

# Representing The Unspeakable Trauma: A Deleuzian Reading Of Conrad's

## *Heart Of Darkness*

Che-ming Yang

Associate Professor, Department of Foreign Languages and Literature, National Cheng Kung University, Tainan,  
Taiwan

Correspondence: yang5692@mail.ncku.edu.tw, philyang2003@yahoo.com.tw

Published online: August 24, 2010

### Abstract

This paper explores Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* to analyze Kurtz's ghastly vision of horror (trauma) and how he overcomes this traumatic experience through the metamorphosis of becoming-animal/savage in forming his lines of flight from the oedipalizing/oppressive capitalism and imperialism. To avoid following a conventional approach to study this novella, I explore Kurtz's unspeakable horror that underlies a postmodern aesthetics of problematizing representation. To further unveil the strategies for (re)presenting Kurtz's unspeakable pain and horror, or to be more specific, the mysterious vision that overwhelms him right before he dies, I apply the Deleuzian conception of the "impossible writing"—a writing strategy that is characteristic of minor literature/writing—to analyze Marlow's narrativization, for it happens to highlight Marlow's impasse, just like Kafka's, that bars him access to writing for Kurtz's outrageous experience and vision and thus turns this narration/writing into something impossible.

**Keywords:** Deleuzian; deterritorialization; *Heart of Darkness*; oedipalizing; impossible writing.

We are the hollow men  
 We are the stuffed men  
 Leaning together  
 Headpiece filled with straw. Alas!  
 Our dried voices, when  
 We whisper together  
 Are quiet and meaningless  
 .....  
 Shape without form, shade without colour,  
 Paralysed force, gesture without motion  
 (T. S. Eliot, "The Hollow Men"<sup>1</sup>)

<sup>1</sup> In this poem, Eliot uses an epigraph by quoting two lines from *Heart of Darkness*, and the poem is similar to Eliot's *The Waste Land* in tone and content but much less extensive in treatment. "The Hollow Men" mainly mirrors some aspects of *Heart of Darkness*, which depicts the contrast between "the artificiality of civilization and the elemental but savage power of the primitive superstition" (Heiney & Downs 364). "The Hollow Men" mainly aims to present the spiritual voidness of the modern men, the citizens of modern Western culture, "synthetically stuffed with opinions, ideas and faiths they cannot feel" (Heiney & Downs 364).

## 1. Introduction

Many critics such as Jerome Thale argue that Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*<sup>2</sup> "contains all the trappings of the conventional adventure tale—mystery, exotic setting, escape, suspense, and unexpected attack" [1]. Critics over so many years since it was first published have discovered many themes in *Heart of Darkness*, especially the motif of quest for self-knowledge. Besides, most readers and critics have been puzzled by Kurtz's ghastly vision that reflects his unspeakable horror and pain before he dies, and thus thousands of discussions have been done over this issue. My analysis of this novella will not follow the conventional studies on it. Rather, I intend to take one step further to explore the unspeakable horror that underlies a **postmodern aesthetics of problematizing representation**. Furthermore, I will adopt a Deleuzian perspective—the **(micro)politics of minor writing and the Deleuzian schizoanalysis** (in opposition to the Freudian psychoanalysis)—on this mysterious narrative to unveil the narrative strategies and the complex vision of the unconscious investments of individual and group desire in the capitalist society. In other words, in this essay I intend to explore how Kurtz attempts a **detritorialization** (lines of flight) in a capitalist/imperialist society in *Heart of Darkness*.

