

I. Greene's *The Quiet American*: An Introduction

Graham Greene's novel *The Quiet American* set in Vietnam tells the story of a Jaded English reporter, an idealistic American diplomat, and a mysterious Vietnamese dancer who likes to go to the cinema. Or to put it differently, it is all about a man who writes reluctantly, another man who reads too eagerly and a woman apparently does not read or write at all, but who is also unreadable. So the novel is a story of an adult literate person and a young girl with knowledge about extra activities like dancing but is semi literate. This is a fictitious story of much concerned with reading and writing and the relation of both activities to reality.

The Quiet American considers and exemplifies different genres of writing, news reports, political journalism, poetry, etc and different genres of speech, debate, gossip, courtship, chat, interrogation, etc. It is a text in which different modes of writing mix and jostle for supremacy. The epic story of war and the romance story of love exotic Orientals and topical reportage. It is also an intertextual dialogue with whole library of other novels from Cervantes' *Don Quixote* to the novelist's own *The End of Affair*. This research wants to disentangle some of the genres by focusing on the theme of writing and its inter connection with some dialogues.

This research primarily focuses on the dialogic aspect of Greene's *The Quiet American*. It tries to examine and explore how Greene has put the ideas of reportage, the signal authority of any monologic discourse by representing social diversity, social aspects, the reflection of war and different cultural aspects, especially, fusion of two periods: before and after the war. The research further analyses social heteroglossia and social stratification through the dialogic interactions. It also examines the narrative flexibility, perspectival variations and the disrupted chronology of the plot. The complex structure of the novel tries to correspond to the

complexity and diversity of the social reality. It is exactly a fusion of two categorical societies, two nations' people and their distinct culture with different style of thinking and doing.

The monologic discourses like epic and poetry cannot capture the real nature of social reality because they are composed of the single perspective of the author and the authorial voice presents itself as the ultimate semantic authority. Poetry is the expression of author's single view, his single voice, emotion, feeling and way of thinking. Similarly, epic is absolute, closed and complete genre. There is less chance to have different voices and views. They strictly follow rules and system. They are completely in boundary. Bakhtin says "[. . .] an absolute epic distance separates epic world from contemporary reality" (Epic and Novel, 843). Epic does not capture the current reality and it is far way from current reality. Only the national heroes, gods or semi-gods can be the chief character of epic, not the ordinary man. The story is also adventurous, imaginative and super. There is less chance of being ordinary reality with social aspects. They just try to expose the supremacy and greatness of the single hero with dominant presence of him.

But Bakhtin says, novel is a dialogic discourse which breaks the traditional monologic tradition of finalization, systematization and unitaryness. It is open-ended, free and democratic discourse where plurality, heterogeneity and multiplicity flourish to cultivate the diverse colours of the social reality. The language of the novel "is the fleeting language of the day, of an-epoch, a social group, a genre, a school and so forth" (Discourse 271). Therefore, the novel is not distanced from the current reality because of unbareness of language but it can best represent the social reality with its hybrid nature. The authorial voice is not overpowering and subordinating the voices in the dialogic novel. But it involves in the dialogic interaction as one of the many

voices. A dialogic work embodies dialogic sense of truth by allowing the consciousness of character to be truly someone else's consciousness. Greene's *The Quiet American* subverts the tradition of monologic discourse and immensely displays the dialogic features and this subversion of the monologic discourses are the focus of this analysis.

Born in 1904 in Britain and dedicated his whole life for writing, Graham Greene wrote many plays, film scripts, short stories, children's books, literary criticism, bibliographies, political reportages, travel books and novels. His diverse knowledge produces many genres of literature which contribute to flourish the twentieth century English literature. His penny life with rich experiences of different cultures and wide social experiences of different parts of the world work as the influential factors to present heterogeneity in his novel. His well-known masterpieces like *The Power and Glory*, *The End of the Affair*, *The Heart of Matter*, *England Made me*, *The Quiet American* and *The Third Man* make him one of most renown novelist of the twentieth century. Greene explores different aspects of human life and society like: colonialism, orientalism, moral corruption, and isolation, fear of unknown, hostile nature, material obsession, and existing evil within human beings especially a man and the society in his most of the novels. Self-confusion, self- interrogation, self-romance, self-betrayal or betrayal of the community to which one belongs and its terrible consequences are an ever recurring theme in Greene's books. To some extent, he presents the story of love and religious theme of Christianity and its purity. He supervises the society with keen interest of religion, too which can be seen in his works easily.

The Quiet American presents politically, economically and morally fluctuating condition of post war Vietnam. The economic imperialism of America, economic

exploitation, social unjust and the loyal service of existing foreign polices and their interest to generate the political system of Vietnam, the political conflicts which results in murder, violence, war, loot, extreme political unrest are the subjects of the novel. These are the main focusing area of my study and to analyze these matters in dialogic pattern is my thesis theory. At the center of every action and ideology, there is the story of foreign intelligence officer and native mistress. This may indicate the influence of foreign power in Vietnam after war. It is clear that Vietnamese were attacked by foreign to destroy their economic condition and to get benefit from them.

The Quiet American is a mixed genre that blends the techniques of his earlier novels to produce a work of political narrative, full of action, with psychological introspection. The intricate plot and complex characters with their many layers of motivation and interpretational fuel the concept of ambiguity. Greene employs stark setting and character lacking a great number of choices in his fictional works in order to explore the condition of human experience. Uncertain, equivocal, indistinct and absurd characterization, the places, the people and events make the novel a carnival and the voices of the people make it a dialogic novel.

The writer himself researched on the real panic life situation of Vietnam in early the 1950s through writing including different voices of difference. He also discusses his reporting in Vietnam in his own novel *Way of Escape* and acknowledges that he used own reporting in the novel. He combined the results of his research with existing literary acceptations of Thriller. It is so much more than an ordinary thriller, an auto critical work and the mixed genre of the novel. Genre presents extremely heterogeneous society in *The Quiet American* where people from different countries like America, England, Vietnam, China, and France and the different races like white, Negroes, India, and Asia-pacific come together. Their different interests, ideologies

and desires get open stage to conflict and consent in the novel. *The Quiet American* is not by the public novel of socio-political, socio-economic and socio-cultural contest but also the product of some sort of romantic love-affair.

Highly terrible first person narrative, disrupted chronology, shifting focuses decentralized and unfinalized plot are some of the striking features of its narrative techniques. Juxtaposition, contrast and irony are immensely used. The communicating skills, images and emotions through each character's individual consciousness are powerfully used in the novel.

Greene's *The Quiet American* gets numerous critical responses since its publication. Different critics analyze *The Quiet American* from different perspectives and angles. Because of its diversity in theme and style the focus of criticism is also different in different dimensions of the novel. Postcolonial, humanistic, romantic, stylistic, post-modern, Marxist and dialogic are some of the major critical perspectives from which *The Quiet American* is analyzed and interpreted. All available criticisms are not possible to present in this small project of research. So some of major critical views are discussed here:

Walter Allen provides the American review of *The Quiet American*. He argues that Greene's novel is anti-American and not only strongly enough anti-communist. He praises Greene for what calls his "awareness of Evil" (334). Allen is quick to acknowledge that novel will have its detractors in America.

I would be ideal to pretend that *The Quiet American* is going to be palatable to a majority of readers in this country. In his novel of the war in Indo-China Greene expresses a criticism of America and especially of American eyesight in foreign affairs that is widely held. If

not openly stated by a great many people outside the United States.

(344)

Philip Rahv also reviews the novel in the main issue of commentary. While *The Quiet American* was a best seller in English, Rahv argues that it will not do so well in America for obvious reason. The clearest reason that he provides is "The insinuation the Pyle is the representative of American (489). Rahv's review certainly contains negative opinion of the novel but he acknowledges that Greene is good writer and his other novels have good meet of this kind. Rahv reads Fowler as a "nihilist so struck ness in his capacity to believe in public in causes and ideals as to be willing to settle for his girl and opium pipe without asking anything more in life" (69).

Robert Pendleton discussing the mixed genre of the novel says;

In narratives which blend the psychological process of a protagonist with a more formalistic plot involving composing, pursuit and rescue, the emphasis upon action is parallel by depiction of interiority (83).

The Quiet American is also romantic celebration of the writer as a hero. The protagonist, the English journalist Thomas Fowler appears to take no pride, and not much interest, in writing, which is must valuable to him in providing him as professional reason fro staying in Vietnam. His reporting of the colonial war to French Indo-china is a subject of censorship and he has been very careful not to risk expulsion by filling news that would displease the French authorities. In the case, war reporting seems speech genre not always dependable for truthfulness, such as the heading of the news "[. . .] Highway to Hell '' (28). It is a good example of this. No wonder Fowler is skeptical about what can be learnt from writing." You Know, if you live in a place for long, you cease to read about it", he tells Aden Pyle (29).

Another critic William Chance argues that Greene as a novelist is like a spy searching for superior knowledge of a situation (159-60). The writer then applies this knowledge in creating the story, Chance continues saying that the spy is glamorous:

[. . .] he presents an unattainable world of clear and decisive action, total control, and perfect authority. The characters in this novel do not have clear action, total control and perfect authority and that is what makes the novel. So life like Martin Line, Fowler, and Pyle is habit a complex, sordid world lacking simple solutions. Our own world is equally obtuse and opaque morally, ethnically and spiritually. (162-63)

From this statement, it is clear that the novel has the characteristic of multiple voices representing the present situation of the contemporary societies and their products.

The year 1956 sees several reviews with dialogic notions towards *The Quiet American* in serial of journal and various reviewers' reviews of this novel. Among them, Frederick Wood in English studies writes the following:

The year under review of the novel has long been one of the most barren that has been experienced for a very long time so far as original creative literature is concerned. No new play of any note has been produced, and in field of novel one looks in vain for any work that is likely to be long remembering of the war between France and the Vietnam, is disappointing. (186)

Wood never really explains what is disappointing about the novel other than commenting that the plot and the character are unconvincing. He never explains how or why they are unconvincing. Moreover, we can say this with lack and proper setting of the novel regarding the plot and the characters.

