest", "Susan hears the breathing of all her children safe asleep," and "Rhoda has rocked her ships to shore" whether they have foundered or anchored she cares no longer (*W*: 537). However, their situation confirms why the outsiders "may still be afraid to speak freely or to experiment

openly" (*TG*: 116). Woolf portrays the various gazes of the adventurers who observe "politics and people, war and peace, barbarism and civilization" (*TG*: 118).

The Waves interrogates the growth and education of those young generations under the instructing rule of power to stabilize the imperialist culture of adolescent male or the patriarchal system of power by becoming heroes, ambassadors, travellers, poets, and writers to fulfil the objectives of British Empire. Hence, in every society, the individuals may be in the grip of very strict powers that impose on them certain constraints, prohibitions and obligations. It makes for a politics of struggle—the struggle of identifications—and the war of positions. Thus, the history of colonization is occurring once again within the systems and structures of identification as a new discourse that decodes and translates the deformed and displaced identities.

Rhoda and Louis are two characters by means of whom Woolf maps the colonial power of the British Empire and the meaning of *The Waves*. Rhoda, like Louis, is enigmatic; however, her oddity is not simply due to her action or behaviour, it might be the result of her ambivalent psyche, nationality, race or her racial inferiority. As Robert J. C. Young states, "the problem with Western historiography is that [...] only the West has been allowed a history," which results in "the absorption of weak races [Eastern races] by the strong [Western ones]."[92] Racial difference is identified with other forms of "sexual," cultural and "social perversity as degeneracy, deformation or arrested embryological development."[93] Rhoda, an adventurer in mind, is drowning in the world of dreams, dreams of solitude, of deserts and remote islands or forests of the East "where the parrots chatter and the creepers ..." (*W*: 425). She knows that under the domain of imperialism there is no place for her, whereas for Susan, Jinny and Bernard there are many places as well as opportunities. She observes the shadowy figure of Percival, as one of the products of English public schools and famous universities, an ideal hero of Englishmen and the representative of English imperialism, who has gone out to govern India. In this way, Rhoda comprehends the visibility of social and cultural mummification in the Western society that attempts to modernize and civilize other nationalities and identities.

The position of Peter Walsh, in *Mrs Dalloway*, is similar to these ambivalent personalities. Walsh's temperament, as mentioned before, is completely changed and after having spent five years in India, he has assimilated himself to the norms of the

country to which he travelled. He is in an in-between position "[c]oming as he did from a respectable Anglo-Indian family which for at least three generations had administered the affairs of a continent" (*MD*: 50). Woolf characterizes him as an in-between adventurer who dislikes India, empire and army and likes London, its modernity and civilization. Like Rhoda, he wanders in a wasteland or in a continual fluctuation between wanting his country, its civility, civilization and wanting its opposite, India and its nature.

Woolf illustrates a play or an exercise of power within colonial discourse and the shifting personalities of its subjects; however, colonial discourse produces the colonized as a social reality that is at once an 'Other,' entirely knowable and visible. This shifting or ambivalent position, in Young's words, represents the fact that "the periphery—the borderline, the marginal, the unclassifiable, the doubtful—has become the equivocal, indefinite, indeterminate ambivalence that characterizes the centre."[94]

6. 5. "Take it. This is my life": colonization and imperialism

Colonization is one form of power. The discourse of power, as Barthes argues, governs everywhere and everything, "on all sides, leaders, massive or minute organizations, pressure groups or oppression groups, everywhere 'authorized' voices which authorize themselves to utter the discourse of all power: the discourse of arrogance."[95] This presence of power has a long history in Britain's possession of colonies, triumphantly confirmed in the nineteenth century, especially in India, Ceylon, the Caribbean, Ireland, and to some degree in Africa, especially Egypt.[96]

Benjamin Disraeli's government gave Queen Victoria the new title "Empress of India" and made the British Empire the greatest power in the world; in this way, Great Britain began the construction of a complex and multilayered system of government in India. The allure, the exotic and uncanny mysteries of colonies inspired many Europeans, especially the English travellers, travel writers, and even the novelists, to write and fictionalize the (his)tories of the colonized countries. Woolf, like some of her contemporaries such as Leonard Woolf and E. M. Forster, journeys into the history of colonized nations to show various forms of colonial desires.

The doctrine of "New Imperialism" is the same as "Disraeli's response to his perception that Britain was divided into two nations of rich and poor,"[97] the upper-middle

class and lower or working class, the industrial and non-industrial, the master and servant, the colonizer and colonized, the white and non-white, the men and women. Indeed, empire becomes the principal ideological unifier across class and other social divisions in Great Britain. In 1906 in her journey to Greece, Woolf, referring to George Wyndham,[98] recorded that the "traitors & imperialists are nothing more than names" (*PA*: 345). Her concern with imperialism is shaped from that time in her travel narratives from *The Voyage Out* to *The Waves*. For her, imperialism later becomes, in Loomba's words, "the highest stage of colonialism."[99]

In *The Voyage Out*, the first model of the ideology of colonialism is presented by Woolf in Mr Pepper's statements that "the country was still a virgin land behind a veil," when "the English sailors bore away bars of silver, bales of linen, timbers of cedar wood, golden crucifixes knobbed with emeralds," then:

> [T]he Spaniards came down from their drinking, a flight ensued, the two parties churning up the sand, and driving each other into the surf. The Spaniards, bloated with fine living upon the fruits of the miraculous land, fell in heaps; but the hardy Englishmen, tawny with sea-voyaging, hairy for lack of razors, with muscles like wire, fangs greedy for flesh, and fingers itching for gold, [...]. (*VO*: 81-2)

This reveals the history of few sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English colonists who were traders in Brazil, and posed little threat to the "Portuguese colonizers" (*VO*: 364). The Dutch and the French, however, sought to extend their own colonial possessions. This description of a short-lived English colony has some historical precedent.[100] Therefore, the Englishmen were settled there, women were imported; children grew and the result was the expansion of the British Empire. It is then that:

> [f]rom the interior came Indians with subtle poisons, naked bodies, and painted idols, from the sea came vengeful Spaniards and rapacious Portuguese, [...] the English dwindled away and all but disappeared. Somewhere about the middle of the seventeenth-century a single sloop watched its season and slipped out by night, bearing within it all that was left of the great British colony, a few men, a few women, and perhaps a dozen dusky children. English history then denies all knowledge of the place. (*VO*: 82)

The passage very briefly epitomizes how the life of "the great British colony" is closed. Woolf calls this colonized place "Santa Marina."[101] Through such a brief allusion to the colonial history of Santa Marina, Woolf illustrates, as Karen R. Lawrence states, "the

function of South America as a continual resource for European [especially English] imagination."[102]

In *Mrs Dalloway*, Woolf suggests various forms of colonization in the 1920s, such as the Armenian problem or crisis, which took place in the summer of 1923. The Armenians,[103] who had been, as Linden Peach points out, "colonized and expelled by various imperial powers," were "Christians in a largely Muslim area."[104] In 1915, when the Ottoman Empire ordered the deportation of the Armenian population to Syria and Palestine, between 600,000 and 1,000,000 Armenians were killed. After a brief independence in 1920, Armenia was incorporated into the USSR in 1922, so the country would have been very much in the news at the time of writing *Mrs Dalloway*.[105] The Armenians settled partly within Russian and partly within Turkish territory; however, Britain interfered in this crisis because its profits were threatened in the area. In *Mrs Dalloway,* the narrator, who is "situated in a post-Lausanne Treaty England and is engaged in a dialogue with pre-Lausanne Treaty England," satirizes the "complacency of a group of powerful people who were responsible for the betrayal of the Armenians."[106] The problem of "Armenians" and "Albanians" is referred to by Richard Dalloway who "was already half-way to the House of Commons, to his Armenians, his Albanians", "[h]unted out of experience, maimed, frozen, the victims of cruelty and injustice" (*MD*: 107). Indeed, *Mrs Dalloway* criticizes Richard's and Clarissa's imperious gaze and their sense of Englishness, since they, especially Clarissa, consider the other races inferior and the English superior.

Another form of the British Empire's concern with the colonial lands is the problem of British emigration. The government, as Masami Usui argues, encourages the "British emigration to the empire," whereas it discourages the "alien immigration to Britain."[107] England and many European countries have problems with their native people as the product of chiefly two forces: first, the economic dislocations at home; second, the limited capacity of land and jobs. For instance, Millicent Bruton makes projects "for emigrating young people of both sexes born of respectable parents and setting them up with a fair prospect of doing well in Canada" (*MD*: 97). Lady Bruton recognizes that nations and nationalism are profoundly significant in the formation of colonial practice, because colonialism, as Ashcroft quotes Hobson, "consists in the migration of part of a

nation to vacant or sparsely peopled foreign lands," while "the emigrants carrying with them full rights of citizenship in the mother country [...] may be considered a genuine expansion of nationality."[108] This is one of the strategies of imperialism to control both the colonizer and the colonized. By such a strategy, the English Empire becomes the 'centre' and everything else which lay outside that centre is at the 'margin.'

Considering this point, Peter Walsh compares India to Ireland since both are colonized; Ireland is a European country but in contrast to Britain (the centre) it is marginalized. Walsh's five-year stay in India from 1918 to 1923 is a testimony to confirm that he was aware of the Amritsar Massacre which took place in 1919.[109] The point is that the Amritsar Massacre—which occurred in Amritsar, the holy city of the Sikhs in the Punjab State—is inscribed and recorded as one of the great tragedies of the British rule in India. This group of Sikh demonstrators, Denis Judd writes, "trapped within a walled yet open area, the Jallianwallabagh, and with the gates locked against their escape on British orders"[110] were the victims of the long British imperial control in India. The outcome of these cold-blooded killings was, in Judd's words, "nearly 400 Indians lay dead and more than 1,000 had been wounded."[111] In 1919-23, a series of measures gave the Indians a certain degree of self-rule in which the elected Indian ministers governed together with the British administrators. The British policy-makers attempt to grapple with the new situation by giving constitutional concessions in order to gratify the Indian nationalist's aspirations, and their own desire for retaining India as a central part of the imperial territory.[112]

Nevertheless, Woolf's view of colonization, in *The Waves*, is completely different from her other travel narratives for two reasons. First, she portrays a colonization of the psyche, second she fictionalizes the experiences of colonization in those Eastern countries to which she had never travelled, and just invents these places in her intertextual references to other travel writers', administrators' or ambassadors' works, especially Leonard Woolf's. Virginia's political views were influenced by Leonard's political activities and experiences in Ceylon.[113] Through reading Kipling's, Conrad's and Leonard's works, Woolf becomes familiar with the ideology of the late nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries. She mocks not only the superiority of British policy in

the world of non-Europeans and Europeans but also the very concept of imperiality in every form such as the French or the English imperiality.