## 2. (Re)presenting the Unspeakable Horror: Toward the Postmodern Politics/Problematics of Deleuzian Minor Writing

But his soul was mad. Being alone in the wilderness, it had looked within itself. . . . I tell you, it had gone mad. I had—for my sins, I suppose, to go through the ordeal of looking into it myself. No eloquence could have been so withering to one's belief in mankind as his final burst of sincerity. . . . I saw the **inconceivable mystery of a soul** [emphasis added] that knew no restraint, no faith, and no fear, yet struggling blindly with itself. [2]

To explore the strategies for (re)presenting Kurtz's unspeakable pain and horror, or to be more specific, the mysterious vision that overwhelms him right before he dies, I would like to apply the Deleuzian conception of the "impossible writing" characteristic of minor literature/writing to Marlow's situation, for it happens to highlight Marlow's impasse (just like Kafka's when fired with national consciousness) that bars him access to writing for Kurtz's outrageous experience and vision and thus turns his narration/writing into something impossible:

1. The impossibility of not narrating/writing: Marlow's overwhelming feeling of Kurtz's mysterious horrible vision that necessarily exists by means of literature; that is, he cannot abstain himself from narrating this horrifying experience.
2. The impossibility of narrating what he has witnessed and felt in a human language: it is a sense of the sublime that always evades the verbal reproduction in any human language.
3. The impossibility of narrating otherwise—Marlow has no other choice but to "preach" to the people on the ship in a form of a religious parable (a Buddha preaching a sermon) conveying some insight into the mysteries of life. This association is revealed by Conrad, because in the novella, from beginning to end, Marlow is narrating while sitting in a pose of a meditating Buddha. This seems to imply that his vision is something extraordinary/unearthly and thus incomprehensible. According to Buddhism, Dharma (truths) is beyond verbal description—the unrepresentable/unspeakable.

<sup>2</sup> Joseph Conrad, *Heart of Darkness: An Authoritative Text Backgrounds and Sources*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., (New York: Norton, 1971). All quoted lines or passages from the novella will be only marked with their page numbers only based on this text if not otherwise noted.

According to Lyotard (1979) in *The Postmodern Condition*, the aim of a postmodern artist or writer is “not to supply reality but to invent allusion to the conceivable which cannot be presented” [3]. Given the above-mentioned, I try to highlight another quote from Lyotard in Chapter One that says “the postmodern would be that which, in the modern, puts forward the unrepresentable in presentation itself . . . to share collectively the nostalgia for the unattainable” [3]. Here, we can easily discover that Deleuze and Guattari’s politics of minor writing seems to echo Lyotard’s in problematizing literary/artistic representation, which is a main characteristic of postmodern art. In (re)presenting Kurtz’s ghastly vision and his sense of extreme horror, Conrad seems to deterritorialize the language by multiplying the sense of “horror” to reproduce Marlow’s vision of Kurtz in torture when he is dying.

In terms of minor writing, the horrifying narrative is expressed in a deterritorialized language appropriate for strange and minor uses. Furthermore, Deleuze and Guattari, while stressing the collective value of minor (minoritarian) literature, claim that literature is also revolutionary and thus “produces an active solidarity in spite of skepticism” [4]. Great literature is minor and seems foreign because it diverts from the mainstream standard or norm.

Furthermore, Deleuze and Guattari argue that “each language always implies a deterritorialization of the mouth, the tongue, and the teeth” because the oral organs territorialize food but have to deterritorialize themselves when articulating sounds [4]. They also claim that language compensates for its deterritorialization by “reterritorialization in sense” for “ceasing to be the organ of one of the sense.” To explore the deterritorialization and reterritorialization of language, Deleuze and Guattari take one step further by claiming that

Since articulated sound was formerly deterritorialized noise but one that will be reterritorialized in sense, it is now sound itself that will be deterritorialized irrevocably, absolutely. The sound or the word that traverses this new deterritorialization no longer belongs to a language of sense, even though it derives from it, nor is it an organized music or song, even though it might appear to be. [4]

Kurtz’s murmur of horror happens to correspond to this passage, for it is the sound or word that “traverses” and thus no longer belongs to a language of sense. As a result, language becomes “an instrument of Sense” [4]. Therefore, the ordinary use of language is not appropriate for Marlow in narrating his/Kurtz’s vision of horror, because ordinary articulation of language is extensive or representative—“the reterritorializing function of language” [4]. It becomes an expression of the unspeakable, connoting an extraordinary sense that is mysterious, perplexing and always in the way of becoming, just like the unconscious. Kurtz’s expression of horror has become a vibrating sequence. Together with the interrupting/occasional and inexplicable silence of Marlow while narrating the story, that expression (Kurtz’s “Intended” meaning) and the silent moment have become open onto unexpected internal intensities—“*Language stops being representative in order to now move toward its extremities or its limits*” [4].