Democracy is another subject of this research which is pronounced and aggravating views on what the United States was doing for the world. It is the novel of oppressor those who are under privileged have got more pains and always marginalized not because of having no power but because of having loss to rule over own country. The novel provokes the ideas of democracy despite having war report. The economic attachment of developed countries to developing countries in the novel is praiseworthy. We can find it [. . .] Economic Attaché', displeased with the perceived anti-American elements Makiewicz took nearly all of them out to the film. While Andie Murphy may be the most decorated American Soldier from the World War II, he is horribly miscast in the picture and his dialogue, as I shall demonstrate by discussing those elements one into the carnivalistic aspects of novel. Some of the elements from two version of the film on the basis of novel may also help to compare and presents some dialogic variation towards the novel though there are some short coming with many dialogues by a single character.

The dialogic tension between myth and history, romance and success, politics and power as well its achievement do not cover the whole genuine dialogic aspects of the novel. The novel is immensely rich in its thematic diversity, social heterogossia, narrative structure and intension dynamism, political reportage, the romance of foreigners etc. The researcher has taken Bakhtin's dialogic theory as the basic tool to analyze and examine different dialogic aspects of the novel.

The present research work has been divided into four chapters .The first chapter deals a short explanation of the hypothesis, a brief introduction of the novel and another, some critical views on *The Quiet American*, and an outlying of the whole research work.

The second chapter presents the brief explanation of theoretical modality that is going to apply in this research. It explains general background of the dialogic theory and brief autobiography of Mikhail Bakhtin. And again it explains the major concepts of Bakhtin's dialogic theory like idea of dialogic, heteroglossia, polyphony, novel and language carnival and chronotope , prosaic and unfinalizability.

In the third chapter, the text is analyzed on the basis of theoretical modality of second chapter. Abstracts are quoted as evidence to prove the hypothesis. There are two parts: first part analysis of the issues of heteroglossia, social diversity, social stratification and dialogic interactions in the text, and the second part analyzes the polyphonic structure of the novel.

The fourth chapter is the conclusion of this whole work. On the basis of close textual analysis of the chapter three, it concludes that Green's *The Quiet American* genuinely represents the complex and diverse social reality, social differences multi-languagedness, influence colonization, and economic domination through the dialogic interactions in its polyphonic structure which make the novel is a dialogic text.

II. Bakhtinian Study: A Theoretical Construction

General Background

Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin, a prominent 20th century genre critic, was born in Orel, South Moscow, in 1895. He studied the classics and Philology. His writing career started to flourish from 1920s and continued until his death in 1995. Because of his religious views, he was sentenced to internal exile and forced to work as a clerk on the Siberian boarder by the communist government of The Soviet Union in 1929. Although he published his major works in the 1920s and 1930s but he remained largely unknown outside of the Soviet Union until translations in the 1970s brought him to world attention.

Bakhtin is a theorist of genre, particularly of novel. In his major works are *Rabelais and His World*, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* and *The Dialogic Imagination*. He introduces different and distinctive features of novel. He compares and contrasts novel with poetry. For him, novel is unique, free and democratic genre whereas poetry is closed, unitary and authoritarian.

Bakhtin says novel is the dialogic discourse which can best represent the society. It can capture the social diversity, social stratification and social conflict in more realistic way. But poetry is monologic discourse which is the expression of author's single voice, his view, emotion and feeling. But in the novel, authorial voice is one of the many voices. Bakhtin says epic is absolute, closed and complete genre. He says, "[. . .] an absolute epic distance separates epic world form contemporary reality" (*Epic and Novel* 843). The epic does not capture the current reality but always presents "firsts" and 'bests'. Only the national heroes, gods, semi-gods can be the chief character of epic, not the ordinary man. Thus, Bakhtin says epic is "walled off from life. So, in a work of monologic discourse," "[. . .] genuine interaction of consciousness

is impossible, and thus genuine dialogic is impossible as well" (*Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* 81). Thus, novel can touch life, reality and society.

According to Bakhtin, the novel is more oriented toward the social/historical form of rhetoric than toward the particular artistic or aesthetic ideas present at any particular moment while poetry primarily focuses on aesthetic concerns and only secondarily on the other aspects of social existence. We find multiple voices, diversities, liberty and heteroglossia in the novelistic discourse. There exists a dialogue as well interaction between and among the characters.

Bakhtin explicitly sets his theory against Aristotle's *Poetics*, which proposes that primary component of narrative form, is a plot and that should evolve coherently from its beginning to an end in which all complications are resolved. But Bakhtin elevates discourse into the primary component of narrative works; and he describes discourse as a mixture of voices, social attitude and values that are not only opposed, but irreconcilable, with the result that the work remains unresolved and open-ended.

In *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, Bakhtin contrasts monologic novel of Leo Tolstoy and dialogic novel of Dostoevsky. In Tolstoy's novel, authoritative voice dominates other voices of the characters. But Dostoevsky's novels contain a plurality of "unmerged consciousness", a mixture of "valid voices" which are not completely subordinated to authorial intentions. The character's voice is equally as important and fully weighted" as the author's own. His characters are endowed with free speech and liberty. Bakhtin explores the carnivalesque features in Dostoevsky's novel which suggests laughter, celebration and the breaking down of hierarchy.

Idea of Dialogic

There should be dialogic approach in every novel so that it becomes relevant to the society. Before entering into the concept of dialogic, it is pertinent here to discuss

about dialectics. Bakhtin's concept of dialogic is different from the dialectic concept of Marx and Hegel. Hegel says there is always conflict between two ideas. The dialectical relationship between two opposing ideas generates another new idea. Antithesis is inevitable to the thesis. As the result of the conflict between thesis and antithesis, there comes the third idea which Hegel calls synthesis. In Hegelian spiritual dialecticism, idea precedes action or spirit precedes matter. Another philosopher Karl Marx says there is always conflict between two forces in the society. He sees class struggle in the society, i.e., the conflict between "haves" and "haves not". The conflict is for matter or property. This is what Marx calls "dialectical materialism" in which matter is primary and idea is secondary. Bakhtin says Hegel and Marx are the great intellectual heroes of monologic thoughts and they are the great synthesizers who attempted to give a shape to apparently different propositions into a coherent, all-encompassing system. He again gives more focus towards by the dialogism rather than monologism which are so often discussed by Marx and Hegel.

His dialogic theory primarily focuses on the concept of dialogue on the notion that any form of language whether speech for writing is always a form of dialogue. In this context, it is pertinent here to quote Lynne Pearce, "In essence, all thought became, for Bakhtin, a matter of 'dialogue' and 'difference: dialogue requires the pre-existence of difference which are connected by an act of communication to generate new ideas and positions" (227). Pearce here clarifies that dialogue makes difference which is the primary condition and the process of communication or interaction connects that differences to foster new ideas. Dialogue consists of three elements: a speaker, a listener and relation between the two. Thus, what language says is always the product of dialogic interaction between two or more people.

Dialogue is a conscious effort to address someone and the addresser expects to get some response. All languages have the inherent "addressivity" for Bakhtin, and all languages are addressed to someone."Dialogic (cf'dialogue', 'speaking across') refers to inherent 'addressivity' of all language, that is, all language is addressed to someone, never uttered without consciousness of a relationship between the speaker and addressee" (*Handbook of Critical Approaches* 349).

So, dialogism is an orientation toward the interaction between the various languages of the speaker and the languages of the listener. All the speech is thus oriented toward what Bakhtin calls the "conceptual horizon" of listener, this horizon is comprised of various social languages of a listener. One of the most striking and memorable of Bakhtin's own metaphor for the operation of dialogism is that of a "bridge"; this bridge may be seen to connect not only the speaker and his or her interlocutor, but also individual words of speech which pass between them and become a "shared territory".

Bakhtin explores dialogic even at the level of the individual word not only at the level of whole utterance:

Dialogic relationship are possible not only among whole (relatively whole) utterances; a dialogic approach is possible toward any signifying part of an utterance, even toward an individual word, if that word is perceived not as impersonal word of language but as a sign of someone else's semantic position, (qtd. in *Pearce* 227)

According to Bakhtin ,dialogue is not self-consuming artifact and it is not also dialectic because dialectic can be contained within a single consciousness, and encompasses contradictions in a single, monologic view. But dialogic encompasses different cultures, language and consciousness freely interacting with each other. As Bakhtin says:

Take a dialogue and remove the voices (the partitioning voices), remove the intonation (emotional and individualizing ones), carve out abstract concept and judgement from living words and responses, cram everything into one abstract consciousness and that's how you get dialectics. (*Epic and Novel* 149)

For Bakhtin, dialectics is abstract, monologic, bounded and finalized notion. It is not live and open process. So, dialectics abstracts the dialogic from dialogue. It finalizes and systematizes dialogue. But in dialogic, everything is unfinalized, and in the process of making. Bakhtin says, "In dialectics, we have a thought that, like a fish in an aquarium, knocks against the bottom and the sides and cannot swim further or deeper" (*Epic and Novel* 162). From these lines it is clear that dialectics is limited within its own periphery like a fish in an aquarium.

Bakhtin says that novel is a dialogic discourse which breaks the monologic tradition of finalization, systematization and unitaryness. It is open-ended, free and democratic discourse where multiplicity, plurality and heterogeneity flourish to cultivate the diverse colors of social reality.

Bakhtin contrasts the notion of dialogic with the notion of monologic. Monologic is the communication within oneself where a speaker speaks with himself. According to Bakhtin, in monologic text, all aspects of plot, dialogue, and characterization are subordinated to the monologic will of the author. Characters are static and predetermined, and they lack any vestige of autonomous creativity and free will. Their work is to function as the mouth piece for the transmission of the author's own ideological view point. Again, Bakhtin says that free untrammelled dialogue is therefore subordinated to the dictates of a monolithic objectified world which is ultimately controlled by a unitary, transcendental authorial consciousness. As he says,

"[. . .] introduced in such concepts as 'system of language', 'monologic utterance', 'the speaking individual', various differing nuances of meaning, but their basic content remains unchanged" (*Discourse in the Novel* 35-6). These lines of Bakhtin clarify the nature of monologic discourse which is rooted on rules, system, individuality and unchangibility.