As mentioned before, *The Waves* highlights various forms of imperial sovereignty during three decades (the 1910s, 1920s and 1930s) as the miniature of three centuries ("[t]hree hundred years now seem more than a moment vanished" [*W*: 539]) to represent the emergence of one form of imperialism, for instance, the French imperialism in Egypt, or the English imperialism in India. Woolf tries to show that these wars are the metonymic signs of the characters' psychological battles. The French occupation of Egypt, for instance, had been advanced in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, as Louis remembers, "Napoleon and his conquests," as well as the British Empire which "inflict[s] on the world the injury of some obliquity" (*W*: 507). The purpose of the expedition that sailed under Napoleon Bonaparte was to damage the British trade, to threaten India, and to obtain assets for bargaining in any future peace settlement. Meanwhile, as a colony under the benevolent and progressive administration of revolutionary France, Egypt regenerates and regains its ancient prosperity. A commission of scholars and scientists to investigate and report the past and present condition of the country, therefore, accompanied the military and naval forces. The same case takes place with the British Empire's presence in Egypt.[114] England had a certain familiarity with Egypt and the Egyptians, even the other Oriental countries as is seen in Arthur James Balfour's historical knowledge of the Orient.[115] Actually, the imperial power denigrates Asia, Africa or the East, as Said argues, "geographically, morally, culturally,"[116] psychologically and mentally. Imperial ideology is obvious in Balfour's argument: "we are in Egypt not merely for the sake of the Egyptians, though we are there for their sake; we are there also for the sake of Europe at large."[117]

Woolf symbolizes the scenario of imperialism, in *The Waves*, by arranging two dinner parties. The first farewell party is arranged in a "French restaurant" (*W*: 479) in which Percival is the central figure who supplies the catalyst of British power and creates a moment of unity and communication. The second reunion party is in a restaurant in "Hampton Court" (*W*: 530) in which the other characters achieve a form of communication. The former (in the fourth episode) shows a dinner table conversation of Percival's—the British imperial power's—future in India and, as Eric Warner writes,

"the farewells [the six characters] bid become a permanent part of their experience"[118] through which they review the imperialist's past and current relations with its colonies. The latter (in the eighth episode) reflects the failure of their communication and policy after Percival's death because the six characters become gradually fragmented and sealed in the encroachments of formulated identity. As Warner states, Percival's "death is their first real experience of the 'enemy', one which destroys the sense of youth, and endless possibility which had been enshrined before."[119] These parties might present the union of the super-power or the First World countries, such as Britain and France, as allies in some political strategies and profits to establish a strong imperial power based on Euro-centric values, assumptions, beliefs and attitudes or the British-centric norms in Europe. Historically speaking, various groups of imperial powers have practiced different forms of hegemony by means of which they try to convince other countries that "their interests are the interests of all."[120] In this regard, *The Waves* is Woolf's critique of Europe's imperiality and its imposing power.

The beginning of *The Waves* portrays England during the Great War. During that period, England's socio-political control over India was complete and such control had been maintained by the British Empire since "it took responsibility for education in India after the Charter Act of 1813."[121] The British administration discovers "the power of English literature as a vehicle for imperial authority."[122] Bill Ashcroft quotes G. Viswanathan: "the English literary text functioned as a surrogate Englishman in his highest and most perfect state."[123] This claim makes the presence of intellectual groups of writers, especially the Bloomsbury Group, very significant because this group includes some literary writers during the time Woolf was writing *The Waves*. In 1940, she writes in a letter to Benedict Nicolson, "[m]y puzzle is, ought artists now to become politicians? My instinct says no; but I'm not sure that I can justify my instinct" (*L* 6: 420). In fact, she portrays Bernard as a writer, a biographer or historian who writes the history of multi-faceted imperial power in the colonies.

By saying "[n]ow to sum up," (*W*: 545) Bernard gives a brief autobiography and biography of his and his friends' life, as well as England's and the empire's life. He chronicles Neville's, Rhoda's, Louis's, Jinny's, Susan's, Percival's and his own life from childhood until after their second reunion. This suggests a mosaic of recurring images

and phrases that refers to the presence of imperialism. Once the battle of all characters is finished at the end of the travel narrative, Bernard's psychological battle begins:

> I took my mind, my being [...]. I jumped up. I said, "Fight! Fight!" I repeated. It is the effort and the struggle, it is the perpetual warfare, it is the shattering and piecing together—this is the daily battle, defeat or victory, the absorbing pursuit. The trees, scattered, put on order; the thick green of the leaves thinned itself to a dancing light. I netted them under with a sudden phrase. I retrieved them from formlessness with words. (*W*: 561)