### 3. Becoming-Imperceptible and Allegorization

Instead of presenting Kurtz’s story and his inner world directly, Conrad intentionally creates a multiple point of view in narrating the whole story. Moreover, it is Marlow, the chief narrator, who tells his adventure story in reminiscence, which is occasionally interrupted/jointed by flashbacks and the real narrator’s (Conrad’s) omniscient description (the main narration by

Marlow returns to the *Nellie's* deck several times).

Above all, the main part of this story is presented in quotation marks in the guise of Marlow's reminiscence. The source of the story is already multilayered and problematic—Who's speaking in the "boxed" story which opens with one unnamed "I" (an unspecified narrator sitting on the deck of *Nellie*) and sets the stage for the second "I"? The first "I" speaks in first-person objective voice, whereas the second "I" (Conrad-Marlow) speaks in first-person subjective voice. To sum up, the overall narration of this novella is a palimpsest intertext.

To further analyze the collapse of the boundaries between the narrator and the audience/reader, I try to employ the Deleuzian conception of becoming. To be specific — becoming-imperceptible or becoming-minoritarian/literature. Becoming-imperceptible means "no longer knowing who or what we are; it means seeing with greater openness the differences, intensities and singularities that traverse us" [4]. In addition, Deleuze has been emphasizing that "to write is to become(-imperceptible)"; therefore, literature for Deleuze should be a text that destroys this border between the perceiver and the perceived, for he thinks that life begins with pure difference or becoming, or the impulse toward difference or becoming. The human eye tends to perceive what interests it. Given the above-mentioned, I would like to associate the Deleuzian becoming(-imperceptible) in writing with some postmodern ideas about writing.

*Heart of Darkness* is a palimpsest narrative intertext that seems to foreground the contingent relations between the narrator and the audience/reader. This is an impulse toward the ontological, as McHale argues—the dominant of postmodernist fiction is "ontological"—that is, the postmodernist novelists often employ strategies that foreground some ontological questions about the fictional worlds like: "Which world is this? What is to be done in it? Which of my selves is to do it?" [5].

In *Heart of Darkness*, besides blurring the distinction between the narrator and reader, Conrad also seems to mix Marlow's identity with Kurtz's. Several critics have identified Marlow's quest as "a descent into hell," or be more specific, Marlow's journey is usually interpreted as a study of "a descent into the unconscious self" [6]. It is not only a psychological experience but also a significant moral conflict within Marlow. Meanwhile, Kurtz can be seen as Marlow's darker self that is lost in his desire for more power and wealth or as the repenting self in torture. And this may be why Conrad intentionally blurs their identities in this novella. In other words, Marlow's voice seems to overlap with Kurtz's throughout the whole journey—becoming-imperceptible.

In minor writing, Deleuze and Guattari argue, "one has to lose one's identity, one face in it"; and the finality of writing is still way beyond a woman-becoming, a Negro-becoming, an animal becoming, beyond a *minority-becoming*—"the final enterprise of the becoming-imperceptible" [7]. Doubling and blurring the identities of the narrator and author, Conrad happens to create a traitor's writing, which Deleuze and Guattari regard as a difficult task. Blurring/doubling the narrating voice of the subjective author (the unnamed narrator on the deck) and the supposedly objective narrator (Marlow) who is also one of the main characters in the novella, Conrad happens to mark **a postmodern impulse toward allegorization**. Even the "original" author of the adventure tale that claims to be his only experience is also doubled by his binary and varying points of view, for Marlow is (re)presenting his reminiscences of the journey to the "heart of darkness." In other words, when the narrativization is done by the Marlow in reflection, it becomes an allegorized text.