Bakhtin takes human life as an ongoing process and unfinalized dialogue. As he says, "The single adequate form for verbally expressing authentic human life is open-ended dialogue. Life by its very nature is dialogic. To live means to ask questions, to heed, to respond, to agree and so forth. In this dialogue a person participates wholly and throughout his life [. . .]" (*Toward a Reworking of Dostoevsky Book* 293). The whole verbal behaviour of human being is dialogic which is the main feature of daily existence.

According to Bakhtin truth comes to us only dialogically. He is not in favour of "ready-made-truth". Thus, he writes: "Truth is not born nor it is to be found inside the head of an individual, it is born between people collectively searching for truth, in the process of their dialogic interaction (*Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* 110). For him, the source of truth is dialogic interaction. Dostoevsky's novels expose the dialogic sense of truth far better than the other writers for Bakhtin.

Heteroglossia

Heteroglossia is Bakhtin's other important concept of language which literally means "a mixture of tongues" but he invoked the term to account for the social diversity of speech types. Language, for Bakhtin, is different from structuralist and formalist notion of it. Language is not abstract phenomenon rather it represents social stratification and verbal-ideological world. Bakhtin says that even literary language is stratified according to genre, period and so on. As he says:

The internal stratification of a single national language into social dialects, group manners, professional jargons, generic languages, languages of generations and age groups, languages of trends, languages of authorities, languages of circles and passing fashions languages of socio-political days, even hours - this inner stratification of every language at any given moment of its historical existence is a necessary precondition of the novelistic genre. (*Discourse in the Novel* 62-3)

A single national language is stratified into different forms and that is used differently at different times and different social contexts. Human society is full of diversity and difference. That diversity is reflected in the language. Even a single person's language is heteroglossic according to the time and situation in which s/he uses. A person's conversation with his boss, wife, children, friend and father comprises different sorts of stratification of language. So, different contexts may take different languages.

For Bakhtin, novel is the colorful mixture of such different voices, multiple languages, and plural consciousnesses. He says:

The novel can be defined as a diversity of social speech types (sometimes even a diversity of language) and a diversity of individual voices, artistically organized [...]. The novel orchestrates all its themes, the totality of the world of objects and ideas depicted and expressed in it, by means of the social diversity of speech types and by the differing individual voices that flourish under such conditions. (*The Dialogic Imagination* 262-3)

Bakhtin argues that themes are "orchestrated" in the novel by means of this stratification of the national language. That means heteroglossia presents the thematic diversity in the novel. Again he writes:

Authorial speech, the speeches of narrators, inserted genres, the speech of characters are merely those fundamental compositional unities with whose help heteroglossia can enter the novel; each of them permits a multiplicity of social voices and a wide variety of their links and interrelationships (*The Dialogic* 263)

Therefore, heteroglossia as the social diversity of speech types brings so many things together like 'salad dish' in the novel. Through the speeches of the characters, narrator and authorial speech, heteroglossia enters into the novel. Bakhtin further says, "the diversity of voices and heteroglossia enter the novel and organize themselves within it into structured artistic system" (*Discourse* 46). So, the novel is the artistic system in multitier-in-unity. There is no prescribed form and structure of novel but its internal composition shapes it in an artistic structure.

Polyphony

Polyphony is another key concept of Bakhtin's critical theory. Polyphony literally means "many voices" but it has broader significance in his theory. For him, the dialogic interaction between free and autonomous multiple voices create polyphonic discourse.

For Bakhtin, novel is not monologic discourse but dialogic discourse. In the monologic discourse single voice, single perspective and single consciousness are at work inside the limited, unitary system but multiple perspectives, multiple consciousnesses and multiple voices are at work in the free, democratic and unfinalized atmosphere in the dialogic discourse. As Lynne Pearce says: "[...] his

emphasis on the 'freedom¹ and 'autonomy' of the voices constituting an authentic polyphonic text" (225). Polyphony advocates freedom and autonomy of multiple voices, not the dominance and control of single authorized voice. It is contextual to mention Guerin here, "Instead of subordinating the voices of all characters to an overriding authorial voice, a writer such as Dostoevsky creates a polyphonic discourse in which the author's voice is only one among many and the characters are allowed free speech" (350).

All characters are endowed with free speech and their voices are not subordinated. They are as-equally important as authorial voice. Authorial voice is only one of the many voices. Bakhtin's definition of modern polyphonic novel is made up of plurality of voices that avoids reduction to a single perspective. Dialogues are extremely powerful in a polyphonic novel.

While interpreting Bakhtin two closely related criteria are inevitable of polyphony: a dialogic sense of truth and a special position of author necessary for visualizing and conveying that sense of truth. Since Bakhtin regards the polyphonic work as "form-shaping ideology", these two factors are the essentials to such work. Bakhtin further extends that dialogic sense of truth manifests unfinalizability by dwelling on the "threshold" of "unmerged voices". He argues that these voices cannot be constrained within a single consciousness as in monologism. Bakhtin often speaks to the participants of a dialogic conception of truth as "voice idea". When such voice ideas come to interact, they may produce a dialogue changing both of them giving rise to new insight and new dialogues. In *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, he observes:

It is quite possible to imagine in and postulate a unified truth that requires a plurality of consciousnesses, one that in principle cannot be fitted within the bounds of single consciousness, one that is [. ..] by its

nature full event potential and born at a point of contact among various consciousnesses. The monologic way of perceiving cognition and truth is only one of the possible ways. It arises only where consciousness is placed above existence. (81)

In fact, the author, in monologic works retains full control over the work and never surrenders the right to mediate between characters and readers. In such works, only the author, as the ultimate semantic authority, retains the power to express a truth directly. The truth that the works carries becomes the truth of his or her, and all other truths are mere appendage. By contrast, in polyphonic works the author ceases to exercise monologic control. Polyphony demands a work in which several consciousnesses meet as equals and engage in dialogue that is in principle unfinalizable. Characters must be "not only objects of authorial discourse but also subjects of their own directly signifying discourse" (*Problems 7*).

Similarly, the direct power, which in monologic work belongs to the author alone, belongs to several voices in a polyphonic work. By renouncing his monologic hegemony, Bakhtin claims, Dostoevsky created a way to embody a dialogic conception of truth. A polyphonic work embodies dialogic truth by allowing the consciousness of a character to be truly someone else's consciousness" (*Problems 7*).

Further explaining his notion of polyphony, Bakhtin proposes that to create a truly polyphonic work, the author must be able to confront his or her characters as equals. No doubt his own ideology may receive expression in the work. But what is new in such work is that others may and do contest the author's ideology on equal ground. And it is the author himself who sets the stage for these contests. The polyphonic author necessarily plays two roles in the works: he creates a world in which divergent points of view enter into dialogue and he himself does participate in that

dialogue. He is one of the interlocutors in the "great dialogue" that he himself has created. For Bakhtin Dostoevsky's novel do display this phenomenon profoundly. As he outlines:

A plurality of independent and unmerged voices and consciousnesses, a genuine polyphony of fully valid voices in fact the chief characteristics of Dostoevsky's novels. What unfolds in his works is not a multitude of characters and fates in a single objective world, illuminated by a single authorial consciousness, rather a plurality of consciousness, with equal rights and each with its own world, combine but are not merged in the unity of event. (*Problems 6-7*)

Though the characters in polyphonic work have been created by the author, but once they come into existence, they will escape his control and prevent him from knowing as advance how they will answer him. Therefore, Bakhtin characterizes polyphonic novel having plurality of independent and emerged voices and consciousnesses that are free into play.

Bakhtin uses a very good analogy to characterize the monologic world as "Ptolemaic": the earth, representing the author's consciousness, is in the center around which all other consciousnesses revolve. The polyphonic world, as on the other side, is "Copernican": as the earth is but one of many planets, the author's is but one of many consciousnesses.

Another crucial point of Bakhtin is that plot of the polyphonic novel is no longer the sequence that characters are ordained to follow, but the result of what they happen to say or do. Similarly, the dialogues that compose the novel - that makes the entire novel one "great dialogue" - are not shaped beforehand, not planned in the usual sense. Rather they take place "right now that is in the real present in the creative

process" (*Problems* 63). Like the characters, the work remains unfinalizable throughout its creation. Similarly, plot is also not the coherent sequence of events that all complications are resolved at the end as Aristotle says. In this context, one of the critics Guerin says, "Author may build indeterminacies to his or her polyphonic design, introduce multiple voices, render ideas intersubjective and leave novels seemingly unfinished - all to leave free characters" (352).

From the above discussion we can point out that polyphonic novel does not have special pre-planned and pre-determined design of plot. The writer does not give us finalized plot, but "a live event, played out at the point of dialogic meeting between two or several consciousnesses" (*Problems* 88). Therefore, the polyphonic novel is a "great dialogue" that is still in the process of making.

Novel and Language

Bakhtin says that novel is primarily dialogic, essentially open and indeterminate in meaning. It is incomplete, unformed and still developing which he calls "the genre of becoming". Novelistic word is "a world - in the making", it is itself in the process of becoming what it is.

Bakhtin views that novel is the genre which can display dialogic conception of truth more vehemently than any other genre. He says novel is the supreme achievement in the history of literary form. Bakhtin speaks repeatedly of the novel as the form that best embodies 'prosaic intelligence', 'prosaic vision' and 'prosaic wisdom' (*Discourse* 404).

The novel as a dialogic discourse captures two aspects of language in their interaction and combination: dialogicity and heteroglossia. The novel takes the ways in which various languages of heteroglossia enter in the dialogue with each other. For Bakhtin, languages, like genres, are ways of conceptualizing the world in words. A

language (of heteroglossia) is a complex set of beliefs. Each language of heteroglossia has come out from vast array of social and psychological experiences. As he says, "On entering the novel heteroglossia is subject to an artistic reworking. The social and historical voices that populate language, all its words and forms which provide language with definite concrete sense, are organized in the novel into a structured stylistic system [. . .]" (*Discourse* 43).