Bernard's unending struggle, his "perpetual warfare," his "daily battle, defeat or victory" that results in retrieving "them from formlessness" shows the growing sense of his mysterious identity. Woolf has the same feeling when she writes in her diary, "[h]ere is something to fight: & when I wake early I say to myself, Fight, fight," she also recurrently refers to the "enemy" of that formlessness against which she struggles all her life (*D* 3: 260). Bernard, accordingly, reforms and reshapes his consciousness, identity and knowledge of the world and imperialism. His battle or his victory is crucially different from Percival's conquests. Bernard's academic and practical knowledge is the product of Percival's experience of war mixed with the effective knowledge about and of Orientals, their race, character, culture, history and identity. Bernard's statements indicate his emotional ambivalence that reflects Virginia's own ambivalence, especially in the political decisions. She records this ambivalence in her diary: "[b]ut superficial perhaps. I should like to take the globe in my hands & feel it quietly, round, smooth, heavy & so hold it, day after day" (*D* 3: 209) which conveys her imperial desire in spite of the fact that she is considered as an anti-imperialist for her feminist work, *A Room of One's Own*.

The last episode is a brief explanation in which Bernard reintroduces himself and the other characters. He addresses an unknown person:

> Now to explain to you the meaning of life. Since we do not know each other (though I met you once, I think, on board a ship going to Africa), we can talk freely. The illusion is upon me that something adheres for a moment, has roundness, weight, depth, is completed. This, for a moment, seems to be my life. If it were possible, I would hand it to you entire. [...] Yet like children we tell each other stories, and to decorate them we make these ridiculous, flamboyant, beautiful phrases. How tired I am of stories, how tired I am of phrases that come beautifully with all their feet on the ground! (*W*: 545)

Bernard's statement, "(though I met you once, I think, on board a ship going to Africa)," shows that the addressee might be a missionary, an adventurer, a colonial administrator,

an ambassador or any common traveller who travels to Egypt. Bernard's journey is a sign that represents on the one hand the innumerable metaphorical voyages of discovery, and on the other hand, a contact through trade between the East and the West. Nevertheless, whoever he or she is it makes no difference, since they "tell each other stories" which may signify the recurrent (hi)story of the nations that experienced war, empire and colonization. This narration of nations is the outcome of a traveller's mind that has familiarity with the nations and their histories.

Accordingly, Bernard, Woolf's fictional ethnographer whose language and truth are, in Foucault's words, "linked in a circular relation with systems of power,"[124] longs for some "little language such as lovers use, broken words, and inarticulate words" (*W*: 545) to write the (hi)stories of colonies, nations and their narrations. Bernard, an ethnographer-like adventurer, travels and gazes neutrally into/at the history of a country to tell the truth. However, he is not neutral and his gaze is the imperious gaze of an imperial eye, because he uses the language of empire 'automatically' directed by the *will* of empire. In 1936, Leonard Woolf writes in a letter to Julian Bell that the English government's "policy is now pivoting on a vacuum. It is really the policy of 1911 all over again, i.e. getting entangled in commitments the exact meaning of which no one, including the Government, understands."[125] *The Waves* elaborates the negative effects of power that exclude, repress, censor, abstract, mask as well as conceal the individuals; indeed, power influences the "domains of objects and rituals of truth."[126] Like Leonard, Bernard is tired of these "phrases," since there is a kind of violence instead of justice; accordingly, he tries to free himself of those "ridiculous, flamboyant, beautiful phrases" (*W*: 545) dictated by imperialism.

The Waves criticizes and analyzes the dichotomy between colonizer/colonized and West/East by showing that if England has "Piccadilly South, Piccadilly North, Regent Street and the Haymarket," which are "broad thoroughfares" in London, they are the product of "sanded paths of victory driven through the jungle" (*W*: 520). Colonization is the impact of imperial power over the colonized territories. This image suggests a reciprocal relationship on the one hand between the colonizers and the colonized, and on the other hand, between the West and the East. Indeed, the common people, and even the natives or the "*turbaned men*" (*W*: 456) are completely silent and do not speak, or they

are not allowed to speak since they are just puppets under the control of Bernard's Western imperial eyes. Woolf selects her characters from the upper-middle class to represent how they play their roles as the loyal British administrators or colonizers, and positions the other peripheral characters (the common people and the natives), in an English setting to criticize the superiority of the English. For instance, Bernard in his last soliloquy of the fourth episode says:

> We are slaves bound to suffer incessantly unrecorded petty blows on our bent backs. We are not sheep either, following a master. We are creators. We too have made something that will join the innumerable congregations of past time. We too [...] stride not into chaos, but into a world that our own face can subjugate and make part of the illumined and everlasting road. (*W*: 494)

The passage summarizes the ideology of imperialism as "creators" of history who "join the innumerable congregations of past time." What matters—especially for Rhoda—is a shocking reality about the British Empire that is imperialism and her very contact with such a form of reality as a painful and unbearable ideology which creates a kind of colonization of the psyche. Her fear, recurrently portrayed in an image in which "the tiger leaps," shows Rhoda's dreams of wild remote countries, populated by wild animals such as jackals and eagles as well as wild barbaric men or "*turbaned men with poisoned assegais*" (*W*: 456). Her dreams, which metaphorically reflect her psychological colonization, might signify part of her attempts to construct her ambivalent position in the world of her friends or the Western colonizers.