Moreover, throughout the adventure, the Marlow's persona seems to overlap with Kurtz's. In the multiple-layered overlapping of the narrative points of view in this novella, one text is set over another and at the same time, one text is read through another. Craig Owens has made a very subtle analysis of this kind of "palimpsest" text and has also marked its allegorical impulse:

In an allegorical structure, then one text, is read through another, however fragmentary, intermittent, or chaotic their relationship may be; the paradigm for the allegorical work is thus the palimpsest. . . . [8]

If we conceive in the same way, then allegory becomes "the model of all commentary, all critique, insofar as these are involved in rewriting a primary text in terms of its figural meaning" [8]. Given the above-mentioned, the Marlow in reflection is allegorizing the Marlow in adventure. Moreover, Marlow is allegorizing Kurtz's vision through narrativization.

#### 4. The Deterritorialization of Kurtz's Becoming-Animal

There are animal-becomings in literature which do not consist in talking of one's dog or cat. It is rather **an encounter between two reigns, a short-circuit, the picking-up of a code where each is deterritorialized** [emphasis added]. [7]

Continuing the idea of becoming-imperceptible, we can think of literature, just like other forms of arts, as "becoming-molecular" or "becoming-imperceptible." And this is why Deleuze and Guattari favor Kafka's literature, for Kafka vividly presents how man transforms into insect, the process of becoming-inhuman—becoming-imperceptible, which enables us to imagine life from an inhuman perspective.

Moreover, they argue that Kafka "deliberately kills all metaphor, all symbolism, all signification, no less than all designation," because

Metamorphosis is the contrary of metaphor. There is no longer any proper sense or figurative sense, but only a distribution of states that is part of the range of the word. The thing and other things are no longer anything but intensities overrun by deterritorialized sound or words that are following their lines of escape. [4]

In *Heart of Darkness* many people believe Kurtz has become *corrupted* or *degenerated* because he seems to indulge himself in becoming a member of the savage—becoming-savage. Nevertheless, according to Deleuze and Guattari, the line of flight is an act of deterritorialization [7]; that is, Kurtz has been creating lines of flight from the dominant modes of life. In becoming-savage (for being as uncivilized as the natives), just like becoming-animal, there is no longer man or animal, since "each deterritorializes the other, in a conjunction of flux, in a continuum of reversible intensities"; furthermore, "it is now a question of a becoming that includes the maximum of difference as a difference of intensity, the crossing of a barrier . . ." [4]

On the one hand, Kurtz's becoming-savage/animal implies his lines of escape from the capitalist/imperialist society; namely, the desiring machine is always in the process of deterritorialization that opposes all those discourses and mechanisms which block the flow of the unconsciousness. Deleuze and Guattari in their two joint works of *Capitalism and Schizophrenia*

(*Anti-Oedipus* and *A Thousand Plateaus*) have outlined in great details the desiring production of the libido. They argue that libido is fluid and serves as “a flow prior to representation and production” [10]. Their attack on the repressive mechanisms and discourses of modernity is presented in “idiosyncratic blend of psychoanalytic ideas, a poststructuralist attack on representation and the subject” [10].

On the other hand, Kurtz’s becoming-savage is not a passive act of taking refuge in an “inhuman” world. Rather, it is an active act of intensities, the process of searching for a weapon to fight against the oedipalization of the capitalist culture. Deleuze argues that to flee is not to renounce action but to act and form new worlds:

To fly is to trace a line, lines, a whole cartography. One only discovers worlds through a long, broken flight. Anglo-American literature constantly shows these ruptures, these characters who create their line of flight, who create through a line of flight. Thomas Hardy, Melville . . . In them everything is a departure, becoming, passage, leap, daemon, relationship with the outside. **They create a new Earth; but perhaps the movement of the earth is the deterritorialization itself** [emphasis added]. [7]