For Bakhtin, "languages throw light on each other: one language can after all see itself only in the light of another language (*Epic and Novel* 843). There is the colorful gatherings of languages which interacts with each other and identify themselves in the relationship of each other in the novel.

By using very appropriate and wonderful metaphor of Galilean universe, Bakhtin distinguishes novel form the monologic discourse like poetry. He says the world of novel is no longer Ptolemaic but Galilean. Like the earth, the language has ceased to be at the center, and has become one of many planets. It seems that different languages understand the world differently, and that each must compete with others. As Bakhtin describes it, the novel is based on maximally intense Galilean linguistic consciousness:

The novel is the expression of a Galilean perception of language; one denies that the absolutism of a single unitary language - that is, it refuses to acknowledge its own language as the sole verbal and semantic center of the ideological world. [. . .] the novel begins by presuming a verbal and semantic decentering of ideological world [. . .]. (*Discourse* 366-67)

Bakhtin opposes the notion of absolutism and centrality of language and meaning. What he means to say is that no language enjoys an absolute privilege in the

'eyes of novel'. Each must be tested and retested with respect to other. Each language of heteroglossia is allowed to view other languages, and each found its own image in the eyes of others. From the diverse perspectives and standpoints, the novel offers a vast plenitude of maximally rich images of language.

On the other hand, poetry as a monologic discourse uses Ptolemaic linguistic consciousness which is unitary and centralized. As Bakhtin says:

At the time where major divisions of the poetic genres are developing under the influence of unifying, centralizing, centripetal -forces of verbal-ideological life, the novel - and those artistic prose genres that gravitate toward it - was be'ing historically shaped by the current of decentralizing, centrifugal forces. (*Discourse 37*).

Here, he discusses two forces that operate in the language: centripetal and centrifugal. Centripetal force tends to push things toward a central point; centrifugal force tends to push thing away from a central point and out in all directions. Bhaktin says that poetic language (monologic) operates according to unifying, centralizing, centripetal forces whereas the language of the novel (dialogic) operates through the current of decentralizing, centrifugal forces.

The fundamental impulse of the novel, therefore, is to dialogize heteroglossia as intensively as possible. Moreover, the creation of images of language is a form of sociological probing, an exploring of values and beliefs, and not mere play of forms. Bakhtin further explains that "the image of a language is the image assumed by a set of social beliefs, the image of social ideologies, that has been fused with its own discourse with own language" (*Discourse 357*).

Bakhtin further says that novelistic dialogism is essentially inexhaustible and reflects the infinite potential of social languages in dialogue. Heteroglossia, in sum, is

exerted to make the discourse unfinalizable. Therefore, the real novelistic discourse is fundamentally different from the "manifest dialogue" of plays. Thus, the language of the novel "is the fleeting language of a day, of an epoch, a social group, a genre, a school and so forth" (*Discourse* 272).

Bakhtin, time and again, enunciates the fundamental difference between prose and poetry. Prosaic, according to him, regards novelistic discourse not as style but as style of styles, or more clearly, as the dialogization of styles. Novels are dedicated to the hybridization of the languages. By contrast, poetry regards style as a system. It focuses on tropes, poetic structures, and a host of rhetorical devices.

Therefore, the polyphonic novel is composed of various styles, speech patterns, and dialogues that interact dynamically as "heteroglossia", or many languaged discourse. As Bakhtin says "the novel as whole is a phenomenon multiform in style and veriform in speech and voice" (*The Dialogic* 261). Therefore, the novel is open, free and dynamic discourse which comprises diversity in unity.'

Prosaics and Unfinalizability

While interpreting Bakhtin's theory, "prosaics" and "unfinalizability" are unforgettable concepts. Bakhtin opposes "prosaics" to "poetics", the long established trend of "theory of literature". "Poetics" is the traditional term for understanding the "theory of literature". In the trend of "poetics", prose is always underestimated, and it is taken as less artistic and less literary genre.

According to Bakhtin, "prosaics" encompasses two related, but distinct concepts. First, it opposes to "poetics" and forms a theory of literature that privileges prose in general and the novel in particular. Prosaics in the second sense is far comprehensive than the theory of literature. It is a form of thinking that assumes the importance of everyday ordinary things.

Bakhtin further states that all the methods up to now by which prose is analysed are derived from "poetics", so they cannot reveal the "prosiness" of prose, and the "novelness" of novels. Moreover, everyday world is dead, automatized and uncreative for the formalists and traditionalists. What Bakhtin believes is that novels have special way of conceiving events and of understanding the interrelations of space, time, social milieu, characters and actions. For him, the everyday world is a sphere of constant activities, the source of all social change, creativity and the special area of novel.

Bakhtin further says that "prosaics" is always suspicious towards system. If one thinks prosaically one doubts that any aspects of culture could be organized systematically. Bakhtin believes that the chaotic nature of everyday life cannot be detained within rules, system or organization. In his view, the natural state of thing is a mess. In culture, mess is also normal. The cultural world, Bakhtin argues bears both centripetal (and "official") and centrifugal (or "unofficial") forces. The former seeks to impose order on the heterogeneous and messy world; the latter, continually disrupts that order. Centrifugal forces register and respond to the most diverse events of daily life; so they are prosaic facts.

In fact, Bakhtin says that only "prosaic" instead of "poetics" can explore the "prosiness" of prose and "novelness" of novels. "Prosaics" only can understand "prosaic intelligence", "prosaic vision" and "prosaic wisdom" (*Discourse* 404). Everyday life, diverse events, social reality and unimaginative facts are some of the special areas of "prosaics". It opposes romantic fancy and imagination (i.e. building castle in the air).

Bakhtin puts the view that the world is not only a messy place, but is also an open place. The term "unfinalizability", therefore, emerges to claim this place in the way

of his conceptualization. It designates a complex of values central to his thinking: innovation, surprisingness, openness, potentiality, freedom, and creativity. As Bakhtin writes, "Nothing conclusive has yet taken place in the world, the ultimate world of the word and about the world has not yet been spoken, the world is open and free, everything is still in the future and will always be in the future" (*Problems* 166).

In his opinion, time is open and each moment has multiple possibilities. Nothing is predictable, determined and finalized but everything is in the process. He repeatedly rejects models of any cultural process that strives to investigate that process in terms of laws and system. Unfinalizability and real creativity cannot be located in a system of laws. It is an ongoing process. Moreover, history is open and unfinalizable. Unfinalizability and prosaic do shape Bakhtin's understanding of historicity.

For Bakhtin, only the novel could come close to representing 'open present' and real historicity: "Reality as we have it in the novel is only one of the many possible realities; it is not inevitable, not arbitrary, it bears within itself other possibilities" (*Epic and Novel* 854). This sense of time becomes intrinsic to the way novels describe moments in history and in the lives of characters.

For Bakhtin, the open social atmosphere and social activities are always in the process of continuation. Nothing is predictable but they are in the process of becoming. Therefore, the novel which represents the social realities and historicity, is also in the process of becoming, and inherently possesses the quality of unfinalizability.

Carnival

Bakhtin provides another provocative notion, that is "carnival" or "Carnavalesque", and it is described as a quality to be identified with the development of the novel. Originally, a carnival was a feast celebrated by Roman Catholics before the

Lenten fast began. In a broad sense, a carnival is an occasion or season of merrymaking, feasting and entertainment. In the past, there were carnivals which were symbolic of the disruption and subversion of authority, a turning upside down of the hierarchy.

Bakhtin regards the spirit of carnival as a shaping effect of a polyphonic novel because novels for him are inspired by laughing truth, indebted to parodic genre. For him, carnival is associated with laughter, - comedy, parody, travesty and the breaking down of hierarchy. In carnival laughter, Bakhtin sees an externally "unofficial" truth about the world - a truth that rejects the existence of established "official" truth. Bakhtin further says, "The principles of laughter destroy [...] all pretence of an extra temporal meaning and unconditional value of necessity. It frees human consciousness, thought, and imagination for new potentialities" (*Rabelais and His World* 49). Thus, carnival breaks all the restrictions and dismantles the hierarchy of power, and frees human consciousness and imagination for a new potentiality and creativity. Bakhtin further explains that it completely frees human consciousness from all oppressive social norms and even from the fear of death.

Bakhtin further extends the concept of carnival to explain the incorporation of carnival into social life and its formative effect on literature and language. It is the centrifugal element, which breaks the center and hierarchy, and creates equality in the society at the moment of its celebration. Bakhtin states, "The suspension of all hierarchical precedence during the carnival was of particular importance [...] all there considered equal during the carnival [...] Utopian ideal and the realistic merged in this carnival experience, unique of its kind" (*Rebelias* 40).

Bakhtin's concept of carnival incorporates element of what he calls "critical Utopia". People are free to break, mock and satire the established norms, values, restriction and authority. They crown and decrown the mocking. This "crowning" and

"decrowning" symbolize the disruption of power hierarchy and an effort to create equal society. This is the mixture of Utopia and reality in the carnival.

Carnival is a cultural celebration which has greater significance in life and literature "Gaijatra" is a good example of carnival in Nepalese culture. During this time, people are free to satire and mock at whatever they want. No rules and regulation, norms and values create obstacles for them. "Unofficial" activities become dominant over "official" activities. As M.H Abrams says:

This literary mode parallels the flouting of authority and inversion of social hierarchies that, in many cultures, are permitted in a season of carnival. It does so by introducing a mingling of voices from diverse social levels that are free to mock and subvert authority, to flout social norms by ribaldry, [...]. (63)

Bakhtin further extends that novel has carnival body but other genre do not. The novel can be touched, groped and entered. As carnival plays a vital role in the society to dismantle the hierarchy through culture, Bakhtin uses novel to do the same task in the field of literature. It is most of all an "anti-force", it is subversive. It disrupts the authority and introduces alternatives; it is a kind of liberating influence. This sort of feature of carnival has always positive indicators. "To degrade [Carnivalescally]," Bakhtin states, "is to bury, to sow, and to kill simultaneously, in order to bring fourth something more and better" (21). This feature of carnival always seeks new, better and dynamic creative potential in the life and society.