Louis and his life story is a caricature of Leonard and his administration in Ceylon. Louis's desires and rationality enables him to seek power and to escape from his social marginality and from the inferiority of being a Jew or being in exile, which the Jew shares with other oppressed groups. The image of "the great brute on the beach," (*W*: 420) repeated in his soliloquies, portrays his angst of the "untamed and uncontrolled"[127] humanity in the form of imperial military conquests, especially in the Great War. Rationality strengthens his power to be the chief director of a shipping company which encompasses the whole world and the whole domain of British Empire with its shipping lines. With the ships of his company ruling the waves of the sea, Louis *de facto* tries to rule the waves of sovereignty which change their direction at the end of the travel narrative. This new form of imperiality incarnated in the form of an unknown man

standing "on board a ship going to Africa", "talk[s] freely" with Bernard, who says that, "I would hand it to you entire. I would break it off as one breaks off a bunch of grapes. I would say, 'Take it. This is my life'" (*W*: 545). This highlights the presence of an internal or external enemy, the patriarchal-dominated society, British imperialism and colonization. Woolf satirizes the history of oppression, suffering and persecution imposed on the Jew and other oppressed groups by the imperialist powers, especially the psychological colonization of the marginal identities.

6. 6. "The eclipse of the sun": the momentary absence of imperialism

The discourse of power can be read in all places and times, and there is no escape from the chains of power, because it is "perpetual in historic time"; in other words, it appears, reappears and never disappears.[128] Although power has a momentary absence like "the eclipse of the sun," (*W*: 569) it will, as Barthes points out, immediately "revive and flourish again in the new state of affairs," since it is the "parasite of a trans-social organism, linked to the whole of man's history and not only to his political, [but] historical history."[129] It brings to mind Said's argument whether imperialism ever ended, or whether it has continued,[130] because it also casts a "considerable shadow over our own times."[131] The main point here is the variability and unpredictability of imperialism.

Metaphorically, Woolf formulates and reformulates the history of colonization in the Orient and the Occident by fictionalizing the peoples' geographical and psychological separation from their cultures to present the solidification of imperial power. For instance, *The Waves* indicates how the British imperialism changes its strategy after the Great War, and especially between the Wars, and moves towards a decentralized and empirical type of colonial administration in which some degree of partial decolonization can pave the way for an eventual self-rule. Through realizing the fact that a direct dominion over the ancient civilized lands cannot last indefinitely, Britain works uncannily for an unremitting British presence even in areas where the empire has conferred self-government.

This strategy is obvious in the last episode of *The Waves* through Bernard's political mourning both for the death of Percival in India and for the disappearance of the British

government's all-embracing presence and control over India and other colonial lands: "[w]hat is to be done about India, Ireland or Morocco?" (*W*: 553)

> The scene beneath me withered. It was like the eclipse when the sun went out and left the earth, flourishing in full summer foliage, withered, brittle, false. Also I saw on a winding road in a dust dance the groups we had made, how they came together, how they ate together, how they met in this room or that. I saw my own indefatigable busyness—how I had rushed from one to the other, fetched and carried, travelled and returned, joined this group and that, here kissed, here withdrawn; always kept hard at it by some extraordinary purpose, with my nose to the ground like a dog on the scent [...]. A man without a self, I said. A heavy body leaning on a gate. A dead man. With dispassionate despair, with entire disillusionment [...]. How can I proceed now, I said, without a self, weightless and visionless, through a world weightless, without illusion? (*W*: 569)

Bernard likens the absence of the British control to the "eclipse" of the sun, a momentary absence. His "indefatigable busyness" is a sign full of meaning; it belongs to a history and refers to the role of a British administrator and his presence in a colonial land. The meaning postulates, in Barthes's words, "a kind of knowledge, a past, a memory, a comparative order of facts, ideas, [and] decisions" that signify the myth of imperialism whose presence is "tamed", "transparent," and becomes "the accomplice of a concept,"[132] British imperiality. Eventually, Bernard confesses his role as an agent of imperial eye/I: "I could go like a spy without leaving this place, without stirring from my chair. I can visit the remote verges of the desert lands where the savage sits by the campfire" (*W*: 572). This might suggest that visiting or travelling to a remote land is not necessarily a neutral action; instead, some imperialist agents travel to achieve their own political purposes and to improve their colonial power and will. Going as a spy is not an empty form for the imperial presence, it is rather a full meaning to show that what the British imperiality conceals is a factual discourse that tells us about the surveillance or its panopticon system used by imperialism in modern times.

The myth of British imperial power incarnated in Percival is a recurrent chivalric image made by imperialism. This mythical signifier—Percival[133]—suggests its form as empty or dead but present, and its meaning absent but full. The British imperiality instructs the soldiers and administrators, such as Percival and Bernard, to be nothing more than instrumental signifiers who die for its sake. The travel narrative represents different reactions of six characters towards Percival's death. For instance, Neville likens Percival to the "lights of the world" which disappeared and died "among unknown men" (*W*: 497).

The heroic scene of Percival's death recreates the patriotic responsibility of every soldier who is loyal to the English Queen and imperial power.

Because of Percival's incomprehensible death, Bernard is unable to distinguish the borderline between joy and sorrow: "My son is born; Percival is dead" (*W*: 498). Bernard's newborn son may refer to the desire for the imperial power born in Bernard when Percival is dead. Moreover, his feeling about Percival is that "he sat there in the centre" (*W*: 498); this claim reflects the centrality of Percival as an "always present *I*" which is constituted only by confronting with "an always absent *you*."[134] He believes that they have lost a leader whom they need to follow, because the presence of a political leader makes the subjects alive. Metaphorically speaking, Percival is a historical text written by imperialism and read by the characters.