There is another similar case with Kurtz’s becoming in literature—Deleuze and Guattari cite from Melville’s *Moby Dick* the Ahab’s fascination for the whale. Ahab persists in pursuing the whale with no effort spared, not for any aim or purpose, and definitely “not to assert his power over the whale”; rather, becoming-animal is “the power, not to conquer what is other than the self, but to transform oneself in perceiving difference” [7]. Likewise, Kurtz’s becoming-savage or fascination for the savage culture is not aimed at conquering the savage, though he has tamed them “with thunder and lightning”—“He could be very terrible” [2]. To further explore this argument, I intend to refer to Kurtz’s fascination for the savage—Kurtz even struggles to participate in a savage devil ceremony despite his illness. Therefore, he does not maintain his identity as a Western leader, but rather one among the savage. The colonizer One is indistinguishable from the colonized Other.

Just like the whale in *Moby Dick*, the savage in *Heart of Darkness* is neither a symbol nor a metaphor for life—the same perspective of the Kafka’s minor literature, according to Deleuze. It is perceived by Kurtz as “a singular event of life with its own power to become.” For Deleuze, “transversal becomings are the key to the openness of life” [7]. In other words, becoming is an everlasting process of metamorphosis.

Making himself a god among the natives at the heart of the “dark continent,” Kurtz abandons his ideal that he carries with him when he first arrives there. He deserts the “plan” that the company has made for him in their “grand” plan of endless exploiting the savage and their land. Deserting the plan means a deterritorialization of the oedipalization of the European capitalism imposed on him, for “all Europe has contributed to the making of Kurtz” [2]. Nevertheless, his deterritorialization happens to create a new territoriality for reterritorialization by human greediness. According to Deleuze and Guattari, there are three theorems of deterritorialization:

1. One never deterritorializes alone; there are always at least two terms . . . And each of the two terms reterritorialize on the other. Reterritorialization . . . necessarily implies a set of artifices by which one element, itself deterritorialized, serves as a new territoriality for another, which has lost its territoriality as well.
2. The fastest of two elements or movements of deterritorialization is not necessarily the most intense or most

deterritorialized. . . . The fastest can even connect its intensity to the slowest . . .

3. It can even be concluded from this that the *least* deterritorialized reterritorializes on the *most* deterritorialized. This is where the second system of reterritorialization comes in. [9]

Consequently, Kurtz's subjection to his "various lusts" is due to the reterritorialization of his deterritorialized desire to become something other than an agent practicing the capitalist exploitation of the savage. For Deleuze and Guattari, becoming-animal is not just an issue within psychoanalysis. It provides "a new way of thing about perceiving and becoming" [10]. Life is desire, and desire is the expansion of life through constant metamorphosis. In Kurtz's desiring production and becoming-savage, he keeps creating new lusts, various lusts. Finally, he experiences a kind of nervous breakdown because of his failure to find the "right" one that can serve as the end of his lines of escape.

Above all, we have to notice an important Deleuzian conception of desiring production—it is not functioning because of "lack." Rather, it is always a kind of creation of new intensities. In other words, Kurtz's collecting more ivory is not an act of his sense of lack. Now, let's take a look at Kurtz's desire for more ivory: Kurtz has been collecting ivory, even long after he has cut his relations with the central station. Therefore, he utters an overwhelming roar of despair—Horror—before he is fully consumed by the fear toward the "inconceivable" degradation of his soul. To be more specific, Kurtz's endless pursuit for more ivory is an act of his desiring production, not because he needs the ivory to fill his sense of lack but rather, he is seeking some lines of escape—an act of deterritorialization of the capitalist society, but is finally conditioned/reterritorialized by his endless greediness for more power (over the natives) and wealth (by collecting ivory) that originated from the values of a capitalist society—the possession of materials. However, after close observation on and constant company with Kurtz, Marlow discovers that Kurtz's boundless desire for more power and materials brings Kurtz a Satanic vision brooding over him:

Evidently the appetite for more ivory had got the better of the—what shall I say?—less material aspirations. . . . I [Marlow] thought his [Kurtz's] memory was like the other memories of the dead that accumulate in every man's life—a vague impress on the brain of shadows that had fallen on it in their swift and final passage . . . **I had a vision of him on the stretcher, opening his mouth voraciously, as if to devour all the earth with all its mankind** [emphasis added]. [2]

For Deleuze and Guattari, desire/desiring is a positive and creative power, just like Nietzsche's will to power:

Desire: who, except priest, would want to call it 'lack? Nietzsche called it 'Will to Power.' There are other names for it. For example, 'grace.' Desiring is not easy, but this is precisely because it gives, instead of lacks, 'virtue which gives.' [7]

Moreover, from ordinary people's point of view, Kurtz's eccentric acts are usually interpreted as a kind of "madness." But, from the Deleuzian point of view of desiring, Kurtz's bizarre acts are schizophrenic behaviors that reflect the positivity of desire, for life is desire and desire is "the expansion of life" through creation and transformation.

Now, to further explore the significance of Kurtz's becoming, I intend to apply the Deleuzian schizoanalysis, which is set against the Freudian/Lacanian psychoanalysis, to outline Kurtz's deterritorialization of humanity. In Deleuzian terms, Kurtz's lines of

flight is not to run away from reality; namely, to take refuge in a savage society. Rather, his becoming-savage/animal is a rhizome (the Deleuzian image of the world and of realities); it is a creative line of escape that

vacuums up in its movement all politics, all economy, all bureaucracy, all judiciary: it sucks them like a vampire in order to make them render still unknown sounds that come from the near future—Fascism, Stalinism, Americanism, *diabolical powers that are knocking at the door*. [4]

From this passage, we may well say that Kurtz is practicing lines of flight as a reaction against the oppressive and dehumanizing powers of imperialism. To achieve his objective, Kurtz has to make himself a schizo so that he can deterritorialize the oppressive powers that are always reterritorializing him:

The schizo knows how to leave: he has made departure into something as simple as being born or dying. But at the same time his journey is strangely stationary, in place. He does not speak of another world, he is not from another world: even when he is displacing himself in space, his is a journey in intensity, around the desiring-machine that is erected here and remains here. . . . He has simply ceased being afraid of becoming mad. He experiences and lives himself as the sublime sickness that will no longer affect him. [10]

Hence, Kurtz's eccentricity is not madness. Rather, he is making himself *a body without organs*, which is against the organization of his psyche imposed by imperialism/capitalism. Kurtz is transforming himself in the process of becoming-imperceptible—the desire to be inhuman.

For Deleuze and Guattari, becoming-imperceptible is becoming-molecular. Of course, we do not want to be a molecule or an animal in our lines of flight from the oppressive human world, for this would mean not living at all. Rather,

by *approaching* or imaging the inhuman point of view of animals, machines and molecules we no longer take ourselves as unchanging perceivers set over and against life. . . . The human becomes more than itself, or expands to its highest power, not by affirming its humanity, nor by returning to animal state—but by becoming-hybrid with what is not itself. This creates 'lines of flight' . . . using the human power of imagination to overcome the human. [11]

In other words, Kurtz is transforming himself and becoming inhuman so that he can overcome the human Oedipalization (subjugation) of imperialism/capitalism. This is a kind of freedom gained by no longer "seeing ourselves as a pint of view detached from life. We become free *from the human*, open to the vent of becoming" [10]. Therefore, in becoming-savage, Kurtz opens up a possible realm for pursuing a new meaning of life, though finally he fails.