Similarly, Bakhtin further extends the notion that carnival is a way of understanding the world and carnival sense of truth is an essential part of form-shaping ideology. He says carnival is not a mode of "abstract thinking" but- "artistic thinking". It is not a set of proposition about the world but a way of viewing the world.

Bakhtin expresses that the root of modern polyphonic novel is the ancient folk culture, folklore, folk laughter and carnival. He traces the occurrence of the carnivalesque in ancient, medieval, and renaissance writers (especially in Rabelais). For Bakhtin, Dostoevsky's novel exhibits the real features of carnival and he writes out of a rich tradition of seriocomic, dialogic and satiric literature. Just as the public ritual of carnival inverts the values in order to question them, so the novel calls closed meanings into question.

Chronotope

Chronotope literally means "time and space". Bakhtin describes chronotope in relation to how "time and space" is encoded in the novel. The basic concern of chronotope is to explore the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationship that is artistically expressed in the literature. Bakhtin's interest is not in the way literature reflects the world; instead it is with the way in which literature organizes the world spatially and temporally.

Bakhtin further says chronotope is a way of understanding experience, nature of events, and actions. Actions are performed in a specific context, and "time and space" differ by the ways in which they take context and the relation of actions and events to it. All contexts are shaped by the kind of time and space that operate within them. His significant point is that time and space vary in qualities, different social activities and their representations presume different kinds of time and space.

Again, Bakhtin stresses that chronotopes are fair ground for the activities. They are "the ground essential for the [...] represent ability of event" (*Forms of Time and of the Chronotope* 250). Therefore, chronotope is the spatio-temporal situation in which events and action take place. Events have intrinsic relationship with that situation. So, chronotope is the place where "the knots of narrative are tied and untied. It can be said

without qualification that to them [Chronotope] belongs to the meaning that shapes narrative" (250). For Bakhtin, meaning is not fixed and absolute but contextual.

Meanings cannot be separated from socio-historical and socio-cultural situations.

Bakhtin further explains that literature offers a multiplicity of chronotopes. A great number of literary genres have been working for conceptualizing the "image of a person", the process of history, and the dynamics of society. Some genres do a better job than others of "assimilating real historical time and space" and "actual historical person in such time and space" (*Forms of Time and of the Chronotope* 204). Among multiple genres novel is the best for Bakhtin. It presents the actual sense of chronotope.

Therefore, it offers most profound image of people, actions, events, history and society.

III. *The Quiet American*: A Dialogic Novel

In the monologic discourses, everything like action, belief, ideology or meaning is centralized according to the monogic will of the author within its finalized and very well systematized structure. It is so united and totally systematized by the "centripetal forces. The main characters become the centrality of the focus as the authorial voice. We find the centrality of meaning, singular perspective, and single theme monologic sense of truth in it. The plot, narration and thematic aspects of the text are similar to author's voice. So, monologic text cannot represent the multiple voices of the society.

But, Greene's *The Quiet American* displays multiple centers of ideologies and actions, beliefs and attitudes, interest and desires within its complex structure. There is not the single ideology, single perspective and single character or voice dominating the whole story of the novel. But there are multiple characters with equal autonomy and freedom, multiple stories and actions, multiple ideologies and meanings. Bakhtin's concept of multiple meaning and multiple centers are different from the Derridian 'concept of decentring' and multiplicity of meaning. For Derrida, there is no ultimate truth or no truth at all because language does not carry truth or meaning. Searching center or ultimate meaning is going into aporia. But Bakhtin does not mean that a text does not have any meaning or centers and he says there are multiple meaning and centers in the dialogic text. Different contexts give different meanings. Novel is free, open ended and democratic genre and it is structured by the "centrifugal forces" of the language. Greene's *The Quiet American* displays multiple centers of ideologies, actions, histories, voices and multiple meaning through the dialogic interactions between and among heterogeneous characters.

Heteroglossia is the most essential feature of a dialogic novel. Heteroglossia- diversity of speech 'types-essentially' covers the various aspects of social reality. The concept of heteroglossia itself unfolds the area of heterogeneity and variety. Diversity of people as a must to enhance heteroglossia in the genuine dialogic interaction. Language, for Bakhtin, is not an abstract phenomenon rather it represents social change; and social stratification and verbal ideological world. There are always different ways of speaking and such different "languages" reflect the diversity of social experience, conceptualizations and values. People of different professions have their own way of speaking and as so do different generations, different professions have their own ways of speaking and, as so do different generations, different classes, ethnic groups, age groups, and any number of other possible divisions.

The most important thing to grasp here is that these different languages are not just a matter either of professional jargon, or of varied form of the language or system. Instead what constitutes these different languages is something that is itself extra linguistic: a specific way of conceptualizing, understanding and evaluating the world. A complex set of experiences, shared evaluation, ideas and attitudes" knit together" to produce a way of speaking, so attitudes and views of the world identify languages. Bakhtin says languages embody the specific world views, each characterized by its own objects, meaning and values" (Discourse in the Novel 291-292).

Heteroglossia is the inherent quality of the dialogic novel. Heteroglossia in the novel should not be considered simply as author's artistic exploitation of language what Russian formalists naively comprehend as" defamiliarization". Instead, they should be acknowledged as a novel's fundamental attempt to correspond the reality of the world itself that is indisputably multifarious and much prosaic.

While interpreting Greene's *The Quiet American* from this theoretical background, diversity of speech types is to be analysed as the first and foremost quality of a dialogic novel. It is simply the Bakhtinian study due to its quality of dialogic novel. This chapter basically focuses on how Greene has dialogized the heteroglossia to correspond the social diversity, social reality and socio-economic condition in the novel to contemporary Vietnam. Two versions of the film on the basis of dialogue of its novel also presents the extra quality a dialogic novel.

Greene has subtly presented the social, cultural, political and economic condition of whole Vietminh territory especially, Saigon. It is the time of war with interest of expansion of colonial effect. During the time of the colonial expansion, people of different races, cultures and countries come together and as a result the society gets its form in heterogeneity as in Vietnam. Greene has created such a dialogic platform where people of different social sectors and background as well professions come into interaction. We can analyse those heterogeneous people from various angles of social stratification. Greene himself researched the real-life situation of Vietnam in early the 1950s in multiple layers.

Greene has mixed *The Quiet American* with numbers of characters from different socio-economic, socio-cultural, social-political and other contemporary existing backgrounds of the Vietnam and Saigon. There are politicians, spies, workers, capitalists, aristocrats, military persons, reporters, journalists, fighters, etc. They are from different sectors, professions, and sources. Here we can say it is simply a carnival. From the point of age groups, there are young, middle-aged, adult and old people both men and women. On the other hand, Greene has presented racially different people like white, Chinese, Vietnamese, Indians, Negroes-American and other native races. It is a novel from different social backgrounds like French,

American, British and Vietnamese. It is simply a story not history of early 1950's Vietnam. Because of its own typical setting of Vietnams and city Saigon, the novel becomes anti-American though the character of Pyle is related to story American personality. From this background, we can clearly point out that Greene's characterization of such heterogeneous people in the novel bears real color of social diversity and multiplicity in its heart. It is contextual to mention here what Greene of himself writes about the background of *The Quiet American* in Author's note,

"I have asked permission to dedicate this book to you not only in memory of the happy evenings. I have spent with you in Saigon over the last five years, but also because I have quite shamelessly borrowed the location of your flat to house one of my characters, and your name, Phuong [. . .]". (iv)

This indicates that it is romantic celebration of his lifetime that had spent in Vietnam, especially, Saigon. It is the attachment of Vietnam's people so he takes the character name Phuong. He himself says that it is not history simply a story of that time. Again, we can add another point to clarify this note, "This is a story about a few imaginary characters it will pass for both of you one hot Saigon evening". This shows the happy situation, romantic mood, optimistic feelings and joys though there is a miserable condition after war.

Greene also interacted with American members of one economic aid mission in China. He recalls one individual who lectured him "all the long drive back to Saigon on necessity of find "third forces in Vietnam" (170). This denotes that there is much more foreign interest to grab the opportunity after the war. It is colonial period and every powerful country wanted to dictate Vietnam. The bombing that Philip Noyce shows in his film is such moving and powerful fashion. Greene has then

suspected American directly involved in the bombing in novel. He also notes that photographer from *Life Magazine* was present "Who was so well placed that he was able to show an astonishing and horrifying photographic which showed the body of a trishaw driver still drawing after his legs had been blown off (171). When the photograph was published, the caption "The work of Ho Chi Minh" even though general the proudly claimed to be responsible for bombing, given the historical reality of the situation, it is no wonder that Greene came towards hard on Pyle. His research certainly pays off in *The Quiet American*.

Things in March of 1956 as reviews of *The Quiet American* begin appearing regularly in American newspapers and popular magazines. Harold Gardiner condemns the novel in a 10 March review for American calling *The Quiet American* a "disappointer novel" and describes its tone as "needlessly and depressingly unwholesome" (369). This later comment springs out of Phuong as Fowler's live-in mistress and Pyle as little more than a caricature. Gardiner presents precious little literary analysis to justify his opinions. The very next day another review appeared this time in *The New York Times Book Review*. Robert Gorham Davis reads he novel in terms of politics with the characters as "representatives of their nations or political factions" (1). Because the novel is about America as "a crassly materialistic and 'innocent' nation with no understanding for other peoples"(1). David dislikes *The Quiet American*. He argues that Greene's novel is anti-American and not strongly enough anti-communist. Then, it is a bad novel.

John Lehman's March 12 review for *The New Republic* contains a more balanced reading. He quickly praises the winning construction of the novel and brilliant writing is the war scenes. Nevertheless, he calls *The Quiet American* "One of the most icily anti-American books I have ever read" (26). He also notes that Pyle is a

two dimensional caricature "with little or no reality outside his function in the novel" (26).