Rhoda's reaction to Percival's death is somehow different:

> I hear the rush of the great grindstone within an inch of my head. Its wind roars in my face. All palpable forms of life have failed me. [...] The figure that was robed in beauty is now clothed in ruin. The figure that stood in the grove where the steep-backed hills come down falls in ruin [...]. I will pick violets and bind them together and offer them to Percival, something given him by me. Look now at what Percival has given me. Look at the street now that Percival is dead. [...] Reckless and random the cars race and roar and hunt us to death like bloodhounds. I am alone in a hostile world. The human face is hideous. [...] I like the passing of face and face and face, deformed, indifferent. (*W*: 501)

Rhoda reconstructs and compares, in her mind, the connection between Percival's desire for war and his solitary self-reliance in his actual life. She is changed by being confronted with what counts as the true nature of imperiality. She gazes at "the street," the "lightly" houses, "the cars" that "race and roar and hunt us to death like bloodhounds," the loneliness in a "hostile world," the hideous "human face," the deformed and indifferent "face and face and face." By his death, Percival has given Rhoda a present, disclosed a terror and left her to undergo the humiliation to see the "greedy" faces while "ogling, brushing, [and] destroying everything" (*W*: 501). These references show the true image of colonization. Percival becomes a form of truth, as Foucault states, "linked in a circular relation with systems of power which produce and sustain it,"[135] and the characters understand the effects of such power differently. Percival's death solves the mystery of his existence. From Rhoda's viewpoint, he presents all the fake, dehumanized and

artificial beauties of the colonizer in order to screen off all the pure or wild beauties of the colonized.

Rhoda's understanding of life is changed by the impact of her painful experience and reciprocal interactions, through which she learns what she did not know before and did not expect. Rhoda comprehends that the only thing they can do is to "cluster like maggots," (*W*: 502) to sway and to open programmes with a few words of greeting to friends, and then the "beetle-shaped men with their violins; wait; count; nod; down come their bows" (*W*: 503). Percival's death or the death of British military power changes Rhoda's gaze, as she confesses, "Percival, by his death, has made me this gift, let me see the thing" (*W*: 503). This gift might be an apparent and transitory independence given to India by self-ruling, or a kind of knowledge by which Rhoda articulates the gap between the imaginary and real experience of imperial power in the colonies.

Her restlessness is the result of her travels and her travelling psyche. Like every traveller, the sense and love of adventure and far out places motivates her to return to India:

> Now from the window of the tram I see masts among chimneys; there is the river; there are ships that sail to India. I will walk by the river. [...] Now I will at last free the checked, the jerked-back desire to be spent, to be consumed. We will gallop together over desert hills where the swallow dips her wings in dark pools and the pillars stand entire. Into the wave that dashes upon the shore, into the wave that flings its white foam to the uttermost corners of the earth, I throw my violets, my offering to Percival. (*W*: 504)

It is partially true that Rhoda can only understand based on her own horizon of expectations. At last, she frees herself from the "jerked-back desire to be spent, to be consumed" and then gallops, like Vita Sackville-West, over the "desert hills" of India, or maybe Persia in her desires, "where the swallow dips her wings in dark pools and the pillars stand entire." By observing the splendid waves of the sea of her mind, she throws her violets, her "offering to Percival." This might symbolize a romantic farewell between two friends or lover and beloved. It might also suggest the relationship between Britain and India as a swinging between love and hate to show that there is rarely a proper dialogue between the British and the Indians, because one is the ruler or colonizer and the other is ruled or colonized.

> Dawn is some sort of whitening of the sky; some sort of renewal. Another day; another Friday; another twentieth of March, January, or September. Another general awakening. The stars draw back and are extinguished. The bars deepen themselves between the waves. The film of mist thickens on the fields. A redness gathers on the roses, even on the pale rose that hangs by the bedroom window. A bird chirps. Cottagers light their early candles. Yes, this is the eternal renewal, the incessant rise and fall and fall and rise again. (*W*: 575)

The situation and the references to "Friday", "twentieth of March" and "January" reflect "some sort of renewal." It awakens a sense of "the eternal renewal, the incessant rise and fall and fall and rise again" that might suggest the desire or love of adventure which motivates every one to travel. The passage may also reflect the spirit of imperialism, which metaphorically rides against the enemy like Percival as a young man who epitomizes the culmination and potential of patriarchal society and culture. Now Bernard is Percival's surrogate:

> It is death. Death is the enemy. It is death against whom I ride with my spear couched and my hair flying back like a young man's, like Percival's, when he galloped in India. I strike spurs into my horse. Against you I will fling myself, unvanquished and unyielding, O Death! (*W*: 575)

The passage reflects Bernard's internal and psychological struggle, which rather mirrors Percival's military conquest in India. Bernard, other travellers, ethnographers, spies or administrators are signifiers, like Percival, that indicate the never-ending store of the mythical signifiers. Bernard's striking "spurs into [his] horse" metaphorically suggests the striking spurs into the colonies. He claims that this imperial power is "unvanquished and unyielding." Bernard's struggle and quest is different from Percival's because Bernard experiences and recognizes all the inescapable boundaries of the modernized world and discovers the inefficiency of the imperial power's knowledge. He investigates like a historian or an ethnographer, though not a participant-observer. His attempts are the result of the long succession of years, decades, periods and centuries through which the British Empire continues to work its way in the lives of the colonial subjects. Bernard might be the representative of the inherited hierarchy of imperialism in the colonies replaced by a 'self-invented order' of independency that is, however, again controlled by the British imperiality.