In Kurtz's becoming, he makes himself a schizo or body without organs. However, his flight has always been recognized by the society as a negative act—a degradation of soul:

But his soul was mad. Being alone in the wilderness, it had looked within itself, and, by Heavens! I tell you, it had gone mad. . . . No eloquence could have been so withering to one's belief in mankind as his final burst of sincerity. He struggled with himself too. I saw it—I heard it. I saw the inconceivable mystery of a soul that

knew no restraint, no faith, and no fear, yet struggling blindly with itself. [2]

From this quote, we can see that even Marlow is Oedipalized by the capitalist/imperialist values and thus concludes that Kurtz is “blindly” finding a way out. According to Deleuze and Guattari, this is a “paranoiac”<sup>3</sup> power of the despotic authority, whose incarnation in *Heart of Darkness* is the Company, which is embodiment of the Oedipalized capitalism, for it always treats the unconscious as a negative force. Any attempt of lines of escape would be blocked and misrepresented as “madness.” It is never easy to fight against this oppressive regime.

To sum up, Kurtz has tried his best to find a way out of the capitalist regime and thus creates a new identity by aligning himself with the natives/savage. Though he finally ends up his becoming by taking his own life, we cannot say that all he has done is meaningless, for Deleuze and Guattari argue that one can never go far enough in the direction of deterritorialization. Kurtz's becoming-savage is no more than becoming-imperceptible—to become inhuman and finally gains a vision of life as pure difference and becoming, which can never be filled up with materials (e.g. ivory or human endeavors in pursuing fame and power). In addition, the world is just like a rhizome, it has neither subject nor object, always in the process of becoming. Any human endeavor to firmly capture or maintain what s/he has is futile because of the impermanence of life, which is just like a book—a Deleuzian image of the world and reality:

In a book, as in all things, there are lines of articulation or segmentarity, strata and territories; but also **lines of flight, movements of deterritorialization and destratification** [emphasis added]. . . . A book is an assemblage of this kind, and as such is unattributable. It is a multiplicity—but we don't know yet what the multiple entails when it is no longer attributed, that is, after it has been elevated to the status of a substantive. [9]

However, for the most part people do not perceive becoming; we only perceive a world as transcendent, a world of external and extended things.

Consequently, **Kurtz's vision of unspeakable horror and pain** is characteristic of the dilemma of the contemporary humanity in our vain pursuit for more knowledge of the world in the hope of becoming the master of our fate and of the universe. Kurtz's helpless and hopeless roar happens to highlight the darkest prospect of humanity, especially when we human beings are facing an era with fast-growing science and technology that seems to run beyond our control, just like the pessimistic vision of Yeats's famous poem—“The Second Coming.”

---

<sup>3</sup> In *Anti-Oedipus*, Deleuze and Guattari term the problematic and oppressive psychoanalysis as paranoia and they devise “schizoanalysis” as the solution to it.

**References**

1. Thale J, 1995. "Marlow's Quest." *University of Toronto Quarterly* 24: 351-58.
2. Conrad J, 1971. *Heart of Darkness: An Authoritative Text Backgrounds and Sources Criticism*. Ed. Robert Kimbrough. New York: Norton.
3. Lyotard J-F, 1985. *The Postmodern Condition*. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP.
4. Deleuze G, Guattari F, 1986. *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*. Trans. Dana Polan. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P.
5. McHale B, 1987. *Postmodernist Fiction*. London: Methuen.
6. Feder L, 1995. "Marlow's Descent into Hell." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* 19: 280-92.
7. Deleuze G, Parnet C, 1977. *Dialogues*. Trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Hobberjam. New York: Columbia UP.
8. Owens C, 1992. "The Allegorical Impulse: Toward a Theory of Postmodernism. Part I and Part II." *October* 12-13. 67-86: 59-80.
9. Deleuze G, Guattari F, 1992. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. London: Athlone.
10. Deleuze G, Guattari F, 1984. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. London: Athlone.
11. Colebrook C, 2002. *Gilles Deleuze*. London: Routledge Woods, Tim, 1999. *Beginning Postmodernism*. Manchester: Manchester UP.