One of the most scathing contemporary reviews of *The Quiet American* appears in the *New Yorker*. A.J. Libeling dislikes the novel because it is anti-American, but he never really explains why this makes it a bad novel. Given the literary reputation of *The New Yorker*, one would expect serious comment in six-page review. Libeling seems much more concerned with speculating that Greene really grew up in America or only knows about America from what he reads in French books than he is concerned with literary criticism. His review is much more about himself a person and his writing ability than it is about Greene and his writing. The closest Libeling gets to analysis is when he writes that Fowler is a Hemingway hero, albeit, a bad Hemingway hero (148). Later in the month of April 1956, Walter Allen provides the best American review of *The Quiet American*. He praises Graham Greene for what he calls his "Awareness of evil" (344). Allen is quick to acknowledge that the novel will have its detractors in America.

It would be idle to pretend that *The Quiet American* is going to be palatable to majority of readers in this country. In his novel of the war in Indo-china, Greene express criticism of American and especially of America behaviour in foreign affairs that is widely held, if not openly stated, by a great many people outside the United States (344).

What notes of these American critics have demonstrated, however, is that Greene's criticism of American and American behaviour is incorrect in appropriate, or unjustified. These reviews seem to subscribe to the "my country right or wrong" school of criticism. To some extent, it is a description of American interest to other countries to suppress and to grab opportunity from their mistakes.

Continuing in chronological order; the next review comes from a Canadian publication titled *Saturday Night* in the 21 May issue, an unsigned review acknowledges that American readers will be stung by the bitter comments of the novel. The review ends thusly: "certainly this is a bitter and trouble-making book, but as Canadians (and therefore by definition Fence-straddle) we can afford to see the truth in it, and to enjoy it without making taking sides" (18). Since there are no Canadian characters, Canadian readers can't be offended by *The Quiet American*. They are as uninvolved in the novel as Fowler claims to be. Thus they can appreciate the novel as an excellent study of ambiguity in the modern world. It presents the various characters different ideas in the novel. Philip Rahv reviews the novel in the May issue of commentary. While *The Quiet American* was a best seller in England, Rahv argues that it will not do well in America "For obvious reasons" (480). The most obvious reasons that Rahv provides is "the insinuation that Pyle is the preventative American" (689) Rahv's review certainly contains a negative opinion of *The Quiet American*, but he acknowledges that Greene is a good writer and that his other novels have merit. Philip Rahv and Diana Trilling provide more opinions on the novel in dialogue with another in commentary from the July 1956 issue. The later detests the novel calling it "an affront to America" (67). The former seems to have paid attention in his literary criticism 101 class because he is quick to note that another of a piece of literature is not the same as a character within the work no matter how similar they might appear.

Rahv reads Fowler as "a habit so shrunken is his capacity believe in public causes and ideas as to be willing to settle for his girl and opium pipe without asking anything more in life" (69). Given Fowler's nihilism and in position as a limited, biased first person narrator. We as readers cannot trust everything that he says. Rahv

also responds to political criticism stressing the fact that "anti-Americanism is not necessarily the equivalent of pro-communism" (70). What a refreshing idea for the mid- 1950s in America with McCarthyism and the Red Scare. The mix of different ideas and different views on the novel. It is quite interesting that some argument on the basis of politics and romance is clearly mentioned. It provides the novel as a mixed and carnival of politics as well as other contemporary social Diaspora.

To be sure, although it has a writer for a central character *The Quiet American* is far from a romantic celebration of the writer as hero. The English Journalist Thomas Fowler appears to take no pride, and not much interest, in his own writing, which is valuable to him improving him a professional reason for staying in Vietnam. His reporting of the colonial war in French Indo-China is subject to censorship and he has been careful not to risk expulsion by filing news that would displace the French authorities.

‘Great victory north-west of Hanoi. French recaptured two villages they never told us they’d lost. Heavy Vietminh casualties. Haven’t been able to count their own yet but will let us know in a week or two.’
[...] They lay on a flight over the two towns they’ve recaptured and show us the tri-colour flying. It might be any darned flag at that height. Then we have press conference and a colonel explains to us what we’ve been looking at.(27)

In any case, war reporting, it seems in a speech genre not always dependable for truthfulness; when Bill Granger is congratulated for a graphic action report headlines "Highway to Hell", he says he never went anywhere near it (35-36). No wonder Fowler is skeptical about what can be learned from writing. "You know, if you live in a place for long you cease to read about it" he tells Alden Pyle (24). Pyle, who is the

"quiet American" of the title, replies continuously- "Of course I always like to know what the man on the sport has to say " (26) but this difference of views about writing in the first of the defining gaps that open up between the older and younger man.

Pyle is intensely bookish. He has an enormous respect for what he calls serious writers. Above all he venerates *York Harding* author of *The Advance of Red China*, an American diplomatic correspondent and cold warrior whose ideas about Southeast Asia will inspire Pyle's own intervention, in the name of a Third Force in Vietnam, with its tragic results. Pyle supplies explosive to a Vietnamese warlord, which are subsequently used for a terrorist bombing in which civilians are massacred. Leaving aside their rivalry in love for the beautiful Phuong, there is certainly in Fowler's exasperation with Pyle some of the old colonial Power' bilious resentment of the arriviste hegemonic, and something \else of the scorn of the old hand for the metropolitan theorist, which goes back to Kipling's satire on Pagett. But more fundamentally there is a difference here between faith and faithfulness in writing itself. Fowler thinks York Harding's political theory has no attachment for the complex local realities in which he himself is experienced, but indeed he inhabits a universe in which writing in any case has a weak grip on reality. The early chapters make this point in what seems a systematic and polemical way. The comment on Pyle is described as:

Pyle was quiet, he seemed modest, and sometimes that first day I had to lean forward to catch what he was saying. And he was very, very serious. Several times he seemed to shrink up within himself at the noise of the American Press on the terrace above. (15)

The above paragraph clearly hints that the American interest on various countries to rule over them is a colonial interest and the domination towards them. Pyle is the

representing character and seriousness in plan to dictate other countries personnel affairs.

In the intricately time shifted narration of *The Quiet American*, Pyle is killed at the very beginning of the book, his murder a political assassination in which Fowler himself has been accessory-takes place during the action narrated in the book's first sentence although it is not entered into the narrative record at the point. This aporia will turn out to be an ominous signal of the discrepancy between writing and reality, but the early pages soon furnish plenty more. One of the first things Fowler does after being questioned by the police about Pyle is to file his story about Pyle's death, "American officials murdered in Saigon". We can assume that the story conceals its authors guilty knowledge of the crime, Fowler textualizes and falsifies Pyle in the same act of writing. The police, it turns out are doing the same. Fowler asks his friend Vigot, The French Surete' officer investigating the death, if he is really looking for Pyle's killer, and he says no "I'm just making a report, that's all. So long as it's act of war-well, there are thousands killed every year" (20). Once again, writing seems to be a sort of substitute for or evasion of real action. The American Economic Aattaches', Pyle's boss, tells it differently, but just a questionably, in a telegram to Pyle's parents.

Although political science, official, communiqués, and press reports are all wide of the mark in different ways, there is another kind of writing that Fowler seems to allow is capable of capturing what Vietnam is really like and this is the literary writing expressly dismissed by Pyle as being not serious. As he sinks into an opium lassitude, Fowler finds the words for his mood in the French of Baudelaire 's "*L'invitaion au Voyage*" (*Mon enfant, ma soeur*") which not only seems perfect evocative of his enjoyment of opium and the girl Phuong together, but also release his mind on an associative and synaesthetic drift that takes him from the fragrance of

opium and the girl to the flowers and canals of the north, curling back to his feelings of contentment and inertia, and his desire never to go home. It clearly denotes that the desire and interest of develop counties people to get sufficient advantages from the developing and war effect counties. They want to suckle everything from them, as much as they can even blood too.

Baudelaire's lyric seems to activate in Fowler metaphorical power which is the only way language- a Western Language, at least- can adequately represent the experience of Vietnam. Something similar is researched in Fowler' briefing of Pyle, when the new arrival has earnestly asked him about the country. Willingly enough, he gives the younger man what he calls "arid bones of background" about Vietnam, while admitting that Pyle will have to learn for himself, " the real background" of more subjective impressions (25), and this is then invited in a lyrical catalogue images.

There is quite similar example in Greene's evocation in *Ways of Escape* of the 'spell' of Indo-China, cast" by the tall elegant girls in white silk trousers, by the pewter evening light on the flat paddy fields (154). Almost invariably given in present tense or participles, or verbally, such catalogues can be seen as a dehistoricizing trope, and in this case a version of the orient as pastoral; such as their "Occidentalism" equivalent in the novel is the glossy pictures in western magazines pored over by Phuong. This essentially poetic sensory inventory of the country is something vouch-safe only to the experienced and is to be collected only at first hand. Neatly enough, this kind of writing which is advanced as being able to convey the emotional truth about the experience of Vietnam, can never be available to Pyle since it is described in the narrative record that is the story of his own death.

[. . .], he might be murder by the Vietminh. They have murdered plenty of people in Saigon. His body was found in the river by the by the bridge to Dakow-Vietminh territory when you police withdraw at night. Or, he might have been killed by the Vietnamese Surete'-it's been known. Perhaps they did not like this friends (19).

This paragraph clearly notes that Vietnamese people take revenge upon the Americans by killing Pyle.

If we consider this novel's part in the generic mission of the "auto-critique of discourse" through exposure to "contemporary reality", the dialogues is not of encouraging. This matters because the reality in question-Vietnam in 1950s has a serious political dimension: in the classic pattern that would be described by Said in *Orientalism*, a discourse of Western "Knowledge" about what Vietnam was really like, and what it really needed, was being constructed and this knowledge had already deadly consequences and would lead to more. But in much of *The Quiet American* there is a strong sense of the illegibility of Vietnam and its people most obviously of Phuong herself, who is disadvantaged in relation to these western men not only economically but also her limited knowledge of French and English, but who nonetheless move s in Vietnams language environment entirely closed to Fowler and Pyle.