This intellectual administrator or (maybe) spy struggles with his pen, policy or administrative surveillance willingly and undoubtedly under the control of the imperialist will. For this reason, Jane Marcus is right, when she states that Woolf:

> explicitly repeating the words 'rise and fall and and [sic] rise again' throughout [*The Waves*] [...]. These (Eastern) episodes surround a (Western) narrative of the fall of British imperialism. Imperialist history is divided into chapters called 'the rise of ...' or 'the fall of ...' *The Waves* explores the way in which the cultural narrative 'England' is created by an Eton/Cambridge elite who (re)produce the national epic (the rise of ...) and elegy (the fall of ...) in praise of the hero.[136]

Yet Marcus concludes that "the fall of ..." is the death of imperialism, while he refers to the recurrent word "rise and fall and fall and rise again." In her analysis, she has forgotten to put emphasis on the "rise again," which may signify the emergence of different forms of war, militarism and imperialism. If one considers imperialism, like Loomba, "as a political system in which an imperial centre governs colonised countries, then the granting of political independence signals the end of empire,"[137] we can accept Marcus's argument. By contrast, imperialism can also be "an economic system of penetration and control of markets"; accordingly, the political changes "redefine"[138] imperialism. In fact, *The Waves* shows "the rise of" or "the fall of," which is the rise and fall of one form of imperialism changing into another form, for instance, the rise of the 'economic penetration' and the fall of the 'military power.' Woolf, however, uses the phrase "the eternal renewal, the *incessant* rise and fall and fall and *rise again* [my emphasis]" (*W*: 575) which underlines the impact of imperialism on shaping and reshaping different forms of imperial power. Concluding that there is "the incessant rise and fall and fall and rise again," Bernard understands that this is not the end of British imperial power and will; rather, the form of its power is changed. He is also changed as an active representative of the British Empire: "while I sat here I have been changing" (*W*: 574). This change might refer to an unconscious changing of the self of a traveller, or a conscious changing of the policy of an imperialist agent. He realizes that the death of colonial power means the lack of presence of the British Empire in the colonial countries. Therefore, the last sentence of the travel narrative does not portray "the submerged mind of empire,"[139] as Marcus claims; rather, it indicates a new "unvanquished and unyielding"

quarrel against the death of Empire by striking "spurs into [Bernard's] horse" which might refer to India.

Another form of power is shown in Louis's soliloquy:

> I have lived thousands of years. I am like a worm that has eaten its way through the wood of a very old oak beam. [...] I, now a duke, now Plato, companion of Socrates; the tramp of dark men and yellow men migrating east, west, north and south; the eternal procession, women going with attaché cases down the Strand as they went once with pitchers to the Nile; all the furled and close-packed leaves of my many-folded life are now summed in my name; incised cleanly and barely on the sheet. Now a full-grown man; now upright standing in sun or rain. [...] I roll the dark before me, spreading commerce where there was chaos in the far parts of the world. (*W*: 506)

Louis is a mythical signifier or an inextricable whole made of meaning and form, a Jew, who lived thousands of years like "a worm that has eaten its way through the wood of a very old oak beam." He desires to unite the white and black people from remote parts of the world, not for humanitarian reasons, but for "spreading commerce" and satisfying his own desire. The phrase "furled and close-packed leaves of my many-folded life are now summed in my name," might reflect a personal form of the ideology of imperialism or a patriarchal chauvinism. In spite of his "accent; beatings, and other tortures; the boasting boys" and his father who is a "banker at Brisbane," he wants to "erase old defilements" (*W*: 506-7). He is a merchant, a man of business, a spy or an ambassador who journeys to the remotest parts of the globe while he has colonial desires. Like Socrates, Louis finds true strength, so that his own understanding may be transformed. Socrates's dialectical approach may serve as a model for all truly dialectical questioning to realize the reason of Percival's death. He believes that Percival died in "Egypt", "he died in Greece, all deaths are one death" (*W*: 507). These references make Percival equivalent to war and violence, which are finished after Percival's death. He plays the role of an imperialist's formal and military power destroyed by the new reforms in those parts of the world which are under the control of the British Empire.

Susan plays the role of a mother, a Queen, England, Empire, who supports her children, soldiers and people when they sleep, or when they are in danger: "wrapping in a cocoon made of my own blood the delicate limbs of my baby" (*W*: 508). Woolf highlights her colonial, national fantasy that plays upon and with the connections between women, land, or nation; in this regard, the British Empire covers the life of all the characters as symbols

of different version of the national temper. Susan considers all the soldiers as her babies and protects them against the unexpected enemies. She emphasizes that she feeds her baby:

> making of my body a hollow, a warm shelter for my child to sleep in. Sleep, I say, sleep. [...] "His [her baby's] eyes will see when mine are shut", I think. "I shall go mixed with them beyond my body and shall see India. He will come home, bringing trophies to be laid at my feet. He will increase my possessions." [...] "No more. I am glutted with natural happiness." Yet more will come, more children; more cradles, more baskets in the kitchen and hams ripening; and onions glistening; and more beds of lettuce and potatoes. [...] I am glutted with natural happiness [...]. (*W*: 509)

The passage might suggest Susan's role as Queen Victoria, the empress of India, whose British soul is automatically present with the soldiers, especially during the war. Woolf criticizes this presence by showing that there is no end of British imperial power; for example, Susan is in quest of more lands, "more children; more cradles," and "more baskets." This confirms the unremitting desire of imperialism for colonizing the remote lands in order to bring the "natural happiness" for the colonizer.