This goes some way beyond the clinched inscrutability of the Orient, for although others may lie to her, Phuong is startlingly simple and transparent in her conduct. Mendacious English is shadowed by simply in comprehensible Vietnamese. Pyle attempts to fill this cognitive emptiness by projecting a romantic narrative in which Phuong is a helpless childish innocent and he the heroic reseuer. Fowler supposes her tough, pragmatic and virtually lacking interiority- "She'll never suffer

like we do from thoughts, obsessions" but has to admit that this too is a fiction, and "I was inventing a character just as much as Pyle was" (133). For her inner life is a blind spot to these western men, linguistically impenetrable hinterland that is beyond representation. She is a bird who escapes from the net. (There is a symbolism in their names, *Phuong* means Phoenix, and *Fowler*, a hapless papageno, wants to capture her for himself) "I wanted to read her thoughts" says Fowler, "but they were hidden away language couldn't speak" (140). *Phuong* is garrulous enough in her own language-when speaking with her sister for example, but what she has to say is not open to transcription in Fowler's record, where her speech is represented only in simple and uninteresting utterances in school girl's French. For *Phuong* and *Fowler* converse in French though apart from few phrases, their conversation is given in English in the narrative, *Fowler's* French is better than *Phuong's* and she cannot understand him when she speaks ironically.

On the other hand, he cannot speak Vietnamese language and don't understand when she speaks her own language. The same goes for the gossiping old women on the landing of the stairs in *Fowler's* building. They are themselves texts, for they carry fate, "in the lines of their faces as others on the Palm", they were silent as I passed and I wondered what they might have told me, if I had know their language, of what had passed while I had been away" (115)

It seems there is a book of Vietnam, but it is closed to *Fowler*. It is to be glimpsed again when *Fowler* visits the communist agent *Mr. Heng*, and is ushered into a little in her room at the back of a funereal parlor. I had the sense that on this occasion the chairs had been employed, for there were five little-tea cups on the table, and two were no empty" (175). This is where the real story of Vietnam is being made, and *Flower* is privy to it. It remains unreportable, at least in a western language.

Though the novel is disappointing and post war written, it has talked some aspects of the democratic movement of America. However, America wants to dedicate other countries, she never forgets to teach the lesson of rights of the people. The death of Pyle is the symbol of death of democracy in Vietnam. Some of the communist government officials do not want the presence of any Third Force in their countries. It was suspected that Pyle was killed by some loyal people of Vietnam

Grieved to report your son died a soldier's death in cause of democracy. [. . .] yes, they killed him because he was too innocent to live. He was young and silly and got involved. He had no more notion that any of you what the whole affair's about and you gave him money." (23)

The ambiguity lies in the fact that Pyle works for CIA. Greene's scorn for American espionage comes out loud and clear because Pyle did not die a soldier. He was stabbed and the support of thrown face down in the river to drown. In the name of "Democracy", Pyle with the CIA and the American government slaughtered innocent women and children.

Innocence occurs as a theme again in the novel. While having few drinks in a bar, Fowler and Phuong meet Pyle and another American name Granger. Granger is drunk and wants to go for dinner. Granger stumbles out of the bar, and Pyle follows to make sure that Granger is safe. Fowler and Phuong go to the restaurant. When Pyle does not joint them there later, Fowler goes in search of the "quiet American".

That was my first instinct to protect him. I never occurred to me that there was greater need to protect myself. Innocence always calls mutely for protection when he would be so much sire to quart

ourselves against it, innocence is like a dumb leper who has lost his bell, wandering the world, meaning to harm. (29)

Only after the bombing does Fowler realize his own need for protection. Pyle's foolishly naive innocence allows him to think that he is doing the right in the long term by working with General The' to establish a democratic option for Vietnam. Pyle and the CIA think that they can tame to their own ends because they are supplying this revolution. Their belief is like the leper it destroys all these with whom it comes in contact.

Fowler sometimes sees himself through Pyle's eyes: "A man of middle age, with eyes a little bloodshot, beginning to put on weight, ungraceful in love, less noisy the Granger perhaps but more cynical, less innocent (32). Pyle, a Bostonian, is an innocent, respectful, and sincere young man who "Believes in being involved". Fowler is an experienced but detached journalist. He has a jaded attitude and is comfortable with his Vietnams mistress. Pyle, on the other hand, has little practical experience. He is so naïve and inadequate that he lives his life from books. Pyle studied about the east before coming to Vietnam. His closest involvement with a woman is dancing with Phuong. Therefore, to supplement his merge knowledge, Pyle then reads about sex from *The Physiology of Marriage*. Fowler would have simply gone out and found a woman. Another difference between Fowler and Pyle concerns belief. Pyle cannot imagine life without God little religious, while Fowler says that life does not make sense with god. Fowler's ultimate God is death that takes away all pain and fear. Fowler mentions God quite often, but he is not a believer. He never desired faith. The job of reporter is to express the news and to record with new exposure. How many Hundred million Gods do people believe in? Why ever a Roman Catholic believes in quite different God when he's cared or happy or hungry? (86)

There is no source of stability in Fowler's life. He is skeptical and existentialist. He always believes the physicality, no spirituality. Needless, to say, Fowler becomes disturbed by the American Intervention. Pyle can marry Phuong, but Fowler cannot because his wife will not grant him a divorce. The materialist approach of Fowler is clearly seen here that he wants to be a luxurious.

Time has its revenge, but revenges seem so often sour. Would not we all do better not trying to understand, accepting the fact that no human being will ever understand another, not a wife a husband, a lover a mistress, nor a parent or child? Perhaps that's why men have invented God a being capable of understanding. Perhaps if I wanted to be understood or to understand I would bam-boozle myself into belief, but I am a reporter: God exists only for leader -writers. (52)

Again Fowler's self interests' reveals to them with comment like this, it seems impossible for readers to like the British narrator of the book when presented with such a likable character as Aden Pyle, the American. Two characters from two different nations have different natures and specialties having different notions and interest towards life and the world.

As the narrator Fowler subtly tries to influence reader's opinions of Pyle negatively, but we cannot trust that he is not simply jealous about losing Phuong. One day when Fowler is having beer, two American women are having an ice cream at the next table. They get up from their table with the cryptic comment "warren said we mustn't stay later than eleven five" (151). A few minutes later; a massive bomb rips through the city square causing horrific casualties. Fowler thinks of Phuong who is normally having a drink with her friends at this time and goes rushing across the square to see if she is still alive. He meets Pyle who assures him that Phuong is not

there because, as he says," I warned not to go. [. . .] I told her to keep away this morning. (153). Thus, Greene unequivocally demonstrates that Pyle knew about the bombing both in term of where and when it should go off. Phuong and the American women were all told to keep out of the square.

When Pyle looks down at the blood of innocent women and children killed in the square during the shopping hour, he does not recognize it for what it is. Fowler tells Pyle: You've got the Third Force and National Democracy all over your rights shoe. Go home to Phuong and tell her about your heroic deed. There are a few dozen less of her people to worry about (154).

Pyle's ignorance comes to the forefront when he humbly tries to explain that there was supposed to be a military parade and that General The' should have called if the bombing when the parade was cancelled. The episode ends with Fowler thinking about Pyle. He'll always be innocent, you can't blame the innocent, they are always guiltless. All you can do is control them or eliminate them. Innocence is kind of insanity. (155)

By trusting that they really have the best interests of the Vietnamese people at heart, Pyle has been duped by the renegade general. Even when failed with the results of the naiveté', Pyle cannot believe that he has been lied to. He maintains his innocence, and Fowler, knowing that Pyle cannot be controlled, is led to thoughts of eliminating him. Even with this mind, Fowler still remains undecided about getting involved. When he meets Heng, a communist organizer, Heng asks Fowler for help. The communist wants to talk to Pyle about the bombings and ask Fowler to arrange dinner engagement with Pyle for later that evening. Fowler cannot give him a definite answer. Heng ends the meeting by saying sooner or later [. . .] one has to take sides. If one is to remain human unable to take a side (166) .Fowler invites Pyle over for a

drink to discuss the day's events. Pyle remains unpleasant for his actions. He calls the dead in the city square "war casualties" and continuously saying, "It was pity, but you can't always hit your target. Anyway they died in the right cause. [. . .] in a way you could say they died for democracy (171).

Outrage is the only word one can use to describe Fowler's response to Pyle's words. The novel began with Fowler looking awful and Pyle looking like a noble character. By the end, however, we see the Greene has reversed their roles. Pyle appears to be a villain in spite of his good intentions. While we might not agree with Fowler condemning Pyle's to death, we can certainly understand quite clearly why the Englishman finally takes a side. Fowler becomes human; even we do not like it. From this, Greene moves into the present time, and the novel closes with Fowler and Phuong living together again. His wife has finally agreed to divorce, and Fowler and Phuong can now be married. Thus, we have a sort of happy ending to *The Quiet American*, but it is somewhat a happy ending deeply tempered with sadness and death. Real life in the modern world is a similar *mélange* of sorrow and joy, and Greene certainly is modern novelist as we can see some of his novels.

The Quiet American is also a detective story that expresses outrageous truth about the twentieth century that is a slide into savagery" (Gaston 96). The brilliant part of this detective story is that Fowler, the central character, plays the roles of narrator, detective, and criminal. Vigot asks questions, but Fowler tells the story, internally agonizes over his role in it, and finds himself guilty of the crime. He discovers himself at the very centre of this thinking who done it (96). Fowler undergoes some serious psychological and spiritual introspection, but Gaston reverts to religion by arguing that the "Someone" of Fowler last lines quoted above must be God (105-106)

Robert Pendleton certainly blends various critical theories smoothly in interpreting Greene's novel in general, and *The Quiet American* in particular, Pendleton argues that this novel marks the beginning of Greene's mature phase, where politics, human interiority and formulaic thriller plots are played against each other in more complex and integrated fictions" (87). In order to justify such an opinion, Pendleton investigates the formulaic detective story structure of the early entertainments, the religion of the catholic novels, the psychologically real characters and the sociopolitical elements in both types of fiction. He ever discusses the theme of faith and betrayal in several Greene works as well as the imperial setting of *The Quiet American* without charging Greene with imperialism. He sees Greene's characters as having highly interior lives within political structures (90). Greene is a such dynamic and important novelist and *The Quiet American* is so good because it has a political theme, dialogic aspects, covers various dimension of dialogic novels and binds "together the two dissociated detours-towards the thriller and towards the interior Latholic narrative of faith and betrayal, which have occupied him during the earlier part of his narrative *Opus*" (94). By synthesizing and reintegrating these desperate narrative elements, Greene has produced a master piece.

IV. Conclusion

The Quiet American is written slightly stepping a pacing ahead from the ancient tradition. It is the novel where Bakhtin's idea of dialogic best applies. When Bakhtin developed the concept of dialogic society through novel, Greene has tried to prove that the society is always based on social diversification, heterogeneity and other social aspects of dialogic ideas. When we readers are captured by the concept of monologic ideas we are bound to see the society from single perspective. But in the novel it is different and many ideas come with all covering aspects of the contemporary current social realities.

Marx argues that the society is divided only with two groups and always moves around them, it never escapes from the conflict. So, his claim is the world is limited in only material. The thing which I want to assert is that various disciplines become dominant in different periods. And as the society was always shaped according to fixed criteria, the dynamic idea of the society was ceased. These disciplines become more dominant with each other on different periods and people could not judge how society actually was. This is not only the case in discipline; it is the same problem in genre too. The different genres like lyric, poetry and epic that tries to establish hierarchy in society. It clearly creates a kind of grade. It provides upper position to the knights or heroes and neglects poor people who are less in power and relegates them to the lower position. But in novel there is less chance to have above mentioned problems because the language and the society of the novel tat of the poor people and contemporary society. Greene's *The Quiet American* also tries to portray how this kind of problem in the society of Vietnam still exists. He tries to show the supremacy of America and other developed countries to poor war-effect Vietnam.

The genre critic Mikhail Bakhtin who studies the society from different perspective and creates the idea of dialogic, which really represents the society as it is. He brings the idea of dialogic through novel, because novel is that genre which is very dynamic, it can flow with the brook of society. This is the subject which is always in process. Novel always targets on knowledge and experience which is not static at all. We can easily see this in *The Quiet American*. Novel concerns the current issues of the society where lyric does not so. Lyric is a kind of photograph what is today will be the same after a long period. Novel so flexible that everything whether prosed or lyric or epic can be grasped. So it can juxtapose the past and present horizontally. The comparison of things in horizontal dismantles the hierarchy where the vertical comparison creates hierarchy that is possible in epic.

The British writer, Graham Greene who is a great fond of traveling of many countries and places, has got more experiences of different societies and the people and also collected the huge amount of experience of different societies, wrote this novel to show what had been done in Vietnam before and after war. The novel is the reflection that time cotemporary society. It is the text that carries the real sense, problems and the situation of that time people and society. Learning from his own dynamic life ,Greene has found the real sense of life and *The Quiet American* is the reflection of this. He wrote this by adopting the idea of dialogic and heterogeneity. On thoroughly studying the novel there are so many crucial points to support me to prove the novel as a dialogic novel with Bakhtinian concept. However, I can say it is the Bakhinian Study, it incorporates multiple disciplines, voices ,and genres into its structure by mixing them in a single text. To mix up them he has blurred the tradition which has already created the hierarchical standard. The binary opposition created on previous creations between upper class and lower class, fact and fiction, rich and

poor, worker and landlord etc are destroyed in the text. Novel is the dynamic genre that can flow with the society so it known as a genre of everyday life.

The novel is a continuous intriguing piece of story telling. Greene criticizes the relationships within a society that prioritized outward appearances over inward realities. Each of the main characters is a secret agent of sorts, with a double or triple life. Every character, and specially Mr. Pyle, involves in the same manipulative game. So, Greene has brought into vivid relief a universal human problem ,the fearful price of innocence and has shown the behind innocence there lurks unconscious arrogance and self- righteous streak of moral blindness.

Finally, *The Quiet American* is not only the study of text but also the study of a society. Its is a democratic text which gives the ideas of equality, plurality, heterogeneity among the people and readers. It tries to teach us the reality of the society through the medium of dialogues. It also suggests the results of the involvement in war and other country's private affair. The society should sustain itself with its boundary even if ups and downs challenge it. The products of the society are real creations. The writer should go to the inner part of the society to illustrate the real problem and the heart to find the real work .After providing so many clues and proofs, the research work shows that *The Quiet American* is an excellent text to support the dialogic ideas of Bakhtin.

Works Cited

- Adam, Hazard, ed., *Critical Theory since Plato*. Rev. ed., Fort Worth: HBJC Publishers, 1992.
- Allen, Walter. "Awareness of Evil: Graham Greene." Rev. of *The Quiet American*. *The* 21 April 1956: 344-336.
- Alott, Miriam. "The Moral Situation in *The Quiet American*." *Graham Greene: Some* (Considerations Ed. Robert O. Evans. Lexington: U of Kentucky P, 1963. 188-2.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Discourse in the Novel." *Critical Theory Since 1965*. Ed. Hazard Adams. Rev. ed. New York: Harcourt. 1944. 33-47.
- - -. Emerson, Caryl. Ed. and Trans. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 1984.
- - -. "Epic and Novel: Towards a Methodology for the Study of the Novel." *Critical Theory Since Plato*. ed. Hazard Adams. Rev. ed. New York: Harcourt. 1992. 839-55.
- - -. "Forms of the Time and The Chronotope in the Novel." *Emerson and Holquist*. 204-56.
- - -. *Rebelais and His World*. Trans. Helen Iswolky. Cambridge: MTI Press. 1968.
- - -. *Speech Genre and Other Late Essays*, University of Texas Press, Austin. 1986.
- - -. *The Dialogic Imagination, Four Essays* (ed.,) and trans., by Holquist, Michael, University of Texas Press, Austin. 1981.
- - -. "Toward Reworking of Dostoevsky Book." *Emerson*, 290-322.
- Bonney, William. "Politics, Perception and Gender in Conrad's *Lord Jim* and Greene's *The Quiet American*." *Contadina* 23 (1991)-122.
- Cassis, A.F. *Graham Greene: An Annotated Bibliography of Criticism*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow, 1981.

- - -. *Graham Greene: Life, Work and Criticism*. Fredericton. N.B.: York, 1994.
- Davis, Robert Gorham. "In Our Time No Man in Neutral." Rev. of *The Quiet American*. *York Times Book Review* 11 March 1956: 1, 32.
- Eliustratova, Anna. "Graham Greene and his New Novel." *Soviet Literature* 8 (1956): 1
- Even, Roberto, "Existentialism in Greene's *The Quiet American*." *Modern Fiction Studies* (1957): 241-248.
- Evans, Robert O. Existentialism in Greene's *The Quiet American*." *Modern Fiction Studies* (1957): 241-248.
- Freedman, Ralph. "Novel of Contention: *The Quiet American*." Rev. of '*The Quiet American*' *Western Review* 21 (1956): 76-81.
- Gardiner, Harold C. "Nature of Grace." Rev. of *The Quiet American* by Graham Greene, *The Lamb* by Francois Mauriac. *America* 10 March 1956: 639.
- Gaston, G.M. "The Structure of Salvation in *The Quiet American*." *Renascence* 31 (1979-106)
- Graham Greene *The Quiet American*. New York: Penguin, 1955.
- Hartung, Philip T. "The Sophist and The Sophomore." Rev. of *The Quiet American*. *Commonweal* 22 February 195: 541-542.
- Hatch, Robert. Rev. of *The Quiet American*. *Nation* 8 March 1958: 216.
- Hillenbran, Barry. "What's Missing in this Picture?" Rev. of *The Quiet American*. *Commonweal* 28 February 2003: 21-22.
- Holden, Stephen, "A Jaded Affair in a Vietnam Already at War." Rev. of *The Quiet American* *New York Times* 22 November 2002: E 14.
- Lehmann, John. "The Blundering, Ineffectual American." Rev. of *The Quiet American*. *Republic* 12 March 1956: 26-27.

- Liebling, A.J. "A Talkative Something-or-Other." Rev. of *The Quiet American*. New York April 1956: 148-154.
- "Loser on Points." Rev. of *The Quiet American*." Newsweek 10 February 1958: 106-107.
- Morson, G.B; ed., *Bakhtin: Essays and Dialogues on His Work* (1986)
- Pearce, Lynne. "Bakhtin and Dialogic Principle." *Literary Theory and Criticism*. Ed. Patria Waugh. New York: Oxford University Press. 2006. 223-32.
- Pendleton, Robert. "Arabesques of Influence; The Repressed Conradian Masterplot in the Novels of Graham Greene." *Conradiana* 25 (1993): 83-98.
- Rahv, Philip. "Wicked American Innocence." Rev. of *The Quiet American*. Commentary (1956): 488-490.
- Sykes, Christopher. "Culpable Innocence." Rev. of *The Quiet American*. The Tablet 3 December 1955: 550-551.
- Toynbee, Philip. "The Heart of the Matter." Rev. of *The Quiet American*. The Observer December 1955: 155.
- Treglown, Jeremy. "God Save us from the Good." Rev. of *The Quiet American*. Times Supplement 20 November 2002: 18.
- Trilling, Diana, and Philip Rahv. "America and *The Quiet American*." Rev. of *The Quiet American*. Commentary 22 (1956): 66-71.
- Turan, Kenneth. "An Elegant Story of Corruptibility." Rev. of *The Quiet American*. Los Angeles Times 22 November 2002: E8.
- West, Richard. "Graham Greene and *The Quiet American*. *New York Review of Books* 1991: 49-52.
- Whitfield Stephen; "Limited Engagement: *The Quiet American* as History." *Journal of American Studies* 30 (1996): 63-86.