Jinny's speech signifies that the Empire controls the life, religion and policies of the nations. The British Empire on the one hand trained the missionaries who "converted" the colonized by "reading [the] Bible," and on the other hand sent the soldiers, spies, administrators, ambassadors to "take train for France; others ship for India. Some will never come into this room again" (*W*: 510). Indeed, from the British Empire, its modernization and its civilization, "every sort of building, policy, venture, picture, poem, child," and "factory" will spring; hence, somewhere life comes and somewhere life goes, i.e., "we [English] make life," (*W*: 511)—a reference to the superiority of British people, their civilization and imperiality. Jinny is characterized as a heterosexual hedonist who celebrates sexuality more than anything else. Therefore, Jinny as the symbol of all beauties of England seduces the others:

> All London is uneasy with flashing lights. Now let us sing our love song—Come, come, come. Now my gold signal is like a dragon-fly flying taut. Jug, jug, jug, I sing like the nightingale whose melody is crowded in the too narrow passage of her throat. [...] [O]ne has pierced me. One is driven deep within me. (*W*: 511)

Jinny's song "[j]ug, jug, jug" reminds us of T. S. Eliot's line "'Jug, Jug' to dirty ears,"[140] in *The Waste Land*, which might be, according to Humbert Wolfe, "the symbol of

nightingale of beauty singing in the ears of all of us."[141] It might be a picture of Philomela changed to a nightingale, as Kathy J. Phillips also explains, an allusion to "Ovid's story of how Tereus's raped and mutilated victim, Philomela, turned into a bird."[142] Like Ovid, who changes the raped women in his *Metamorphoses*, Eliot changes the indifferent lovers into nightingales to sing the song of sexuality. B. C. Southam writes that in Elizabethan poetry "jug, jug", "a conventional way of representing bird-song," is used as a "crude joking reference to sexual intercourse."[143] Jinny with all her sexual desires and behaviours might be a representative of the modern "prostituted" (*TG*: 85) or trans-cultural society, or the British Empire, which expands its colonies by giving them some of the tempting beauties of this society. By mixing the culture of the various countries or their identities with its own "personal charm," (*TG*: 91) British imperiality circuitously permeates the people's life, and dominates their identities; hence, there is no escape from the chains of power. Metaphorically, the Empire sometimes plays the role of a beloved or a female hedonist who tempts men by her golden signals.

At the end of the sixth episode, Woolf evokes imperialism in Neville's soliloquy:

> We must oppose the waste and deformity of the world, its crowds eddying round and round disgorged and trampling [...]. Everything must be done to rebuke the horror of deformity. Let us read writers of Roman severity and virtue; let us seek perfection through the sand. Yes, but I love to slip the virtue and severity of the noble Romans [...]. (*W*: 513)

What matters is the cliché of triumph or the will to power, which rules the world with the purposes of control and external dominance, shown in opposing "the waste and deformity of the world." The stereotypes of removing the deformity and bringing order and democracy are realistic signs of the British sovereignty or the imperial project. Nevertheless, Bernard believes that Britain is ready "to consider any suggestion that the world may offer quite impartially" (*W*: 538) for a new form of independency for India or every foreign policy. Paradoxically, he compares Britain to a sun that energizes its colonies and its temporary separation will be more destructive than constructive, or even instructive: "the earth is only a pebble flicked off accidentally from the face of the sun and that there is no life anywhere in the abysses of space" (*W*: 538). Bernard metaphorically focuses on the centrality of Britain in India by likening its presence to the eclipsed sun. Bernard's ironical reference to a new form of the imperial control, "a trick

of the mind—to put Kings on their thrones, one following another, with crowns on their heads" (*W*: 539) shows a policy used in the colonies, especially in Egypt and in India. Louis also expresses this idea:

> 'But listen,' said Louis, 'to the world moving through abysses of infinite space. It roars; the lighted strip of history is past and our Kings and Queens; we are gone; our civilization; the Nile; and all life. Our separate drops are dissolved; we are extinct, lost in the abysses of time, in the darkness.' (*W*: 538)

The Waves portrays the attempts of imperialism to control the colonies, which "telescoped [in Loomba's words] marginal histories into the story of capitalism."[144] In this way, it uncovers the marginalized histories of the colonized countries and the history of other liminal and oppressed groups by the imperial powers. By foreshadowing the eternal presence of imperialism and reviewing its patriarchal history, Woolf's narrative of the colonized people, the non-Europeans or the subaltern women creates a particular form of understanding Orientalism, colonialism and imperialism. She highlights the ideology of imperialism and once again raises the question of whether imperialism ever ended or whether it has continued in the lives of the colonized, subaltern and non-Europeans.